

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES  
NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

SOLICITATION NUMBER: #952 – EBT Services RFP  
DATE: February 21, 2018  
POINT OF CONTACT: Mark Close  
Email: Mark.Close@state.sd.us

The following are questions submitted by Respondents regarding the EBT Services RFP #952 issued by the South Dakota Department of Social Services in conjunction and on behalf of the North Dakota Department of Human Services. As required in Paragraph 1.10 of the RFP, the States have reviewed the questions and offer the following responses. Terms used in this response have the meaning of the same terms when used in the RFP.

#	Section	Page	Question	Response
1	Section 1.11 Preference Laws	3	Could you please clarify the first sentence? Which offerors are being given preference for purposes of this procurement, and does that preference relate to the evaluation of offerors?	North Dakota has a "Reciprocal Preference" law (NDCC 44-08-01) that requires the preference given to a resident North Dakota bidder be equal to the preference given or required by the state of the nonresident bidder. Preference being provided to the in-state bidder is dependent on the laws of the State of domicile for out-of-state bidders.
2	Section 1.12 Proprietary Information	3	Is there any particular proprietary marking that offerors should use to designate information that the offeror seeks to protect from release under state open records laws?	An offeror may make a written request that trade secrets and other proprietary data contained in proposals be held confidential. An offeror must include in their proposal a statement that clearly identifies specific page numbers and sections of their proposal considered confidential, or are copyrighted and may not duplicate, or are exempt under N.D.C.C. §44-04-18.4 for trade secret proprietary, commercial, and financial information, and a brief statement that sets out the reasons for the confidentiality request. In addition to the confidential statement, each identified page must be marked "Confidential" in the proposal.
3	Section 1.13 Length of Contract	4	This RFP Section 1.13 states that "By submission of a response, the bidder acknowledges and accepts all terms and conditions of the RFP unless clearly documented in a separate section of the Technical Proposed entitled 'Exceptions to Contract Terms.'" Similarly, RFP Section 1.15 explains that the process is a "...Competitive Negotiation Process" and that each Offeror shall be available for negotiations meetings. However, RFP Section 6.7, on page 106, seems to conflict with these sections by implying that by signing the proposal, Offerors are agreeing to everything without exception or negotiation. Will the States please confirm that Offerors are permitted to include any exceptions they may have in an "Exceptions to Contract Terms" section of their proposal as allowed in Section 1.13?	Section 6.7 statement regarding that the Offeror certifies that it complies with "7) All terms, conditions, and requirements set forth in this RFP" is regarding the RFP itself, and not the resulting contract. The Offeror can indicate its exceptions to the Contract Terms in the RFP per the process documented in Section 1.13 of the RFP.
4	Section 1.13 Length of Contract	4	Will any items included in the "Exceptions to Contract Terms" section negatively impact a bidder's evaluation score?	No, it will not.
5	Section 1.13 Length of Contract	4	How will items included in the "Exceptions to Contract Terms" section be evaluated and scored?	Items in the "Exceptions to Contract Terms" response section are not scored.
6	Section 2.1.1 Subcontractor Definition and Reporting Structure	5	If an offeror has access to the assets of affiliated company and wouldn't normally contract based on relationship would the State consider the affiliate to be part of the offeror or would the State consider the affiliate to be a subcontractor under 2.1.1.	If a contractual relationship exists between the Offeror and the affiliated company, then the affiliated company would be considered a subcontractor under Section 2.1.1.
7	Section 2.2 Contract Performance Standards	8	Would the States consider the following timeframes for responding to customer service complaints? Priority 1: 48 business hours Priority 2: 5 business days	The States would be willing to negotiate the timeframe based on a recommendation from the Offeror.
8	Section 2.2 Contract Performance Standards	9	Access to System by Retailers Using a TPP or Driving Their Own Terminals  EBT processor doesn't have any control over retailers who is behind TPP. It will be between retailers and TPPs. As long as retailer is certified by FNS and active in REDE, we will be able to accept transactions from TPP/retailers, EBT processor does not require to enable retailers. <u>Please clarify the intent of this performance standard.</u>	Intent of the performance standard is to require the EBT Processor to provide access to the Retailer within the required timeframe (30 days) if the Retailer is direct connected or coming through a TPP. Access is defined as allowing the Retailer or its TPP to connect to the EBT Processor and to process and settle transactions coming from the Retailer.
9	Section 2.2 Contract Performance Standards	9	The FNS standard for equipment replacement is 48 hours. Will the States modify the standards for EBT-only POS equipment replacement and PIN selection equipment replacement to allow 48 business hours for replacements to be sent?	FNS standard is 48 hours following notification without regard to business days. If the EBT Processor wants to follow the FNS Standards, it will have to be 48 hours from retailer notification without regard to the business days. If the EBT Processor is notified of a terminal issue on Friday evening, the replacement terminal will need to be onsite at the retailer by Sunday evening.
10	Section 3.2.2.1 Current SDDSS Operating Environment	17	Will this new process be implemented prior to or at some point during the beginning of the new performance period of the new contract?	This process will be implemented prior to the start of the new contract.

#	Section	Page	Question	Response
11	Section 3.2.2.1 Current SDDSS Operating Environment	17	Please share SD current timeline for completing implementation for sending replacement cards via mail	Implementation will be prior to the start of the new contract.
12	Section 3.4.1.3 Transition/ Implementation Phase	21	During conversion downtime the system is not available for any transaction processing which includes the ability to status cards. While downtime can be brief, we are not aware of any transition process that allows this to occur. Will the State please delete this requirement?	The CSR is expected to capture the client's name and other identifying information and status the card following the completion of the conversion and restoration of EBT processing on the new EBT System.
13	Section 3.4.3 Project Management Plan and Schedule	23	Please confirm transition/conversion date.  Section 1.1 mentioned transition/conversion date as July 1, 2019 but in section 3.4.3 it is mentioned as a preferred transition of March or April 2019	Transition/conversion must occur no later than July 1, 2019 when the existing contract expires. However the States would prefer that transition/conversion be planned to occur earlier to allow opportunity to reschedule should a 'no go' decision be required and/or to prevent a conversion occurring over a holiday.
14	Section 3.4.5.6 User Acceptance Test Scripts	27	Please clarify whether the EBT contractor is required to develop a test script for State user acceptance testing or will it be developed by the State or State support contractors?	The EBT contractor is required to provide the initial test scripts for UAT but the scripts may be modified by the States and their Support Contactor as necessary to ensure all EBT functions are adequately tested.
15	Section 3.4.5.10 Training Plans and Materials	28	Will the States please elaborate on the scope of the required reports training module? There are over 200 standard reports, are the States looking for training on each report or training on each category of reports and how to access them?	The States are looking for training on the access, use, and report manipulation (can it be downloaded and sorted, etc.).
16	Section 3.4.5.10 Training Plans and Materials	29	1) In what circumstances are 'provisional credits' issued? 2) If they are provided by the current EBT processor, please provide the monthly number of provisional credits issued and the dollar value for the past year.	Provisional credits are allowable under 7 CFR 274.2. To date we have not experienced a request from a household for a provisional credit.
17	Section 3.5.1 System Testing	31	During the Design Phase of the project, the Contractor shall develop and provide a system test plan, test criteria, and test scripts for review and approval by each State.  Please confirm - will the Contractor will need to deliver 2 different system test plans for approval	The same test plans can be used for each State but the plans must address state specific requirements.
18	Section 3.6 Technical and Functional Requirements	35	Can ND share the roll out date for modernized eligibility system? Since eligibility system roll out is prior to EBT transition, can the state share/release if there are any impact/changes to interface file format provided in Addendum C – North Dakota State Specific Requirements	The States is looking at a rollout at the end of 2018 or early 2019, although this is subject to change. There are no changes to the file formats.
19	Section 3.6.5 Account Set Up	36	Deleting pending accounts that have been established on the EBT system after a predefined number of days is not functionality that is part of the current process. What is the timeframe in which the States would expect pending accounts to be deleted?	The States would appreciate a recommendation from the Offeror regarding the appropriate timeframe.
20	Section 3.6.9.4 SNAP Transaction Set	40	Please provide the statistics for the number of SNAP transactions over the last 12 month period.	SNAP transaction statistics are available for the past 6 months only. See page 8.
21	Section 3.6.11 Emergency Stand- In Processing	42	This section requires emergency stand-in processing to allow SNAP purchase up to \$50 per cardholder per retailer per day. The FNS guideline for the emergency stand-in amount is \$40 per cardholder per day, regardless of whether or not the cardholder visits one or more retailers to reach the daily limit. Will the States agree to this standard and remove the phrase "per retailer" from the requirement?	No, the States will not. If the EBT System is down, a retailer will have no idea if a cardholder has already used their card at another retailer and has exceeded the requested limit of \$50 per cardholder per day.
22	Section 3.6.11 Emergency Stand- In Processing	42	If the States do not agree to remove the phrase "per retailer" from this requirement, will the States clarify if there is a limit on the number of retailers a cardholder can visit in a day in this situation? For example, if a cardholder visits 5 retailers in a day when the system is unavailable, they could have a total of \$250 in transactions processed. Is this the States' intent?	The intent is to allow cardholders to purchase food, albeit at a limited basis, when the EBT system is not available, and not punish a retailer acting in good faith when allowing a cardholder to purchase food up to the emergency stand-in amount. If the Offeror can provide an alternative of limiting cardholder transactions when their EBT system is not available without placing the liability on a retailer acting in good faith, please provide the alternative in your response.
23	Section 3.16.18 Other Exception Transactions	44	Inclusion of these technologies require implementation investment above and beyond that required for traditional EBT transaction processing. Please confirm that at the time that the State implements finger imaging or RFID cards that the implementation will be managed through the change request process?	The States intend to follow the commercial model for payment processing. If there are changes in EBT Processor costs due to the implementation of a new technology, such as an RFID card, it will be managed through the change request process.
24	Section 3.6.16 Store and Forward Transactions	44	Please confirm whether store and forward transaction are restricted for only future benefits and allowed for current available benefits or store and forward transaction is not allowed?	Yes, it is confirmed.
25	Section 3.6.22 Pending Cards	46	How is the information on pending cards transmitted to the EBT processor? It does not appear to be included in the Appendices.	Currently cards are issued OTC in both states using the vendor's web portal and a card activation device. The card number is linked to a state unique ID number only. A demographic record is then received from the States once benefits have been approved through a nightly transmission. OTC cards are issued at the time of application and not approval. When an application is denied, the demographic and benefit records for the case are never received from the States.
26	Section 3.6.28 Authorized Representatives	47	How is SD planning to handle replacement cards for authorized representatives if the card is issued via mail? Will it print primary or authorized representative name on the replacement cards?	The States only issue one card per household. We are not intending to print names on the EBT cards.

#	Section	Page	Question	Response
27	Section 3.6.24 Benefit Transfers	47	Will the States provide an explanation of when they would use benefit transfer functionality and provide an example of a situation that would require this functionality?	Card issuance errors can occur with OTC issuance where a card is linked to an incorrect unique state ID. In these instances, when feasible, a request would be made to transfer benefits from the account linked in error to the correct account.
28	Section 3.6.33 Personal Identification Number (PIN)	53	PINs are made up of four digits. This section indicates a PIN can be made up of four alphanumeric characters. Is it the State's intent to allow alpha characters to make up a PIN?	The QUEST Operating Rules specify "alphanumeric characters or digits". PIN pads support alpha characters on the 2 through 9 keys. The States currently utilize a 4-digit PIN number.
29	Section 3.6.36 Card Issuance/ Activation	54	Please confirm that OTC cards are issued in an Inactive status.	OTC new and replacement cards are issued with an inactive status until the cardholder selects their PIN. In most instances, the PIN selection is accomplished immediately at card issuance. When cards are mailed, the cardholder is instructed to select their PIN through the IVR. South Dakota will issue all new and replacement cards via contractor mail issuance.
30	Section 3.6.35 Mass Reissuance of EBT Card Base	54	A mass re-issuance of EBT cards is mentioned as an optional service being considered by the State. Under what consideration or reason will the State make the decision to conduct the mass re-issuance?	A mass re-issuance would be completed only if necessary.
31	Section 3.6.37 Card Replacement	55	Will the States explain why the replacement cards shouldn't be mailed in an active status? This would be more convenient for the cardholders and lend to a more streamlined process.	Mailing replacement cards in an inactive status is currently viewed as a recipient integrity strategy towards fraud prevention.
32	Section 3.6.39.1 Settlement	58	As required under the current contract, the Bank of North Dakota is currently used to support the settlement for both South Dakota and North Dakota. Is it required as part of this RFP for the awarded contractor to continue to utilize the Bank of North Dakota?	Both States currently utilize the Bank of North Dakota as their concentrator bank. It is a requirement for settlement of North Dakota transactions. Offerors may propose an alternative for South Dakota's consideration.
33	Section 3.7 EBT Customer Service	62	Please provide a breakdown for the number of customer and retailer calls per month for each state in 2017 to show how many calls were handled by the ARU versus the number of calls that required the assistance of a CSR?  Please provide a breakdown for the number of English and Spanish calls per month for each state in 2017 for the customer and retailer lines.	See pages 8 and 9.  The breakdown for English and Spanish calls per month is not available.
34	Section 3.7 EBT Customer Service	62	Please provide the average ARU customer and retailer call time for each state in 2017?  Please provide the average CSR customer and retailer call time for each state in 2017?	See page 8 and 9.
35	Section 3.7 EBT Customer Service	62	For which additional languages are the States seeking interpretive services?	Additional languages have not been identified at this time.
36	Section 3.7.6 State and County Office Assistance	65	Please provide the call and/or email volume for each state in 2017 as it relates to the assistance provided to the State and County offices.	Information relating to the assistance provided to the State and County offices is not available.
37	Section 3.8 Administrative Functionality	65	Will the States confirm if it is their intent to implement host-to-host connectivity under the new contract as referenced in this section?	No, the states do not intend to implement host-to-host connectivity.
38	Section 3.9.6 Retailer Test Cards	72	During a conversion between EBT processors it is not possible to have two 'live' systems at the same time. As such, it will be impossible for retailers to use test cards to test their system prior to conversion since all transactions are routed to the current EBT processor. Will the States waive this requirement in light of this fact?	The requirement is waived prior to the conversion to the new EBT System. Following the conversion, the requirement is not waived.
39	Section 3.10 EBT System Reporting	73	This section seems to require that Offerors are to provide a copy of their Report Manual with details of each report in their proposal. Given the large number of reports and the sensitivity of some of the data provided, including a full copy of the manual in a proposal with detailed explanations of each available report is not recommended as each Offeror's proposal becomes public information. Will the States confirm that only the winning Offeror is to provide this Report Manual following contract award as is indicated in Section 3.4.5 which requires that Reports Manual draft to be provided one month after contract execution?	The RFP is requiring a catalog of the reports available to the States along with basic information regarding the report and a sample of the report. The Report manual is not required.
40	Section 3.11 Change Management	78	Would the state consider including a dollar value limit on the upgrades provided to other states that must be provided to SD/ND? If another state is paying a substantial cost for a particular upgrade does SD/ND expect that it receive a similar upgrade free of charge?	The States will not consider a dollar limit. If an enhancement to the EBT System is paid by a State, there should be no need for a future State to pay for an enhancement already developed. The only additional cost the States would pay would be the cost to implement the enhancement in their EBT environment.

#	Section	Page	Question	Response
41	Section 3.15 Electronic Payment Processing (Direct Deposit) Services (South Dakota Only)	89	<p>Based on the details provided in this section and Addendum D – South Dakota State Specific Requirements for ELECTRONIC PAYMENT PROCESSING (DIRECT DEPOSIT) FILE FORMATS, our understanding is it is a pass through service for EBT processors to format in ACH.</p> <p>Please clarify below questions.</p> <p>Is SD currently or expecting to have an EBT account established for direct deposit service cases?</p> <p>Are we require to convert any data from current EBT processor related to direct deposit services?</p> <p>Are we required to provide IVR, call center &amp; portal supports?</p>	<p>No EBT account would be established for direct deposit service cases.</p> <p>There is no need to convert any data from the current EBT processor for direct deposit cases.</p> <p>There is no need to provide IVR, call center, and portal support for direct deposit cases.</p>
42	Section 3.16	93	<p>Based on the details provided in this section and Addendum D – South Dakota State Specific Requirements for 3.16.2 MEDICAL IDENTIFICATION CARD FILE AND RECORD LAYOUTS, our understanding is it is EBT contractor responsibility to produce and mail Medial Identification Card( MIC) and card carrier.</p> <p>Please clarify below questions.</p> <p>Is SD currently or expecting to have a EBT account established for MIC cases?</p> <p>Are we require to convert any MIC case related data from current EBT processor?</p> <p>Are we require to provide IVR, call center &amp; portal supports?</p>	<p>No EBT account would be established for MIC cases.</p> <p>There is no need to convert any MIC cases from the current EBT processor.</p> <p>There is no need to provide IVR, call center, and portal support for MIC cases.</p>
43	3.16 Medical Identification Card Production - South Dakota Only	94	<p>Please provide the specifications for the mag stripe encoding.</p>	<p>Track I contains the 9 digit recipient ID, 3 d digit sequence, and the recipient name.</p> <p>Track II contains the 9 digit recipient ID, 3 digit sequence, the ‘=’ sign and 11 zeros.</p>
44	Section 4.3	99	<p>Annual reports, which include the required financial information, are lengthy documents. May Offerors include their annual report on CD or provide the URL for its annual report in response to this requirement?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
45	Section 4.5	100-101	<p>This section makes reference to a Project Manager, a Program Manager and a Project Director. Please clarify if each of these roles are required key staff positions.</p>	<p>In Section 4.5, Program Manager and Project Manager are synonymous terms, and is considered a key staff position. The Project Director is defined as the Offeror's lead contact.</p>
46	Section 4.5	100-101	<p>If a Project Manager, a Program Manager and a Project Director are all required key staff positions, please clarify the roles and responsibilities of each.</p>	<p>See previous response.</p>
47	Section 4.5 (i)	100	<p>This section requires “a list of corporate officers, number of employees by classification or work assignment, listing of people who will work on this project, their qualifications, and their experience with SNAP EBT projects.”</p> <p>We have hundreds of staff members that could potentially work on some part of the North Dakota and/or South Dakota EBT project. We have over 100 people dedicated to our government clients as well as additional resources that support EBT projects from the card production and distribution team, data center teams, customer service teams, etc. Will the States clarify the level of detail required and limit this requirement to the immediate project team that will be support North and South Dakota (i.e., Project Manager, Retail Manager, Technical Conversion Coordinator, System Test Manager, Technical System Lead, etc.)?</p>	<p>Information is needed only for the direct project team.</p>
48	Section 4.8	102	<p>Will the States please provide examples of what are considered “special project constraints” as they may relate to an EBT project?</p>	<p>A special project constraint could be multiple EBT conversions happening on the same weekend.</p>
49	Section 5.2.5, Cost Proposal	103	<p>This section states that copies of each State’s cost proposal must be submitted to the POC in each State. Several of the Cost Schedules, beginning on page 112 include rows for pricing for each state. Please clarify if bidders are to include pricing for both states in each cost proposal, or if we should only include costs specific to each state.</p>	<p>Costs for both States should be included on the cost forms.</p>
50	Section 5, Proposal Response Format	103	<p>Please confirm that it is the desire of the states to receive a technical and cost proposal that is specific to each state, instead of a combined technical proposal that is delivered to both states.</p>	<p>A technical proposal is expected to be contained in a single document addressing both state's requirements.</p>

#	Section	Page	Question	Response
51	Section 5.2.4	103	The instructions for Tab 4 indicate that answers to each of the system requirements specified in Section 3.0 are to be included behind this tab. The instructions for Tab 6 also state that point-by-point answers to each requirement detailed in Section 3 is to be provided behind this tab. Per Amendment #1 issued by the State on January 23, 2018, Tab 4 is no longer included in the Evaluation Scoring Table provided in Section 6.1.9.  Will the State please clarify that responses to each requirement contained in RFP Section 3 are to be provided behind Tab 6 of the Offeror's proposal?	Responses to each requirement contained in RFP Section 3 are to be provided behind Tab 6 of the Offeror's proposal.
52	Section 5.2.5	103	This section states that the original and electronic copies of the cost proposal are to be submitted in separate sealed envelopes. However, section 5.1.1 requires that a digital copy of the entire proposal including the cost proposal, be provided in a single PDF file on a flash drive.  Will the States please clarify if cost proposals are to be included with the technical proposal as stated in RFP section 5.1.1, or separated and provided in a separately sealed envelope as instructed in RFP Section 5.2.5?	One flash drive should contain a digital copy of the technical proposal, including all attachments, in PDF format. In addition, as referenced in Section 5.1, each State should receive one original hard copy technical proposal and six additional hard copies.  A second flash drive should contain one digital copy of the cost proposal only. The flash drive containing the cost proposal and one original hard copy of the cost proposal should both be sealed in a separate envelope marked "Cost Proposal".
53	Section 6, Proposal Evaluation and Award Process	105	Please provide additional information on how each state will evaluate the cost proposals. For example, will both states normalize cost points against the lowest bidder's price?	Yes, the lowest cost bid will receive full points, and other bidders will receive less points based upon the ratio of their price to the lowest bid price.
54	Section 7.1, Pricing Approach	108	Should the CPCM be submitted with a profit margin or will the States add a profit margin to the cost that is submitted	CPCM should be an all-inclusive cost to the States that includes the bidder's profit margin.
55	Section 7.9, Operational Invoicing and Payment	111	Section 7.9 describes the detail required to be submitted with monthly invoices from the Contractor. This includes including detail on pass-through expenses. On the cost schedules that follow, there is no detail on pass-through expenses. Please provide detail on what expenses the states consider to be pass-through expenses.	An example of a pass-through expense would be travel costs for personnel from the EBT Processor if a State requested onsite assistance to help resolve an issue. This would be an exception situation, and would only occur with prior State authorization.
56	Section 6.1.8 Section 7.9.1-7.9.7	105 112-118	As the Cost Proposal is worth 300 of the 1000 total points, will South Dakota allocate a particular percentage of the 300 points to each of their seven (7) pricing tables, and will North Dakota allocate a particular percentage of the 300 points to each of their five (5) pricing tables? If so, will the States please describe the allocation of the 300 total Cost Proposal points for each table?	The 300 points would be allocated to the bidder with the overall lowest cost based upon the expected utilization of the various components making up the pricing tables. Other bidders would receive cost points based upon the ratio of their total costs to the total cost of the lowest cost bidder.
57	Section 6.1.8 Section 7.9.1-7.9.7	105 112-118	As each State will evaluate the proposals received from Offerors independently of each other, will the States then average the final scores within the Technical and Cost Proposals for a final total score, or will each State maintain their own score and award separately?	Each State will maintain their own score and award separately. A single Offeror could receive an award from both States.
58	7.9.1 to 7.9.7 Pricing Schedules	112 - 118	Please provide the evaluation points allotted to each Pricing Schedule.	See response to Question 56.
59	Section 7.9.4 Schedule 4 – EBT Optional Services	115	Please clarify if the Optional Services pricing included on Schedule 4 is included in the overall scoring of the Cost Proposal.	Yes, the Optional Service pricing in Schedule 4 will be included in the scoring evaluation of the Cost Proposal.
60	Section 7.9.4 Schedule 4 – EBT Optional Services	116	Will the Optional Services in pricing Schedule 4 be included in the scoring evaluating of the Cost Proposal?	Yes, the Optional Service pricing in Schedule 4 will be included in the scoring evaluation of the Cost Proposal.
61	Section 7.9.7	119	Is the wireless POS required to include a printer?	Yes.
62	Addendum E, § 7.3	209	This section references Appendix A, but the appendix has not been provided. Could you please provide?	Addendum B, - USDA/FNS Federal Procurement Clauses, October 2016, will become Appendix A of the SD Contract.
63	Addendum E, § 10	209	Please clarify whether the ownership rights described in this section would apply to both North and South Dakota. Also, please confirm that the rights described in this paragraph apply only to those reports, plans, software, etc. developed for and paid for by ND/SD under this contract, and do not extend to pre-existing or separately developed IP, data, or technology developed by the contractor exclusively with private funds.	Each state's standard contract template was provided as a means of allowing an Offeror to identify areas where contract negotiations might be needed and to help minimize the contract finalization timeframe.
64	Addendum E, #22	212	Seeking consent to assignment interferes with FIS' ability to conduct business. While we may agree that we will not "one off" assign the agreement, we cannot look to the States for consent to an assignment resulting from a merger, acquisition, spinoff or the like. Will the States accept our suggestion to add that no assignment consent is required for any assignment arising from a merger, sale, or sale of substantial assets of Contractor?	The intent of the clause is to prevent issues that might occur from a merger, acquisition or spinoff that would leave the States without a viable vendor.
65	Addendum E, #29	213	Addendum E paragraph 29, Liquidated Damages, of South Dakota's Contract Terms and Conditions Template, appears to conflict with RFP Section 2.3, Fiscal Remedies for Non-Compliance with Performance Standards. RFP Section 2.3 provides specific details on financial remedies in the form of holdbacks. Will the States please confirm that the contract template's paragraph 29 will be removed from South Dakota's final contract and that the provisions of RFP Section 2.3 will be followed to impose financial remedies, if necessary?	Each state's standard contract template was provided as a means of allowing an Offeror to identify areas where contract negotiations might be needed and to help minimize the contract finalization timeframe.
66	Addendum E	217	The embedded file "Exhibit A - Security Acknowledgement Form" cannot be opened. Please provide this file for review.	The embedded file has been submitted via email to each Offeror.
67	Addendum E	224	The embedded file "Exhibit C - BIT IT Security Policy" cannot be opened. Please provide this file for review.	The embedded file has been submitted via email to each Offeror.

#	Section	Page	Question	Response
68	Addendum F	225	The embedded file "Addendum F - Security and Vendor Questions 07-07-201" cannot be opened. Please provide this file for review.	The embedded file has been submitted via email to each Offeror.
69	3.10 EBT System Reporting and 3.4.5 Project Deliverables	24 and 73	Do the States require the Offeror to submit a copy of their complete report catalog with their proposal (Section 3.10 of the RFP - third paragraph), or provide the States with a draft "no later than one month after signing of a contract with the respective State", as stated in the deliverable table in RFP Section 3.4.5 Project Deliverables?	See response to question 39.
70	3.16 Medical Identification Card Production - South Dakota Only	94 and 203	There is not a data field for "Card Generation Number" in 3.16.2 Medical Identification Card File and Record Layouts. Is this an omission, or is some other method for the State's mainframe computer to provide that information?	The "card generation number" is included in field #2 as follows: 1 byte for state; 9 bytes for recipient ID; and 3 bytes for the card generation number. Rows 2 through 5 are incorrect in the RFP. An amendment to the RFP will be issued to correct the Medical Identification Card, Detail Record Layout (pages 203-204).
71	General		Some vendors may have the opportunity to leverage additional cost savings opportunities through debit card interchange rebates that could be passed on to the states. Given the current construct of the pricing schedules, there is no obvious way for vendors to propose these types of cost savings. Would the states be willing to receive cost proposals that introduce these creative cost savings opportunities? And, if so, how would vendors propose these given the current structure of the cost proposal requirements?	FNS Regulations do not allow the SNAP EBT transactions to incur interchange fees to the acquirer or retailer.
72	General		Would the State consider the addition of a limitation of liability clause to the contract?	North Dakota: Under NDCC 32-12.2-15, a ND state agency cannot limit liability unless a contract is related to software, communication, electronic equipment, or economic forecasting. South Dakota: This request would be handled with the selected vendor during contract negotiations.

### 3.7 Customer Service Cardholder Statistics

ND	Recipient				
	Total Calls	Total IVR Calls Answered	Total Calls Transferred to CSR	Average call length	Average time in ARU
17-Dec	53,587	53,473	380	00:52.8	01:07.5
17-Nov	52,319	52,231	377	00:52.6	00:52.1
17-Oct	54,272	54,114	390	00:53.0	00:52.4
17-Sep	52,962	52,868	405	00:52.8	00:52.1
17-Aug	54,134	54,101	431	00:53.0	00:52.3
17-Jul	53,964	53,900	453	00:53.2	00:52.6
17-Jun	53,865	53,846	468	00:53.0	00:52.4
17-May	52,948	52,928	436	00:52.6	00:52.0
17-Apr	50,931	50,868	362	00:52.7	00:52.3
17-Mar	51,979	51,936	360	00:52.7	00:52.2
17-Feb	50,904	50,887	382	00:52.9	00:52.4
17-Jan	55,043	55,033	459	00:53.2	00:52.6

### 3.7 Customer Service Cardholder Statistics

SD	Recipient				
	Total Calls	Total IVR Calls Answered	Total Calls Transferred to CSR	Average call length	Average time in ARU
17-Dec	97,230	97,032	643	00:52.9	00:52.4
17-Nov	89,853	89,660	597	00:52.7	00:52.3
17-Oct	105,248	105,036	646	00:52.3	0:51.74
17-Sep	92,803	92,622	685	00:52.6	0:52.08
17-Aug	93,420	93,342	758	00:53.0	0:52.44
17-Jul	96,015	95,923	834	00:53.0	0:52.28
17-Jun	92,102	91,842	650	00:53.0	0:52.27
17-May	92,960	92,758	684	00:52.8	0:51.98
17-Apr	90,652	90,547	684	00:52.6	0:52.09
17-Mar	91,086	91,031	763	00:52.7	0:52.29
17-Feb	84,668	84,640	720	00:52.5	0:52.06
17-Jan	96,625	96,589	782	00:52.4	0:51.96

### 3.7 Customer Service Retailer Statistics

ND	Merchant				
	Total Calls	Total Calls Answered	Total Calls Transferred to CSR	Average call length	Average time in ARU
17-Dec	948	948	22	01:15.0	00:52.3
17-Nov	982	981	23	01:21.5	01:13.6
17-Oct	1,378	1,374	143	01:27.1	01:01.5
17-Sep	997	994	16	01:26.1	01:20.3
17-Aug	1,093	1,093	26	01:27.7	01:19.9
17-Jul	1,069	1,064	25	01:23.1	01:19.0
17-Jun	1,020	1,013	25	01:55.5	01:47.0
17-May	1,015	1,013	34	01:54.5	01:53.8
17-Apr	1,031	1,015	46	01:45.9	01:44.4
17-Mar	1,096	1,095	113	01:37.8	01:39.5
17-Feb	1,191	1,191	198	01:28.5	01:31.5
17-Jan	1,046	1,046	94	01:40.3	01:36.4

#### 3.6.9.4 SNAP Transaction Set

Total ND Transactions	
18-Jan	205,478
17-Dec	212,749
17-Nov	212,411
17-Oct	220,533
17-Sep	221,228
17-Aug	225,246

### 3.7 Customer Service Retailer Statistics

SD	Merchant				
	Total Calls	Total Calls Answered	Total Calls Transferred to CSR	Average call length	Average time in ARU
17-Dec	1,081	1,081	24	01:36.4	01:29.5
17-Nov	1,195	1,194	36	01:51.4	01:34.3
17-Oct	1,422	1,422	58	01:55.1	1:46.73
17-Sep	1,328	1,326	33	01:57.5	1:48.20
17-Aug	1,361	1,356	71	02:02.8	1:46.70
17-Jul	1,419	1,418	66	02:01.5	1:48.41
17-Jun	1,338	1,328	41	02:16.7	2:08.95
17-May	1,365	1,362	43	02:14.9	2:08.18
17-Apr	1,403	1,387	80	02:11.4	2:08.85
17-Mar	1,666	1,666	203	01:50.4	1:51.92
17-Feb	1,663	1,662	236	01:45.6	1:50.53
17-Jan	1,461	1,461	147	01:56.7	1:59.91

#### 3.6.9.4 SNAP Transaction Set

Total SD Transactions	
18-Jan	395,839
17-Dec	406,696
17-Nov	406,843
17-Oct	432,670
17-Sep	429,818
17-Aug	441,062