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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE
The purpose of this Electronic Request for Proposal (hereinafter referred to as eRFP) is to solicit proposals to provide design, development, conversion, and phased implementation services for a new enterprise system entitled Driver Record and Integrated Vehicle Enterprise System (hereinafter referred to as DRIVES). The DRIVES system will result in modernization for the Georgia Department of Revenue Motor Vehicle Division (hereinafter referred to as DOR) Georgia Registration and Titling Information System (GRATIS) and the Georgia Department of Driver Services (hereinafter referred to as DDS) legacy Digital Driver License System (DDLS). The State of Georgia (hereinafter referred to as the State) is seeking Offerors who have demonstrated prior experience as defined in Section 4.1.

This eRFP is designed to allow Offerors the opportunity to propose a creative custom solution approach, an off-the-shelf solution, or a combination of both. The State is seeking Offerors with strong organizational strength, proven track history, dedicated resources, ingenuity, and a strong commitment to the vision and goals of the DOR and the DDS.

The State is issuing this eRFP with the intention of awarding a contract, but it is important to note that the State is not obligated to award. The State reserves the right to reject any or all proposals received if determined to be in the best interest of the State. The State reserves the right to issue a split award as defined in Section 12.8. The State is well aware of the current and past initiatives of this magnitude across the U.S. as well as the successes and challenges that have resulted.

1.2 BACKGROUND

1.2.1 Current DOR and DDS Relationship
The DOR and the DDS are independent agencies within the State. The Commissioners of both agencies are appointed by the Governor and report directly to the State Chief Operating Officer (COO). In the past, both agencies were merged into a single entity called the Department of Motor Vehicle Safety. As such, both the DDS and the DOR have a strong working relationship.

The DOR and the DDS are working together on the DRIVES effort due to the many synergies between the two departments as well as the State’s strong commitment to delivering excellent service to a common customer base. Both agencies are active jurisdictional members of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) and utilize their services for national tracking of vehicles and drivers. Additionally, both agencies are accessed by law enforcement on a 24X7 basis. The agencies will continue their close collaboration throughout the development and operation of DRIVES.

1.2.2 DOR
The DOR introduced GRATIS over 15 years ago to automate the handling of registration and titling transactions for the 159 County Tax Commissioners and the Georgia Department of Revenue,
currently consisting of 300 branches (excluding web renewal and kiosk). Today the system is processing over 9.6 million registrations and 1.9 million titles annually with over 6000 users accessing the system. Currently, the GRATIS system maintains over two billion data records supporting over 40 million customer records. From a transaction perspective, GRATIS is a solid workhorse and performs quite well processing and storing information as designed.

There are several groups who use GRATIS:

**County Tax Commissioners** – This is one of the largest groups of users performing most of the transactions (including web and kiosk). County tag offices are the front line for most vehicle transactions and provide the Motor Vehicle Division of the Georgia Department of Revenue (MVD) office with much of their work in the form of title documentation and payment information. The tag offices conduct over 71% of the transactions.

**Business Partners** – this group includes service providers who facilitate Electronic Liens on Titles (ELT) and Electronic Title and Registration (ETR) transactions. The ETR accounts for 21% of all transactions currently and is expected to grow. The DOR business partners utilize the system on a 24X7 basis.

**DOR Motor Vehicle Division** – this group processes title transactions, International Registration Plan (IRP) transactions, insurance reinstatements, dealer, and commercial vehicle transactions representing 8% of all transactions. The MVD office can be viewed as the back office and services provider for the county tag offices.

**Other DOR Internal Users** – these users are the administrative, financial, investigative, and Information Technology (IT) personnel who perform custodial duties on the system, financial accountability and audit, system updates and modifications as well as establish policies and procedures for utilization of the system. Although this group represents the smallest number of users, less than 50 users, this group maintains the vision, integrity, and stability of the GRATIS system for all stakeholders involved with the system.

**DOR Regional Offices** – these 11 offices collect out-of-state sales tax on motor vehicle purchases.

**Data Sharing Entities** – where authorized, DOR shares data with Georgia Technology Authority (GTA), Georgia Bureau of Investigation (GBI), State Road and Tollway Authority (SRTA), Universities, other states via the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS), other government agencies and authorized business partners.

**Law Enforcement** – GRATIS responds to over 18M roadside requests per year for vehicle registration information on a 24X7 basis via the Georgia Crime Information Center (GCIC) network managed by the Georgia Bureau of Investigation.

It is important to understand that the County Tax Commissioners are agents on behalf of the State and are elected officials. The County Tax Commissioners perform most of the title and
registrations for the public and they receive almost all publicity when motor vehicle system issues occur. Offerors should be aware of the County Tax Commissioners’ role in serving the public in performing work for this modernization project.

The DOR embarked on a Business Process Analysis (BPA) in January 2014 and completed the BPA in August 2014. The BPA team analyzed the business processes at the County Tax Commissioner and DOR processing levels as well examined the GRATIS infrastructure requirements. Numerous concerns were brought to light that reinforced the need for a GRATIS modernization effort. Such concerns include but are not limited to the following:

- Operational diversity of the County Tax Commissioner offices and the DOR – transactional integrity within GRATIS has been diminished over the years thus leading to numerous work-arounds.
- Compliance issues such as customer identification, address verification, and insurance verification have caused concerns about integrity of stored data.
- Lack of audit efforts and utilities at all levels – primarily due to budget constraints.
- Lack of real-time report functions to provide basic necessary information to perform day to day business.
- Cash accounting utilities and processing found to be outdated and weak.
- Outdated business processes due to obsolete technologies.

The results of the BPA clearly demonstrated that a modernized GRATIS is needed that enforces standard operating procedures, provides real-time updates, document scanning, image retrieval, and report capabilities as well as an intuitive interface, automated data entry and superior audit controls.

### 1.2.3 DDS

The DDS introduced the legacy DDLS in 2000 to provide process improvement over the previous Total Database System.

Today the system is used to issue licenses and reinstate driving privileges by 67 Customer Service Centers (CSC) employing over 1000 users, and over 200 headquarter staff maintaining driver history, including Georgia Electronic Citation Processing System (GECPS) received from courts.

In addition to the internal DDS users, the following external users groups interact with the DDLS:

- **Courts** – GECPS is owned and maintained by the DDS. GECPS allows courts to submit information to DDS in a standard, electronic format. It is available to all Georgia courts authorized to dispose of cases relating to or affecting a driver’s license, a driver’s privilege to drive, or the operation of motor vehicles on roadways within the State of Georgia.

- **Insurance Companies and Employers** – This group includes authorized consumers of Motor Vehicle Reports (MVR) used for underwriting insurance and employment requirements.
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**Certified Businesses** - Business entities request access to certified multiple MVR’s for the purpose of employment, credit and rental car agency verification. User credentials are provided by DDS, giving the business access to MVR inquiries. The business entity must register with GTA for monthly billing.

**Government Data Sharing Entities** – where authorized, DDS shares data with GTA, Georgia Secretary of State (SOS), Georgia Bureau of Investigations (GBI), Office of State Administrative Hearings, Organ Donor Registry, U.S. Selective Service and other states via the Commercial Driver License Information System (CDLIS) and the Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS).

**Law Enforcement** – DDS responds to approximately 12 MM roadside requests per year for driver history and license status information on a 24X7 basis via the GCIC.

**Other DDS Internal Users** – these users are the administrative, financial, investigative, and IT personnel who perform custodial duties on the system, financial accountability and audit, system updates and modifications as well as establish policies and procedures for utilization of the system.

The DDS divisions formed a needs-analysis committee dedicated to identifying limitations in the current DDLS that interfere with efficient operations. Such limitations include but are not limited to:

- Data element integrity issues such as customer identification, customer name matching, duplicate customer records, and address verification.
- Manual processes and limited functional integration of multiple application processes often results in poor transaction integrity.
- Limited audit capabilities of current and historical transaction processing.
- Lack of real-time access to data needed to support business intelligence functions.
- Lack of adequate controls and lack of real-time payment processing.
- Lack of ability to leverage and share common customer data with other state agencies.
- Lack of unity for processing of functions that span different DDS work units.
- Multiple DDS applications are not fully integrated to support core processes which undermine record integrity and consistent application of business rules.
- Lack of ability to proactively detect issues that would inform the customer and the DDS user that the customer may not be eligible for a requested service.
- Limited tools for automating and enhancing customer communications.
- Disjointed or loosely integrated systems; user interfaces are cumbersome to use, lack intelligence, cause redundant work, and contribute to user error.
- Lack of robust real-time and historical search capabilities.
- Document scanning is subject to inaccurate indexing and categorization.
- System testing and training cannot occur at the same time because they share a common environment.
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- The Online components at DDS need improvement in regards to data verification, integration and customer adoption.
- Federal alien verification complicates the determination of license eligibility from both a processing and end user perspective.

1.3 Vision

The vision of DRIVES is to implement solutions that will ensure the processes and technology associated with titling and registering vehicles and licensing drivers in Georgia will meet all legal requirements, streamline processes and procedures, and provide scalability beyond the types of service delivery that are available in the marketplace today.

One of the most important concepts to DDS and DOR customers and business partners is providing methods that result in a meaningful and positive customer experience. Today’s customer expects to be able to conduct business through self-service channels that are intuitive, fast, easy to use, and accessible from a variety of devices. When a customer visits a traditional brick and mortar location, the expectation is to be served quickly and to have access to other state services. To accomplish this, fully integrated technologies are needed that provide easy access to current data sources and can be rapidly deployed.

The mission of DOR is to administer the tax laws of the State fairly and efficiently in order to promote public confidence and compliance, while providing excellent customer service. The Motor Vehicle Division promotes Security, Safety, and Service through the administration of motor vehicle title, registration and tax related laws.

The mission of the DDS is to provide secure driver and identity credentials to our customers with excellence and respect.

The core values that the State has established for this engagement are:

- Provide customer service to the public that is beyond their expectations.
- Develop the skills and professionalism of our workforce.
- Promote efficient collaboration with strategic business partners (tax commissioners, financial institutions, automobile dealerships, insurance providers, driver improvement schools, driver training schools, service providers, vendors, etc.)
- Protect the public’s safety; maintain their trust by ensuring continued security of their information.
- Collect and distribute related revenues while maintaining an operation that is responsible for the funding allocation of operating costs.

1.4 Scope

The State desires to contract with a single Offeror to provide modernized systems that will meet or exceed the DOR’s and the DDS’ current objectives. The State desires an integrated customer-centric solution built on modern technology that will be easily adaptable and scalable to meet current and future requirements. The State desires a comprehensive solution that is responsive to
the changing needs of customer interface and management, legislative mandates, agency policies, and internal security requirements. Objectives for this modernization project include:

- Improve customer service and communication.
- Improve the integrity of data collected via automated data collection technologies such as bar code scanning, smart documents, and interfaces to trusted sources.
- Improve the efficiency and accuracy of all business processes.
- Implement real-time document scanning and image retrieval.
- Reduce paperwork and paper flow.
- Provide user interfaces that are intuitive and provide in-line assistance to the users.
- Provide transaction interaction that enforces standard operating procedures and maintains the integrity of the transaction data.
- Provide a comprehensive real-time report infrastructure that utilizes business intelligence to ensure adaptability and scalability.
- Reduce fraud and fraudulent activities by utilizing built-in overt and covert proactive processes for fraud detection.
- Improve integration and management of external and trusted party partner interactions.
- Implement and enforce IT and business best practices.
- Improve data information access, accuracy, consistency, and security.
- Streamline internal processes with regard to proactive alerting, communication, support, and training.
- Provide alternate delivery services to customers such as more web based transactions, mobile applications, dealer and financial institution portals and self-service kiosks.
- Provide a system that is easily modified for adapting policy changes, legislative changes, and law enforcement requirements.
- Utilize an adaptive architecture that supports emerging technologies as they are introduced into the market.

1.5 PROJECT APPROACH

The DOR and the DDS have spent the past two years analyzing the successes and challenges of modernization efforts across the United States and other jurisdictions. Both agencies have researched efforts by Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) software vendors and jurisdictions over the past ten years to modernize existing systems in an effort to minimize challenges and failures that have been prevalent to this type of initiative. The DOR and the DDS have visited and consulted with numerous jurisdictions that have completed modernization efforts successfully and those that have faced or are still facing significant challenges. The State has decided not to dictate to Offerors their project approach but instead allow Offerors to justify why their approach will best serve the State.

Through this eRFP process, the State will evaluate the project approach proposed by Offerors with specific regard to meeting departmental goals as defined and ensure continuity of service and strategy for mitigation of risk. The State will examine the Offerors project approach for clarity of
vision, conciseness of execution, depth of management, strength of project management, and experience with large enterprise scale projects.

The State is aware that many of the challenges and failures with these types of initiatives are rooted in the lack of unity and collaboration between the jurisdiction, the Offeror, and the primary stakeholders. The State is aware that many of these types of initiatives have faced challenges or failures due to resource issues such as lack of competency, quantity, availability, and consistency of resources throughout the project lifecycle. The State requires the Offerors to describe their detailed approach in mitigating these types of issues.

Offerors are also strongly encouraged to provide innovative solutions and pricing models that recognize the economies of scale a single procurement brings in serving the State’s collective needs.
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3 ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

3.1 OFFICIAL ISSUING OFFICER
This eRFP is issued by the Georgia Department of Administrative Services (DOAS). The following person shall represent the State throughout this eRFP and procurement process.

Jeff Rolsten
Director – Agency Contract Sourcing
Georgia Department of Administrative Services
200 Piedmont Ave SE, Ste 1308 West Tower
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
jrolsten@doas.ga.gov

3.2 PURPOSE OF PROCUREMENT
Pursuant to the State Purchasing Act (Official Code of Georgia Annotated §§50-5-50 et seq.), this Electronic Request for Proposals (“eRFP”) is being issued to establish a contract with a qualified Offeror who will provide System Modernization Services to the Georgia Department of Revenue (hereinafter, “DOR”) and the Georgia Department of Driver Services (hereinafter, “DDS”) as further described in this eRFP.

The State, on behalf of the DOR and the DDS, is soliciting proposals for updating the legacy motor vehicle registration, titling, and driver license systems. The DOR is seeking to modernize their Motor Vehicle Enterprise software, the Georgia Registration and Title Information System (GRATIS), which is a mainframe legacy system implemented in September, 1999. The DDS is seeking to modernize their driver’s license system which is also a mainframe legacy system implemented in 2000.

3.3 eRFP CERTIFICATION
Pursuant to the provisions of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated §50-5-67(a), the State Entity certifies the sole use of competitive sealed bidding will not be practicable or advantageous to the State of Georgia in completing the acquisition described in this eRFP. Thus, electronic and physical competitive sealed proposals will be submitted in response to this eRFP. This eRFP is being sourced through an electronic sourcing tool approved by the Department of Administrative Services (“DOAS”) and all Offeror’s responses must be submitted electronically and physically in accordance with the instructions contained in Section 11 of this eRFP. Electronic competitive sealed proposals will be administered pursuant to the Georgia Electronic Records and Signature Act. Please note electronic competitive sealed proposals meet the sealed proposal requirements of the State of Georgia, an electronic record meets any requirements for writing, and an electronic signature meets any requirements for an original signature.

3.4 OVERVIEW OF THE eRFP PROCESS
The objective of this eRFP is to select a qualified Offeror to provide the goods and/or services outlined in this eRFP to the State. This eRFP process will be conducted to gather and evaluate
responses from Offerors for potential award. All qualified Offerors are invited to participate by submitting responses, as further defined below. After evaluating all Offerors responses received prior to the closing date of this eRFP and following negotiations (if any) and resolution of any contract exceptions, the preliminary results of the eRFP process will be publicly announced, including the names of all participating Offerors and the State eRFP Revised 03/29/11 2 of 21 SPD-SP016 evaluation results. Subject to the protest process, final contract award(s) will be publicly announced thereafter.

NOTE TO OFFERORS: The general instructions and provisions of this document have been drafted with the expectation that the State will make a single award; however, please refer to Section 12.8 of this eRFP for information concerning the State’s actual award strategy.

3.5 INQUIRIES
Offerors may make inquiries regarding this eRFP any time during the inquiry period listed in the eRFP Schedule. To make an inquiry, Offerors must use the process described in Section 9.3.

Offerors are to base their proposals, and the details and costs of their proposed projects, on the requirements and performance expectations established in this eRFP for the future contract, not on details of any other potentially related contract or project. If Offerors ask questions about existing or past contracts using the Inquiry process, the State will use its discretion in deciding whether to provide answers as part of this eRFP process.

The State is under no obligation to acknowledge questions submitted through the Inquiry process if those questions are not in accordance with these instructions or deadlines.

3.6 eRFP SCHEDULE OF EVENTS
The schedule of events set out herein represents the best estimate of the schedule that will be followed. However, delays to the procurement process may occur which may necessitate adjustments to the proposed schedule. If a component of this schedule, such as the close date, is delayed, the rest of the schedule may be shifted as appropriate. Any changes to the dates up to the closing date of the eRFP will be publicly posted prior to the closing date of this eRFP. After the close of the eRFP, the DOR and the DDS reserves the right to adjust the remainder of the proposed dates, including the dates for evaluation, negotiations, award and the contract term on an as needed basis with or without notice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release of eRFP</td>
<td>As Published on the Georgia Procurement Registry (“GPR”)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for written questions sent via email to the Issuing Officer referenced in Section 3.1.</td>
<td>11/20/15</td>
<td>5:00 p.m. ET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to Written Questions (on or about)</td>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>5:00 p.m. ET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Definition of Terms

Please review the definition of terms in Chapter 13, Glossary of Terms.

### Addenda to the eRFP

The State reserves the right to amend this eRFP. Any revisions must be made in writing prior to the eRFP closing date and time. By submitting a response, the Offeror shall be deemed to have accepted all terms and agreed to all requirements of the eRFP (including any revisions/additions made in writing prior to the close of the eRFP whether or not such revision occurred prior to the time the Offeror submitted its response) unless expressly stated otherwise in the Offeror’s response. **THEREFORE, EACH OFFEROR IS INDIVIDUALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR REVIEWING AND CHECKING TO MAKE SURE THEY ARE USING THE MOST CURRENT REVISED eRFP VERSION AND MAKING ANY NECESSARY OR APPROPRIATE CHANGES AND/OR ADDITIONS TO THE OFFEROR’S RESPONSE PRIOR TO THE CLOSE OF THE eRFP. OFFERORS MUST INDICATE THE eRFP VERSION BEING RESPONDED. Offerors are encouraged to frequently check the eRFP for additional information and to make sure they are using the current version containing any addendums. Finally, the State reserves the right to cancel this eRFP at any time.**

### Multiple or Alternate Proposals

The State will accept multiple proposals from a single Offeror, but the State requires each such proposal be submitted separately from every other proposal the Offeror makes. Additionally, the Offeror must treat every proposal submitted as a separate and distinct submission and include in
Georgia Department of Revenue and
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each proposal all materials, information, documentation, and other items this eRFP requires for a proposal to be complete and acceptable. No alternate proposal may incorporate materials by reference from another proposal made by the Offeror or refer to another proposal. The State will judge each alternate proposal by its own merit.
Section 4 of the eRFP is a Mandatory Scored Response section for all Offerors and is designed to allow Offeror’s the ability to clearly and thoroughly detail their experience and capability to perform the DOR and the DDS requirements and functions as listed herein. The Offeror response to the Offeror Requirements, Functional Requirements and Technical Requirements sections will be the primary criteria for the Evaluation Committee to decide which Offeror to choose for this project. The Offeror is required to respond to each part of Sections 4, 7 and 8 in a detailed, clear, and thorough fashion. This will demonstrate to the Evaluation Committee how well the Offeror understands the requirements of this eRFP. The State will not accept any sales, marketing, or promotional literature as part of this sections response. Failure to complete all forms referenced in this section accurately, to include all fields, may lead to the rejection of the Offeror’s proposal.

Each Offeror must complete the Mandatory Offeror Requirements table found in Attachment 14.7 by answering each question with a Yes or No.

4.1 MANDATORY EXPERIENCE

This eRFP covers an extensive, complex project in which development and implementation will span multiple years and require extensive motor vehicle and/or driver licensing experience. The State will only accept proposals from Offerors who have proven experience with large complex enterprise systems, strong depth and experience of staffing, and substantial proven financial strength.

Only Offerors that meet the following minimum requirements may submit a proposal:

- The Offeror must have successfully developed and implemented at least two Vehicle Titling and Registration and/or Driver Licensing and Driver Record Management solutions in an AAMVA jurisdiction within the past eight years.
- The Offeror must have implemented an additional solution of similar size, functionality and scope within the past eight years.
- Of the Offeror’s referenced solutions at least two must be currently in production within AAMVA jurisdictions.
- The Offeror must be able to meet the bond requirements as detailed in Section 10.3.
- The Offeror’s project manager(s) assigned to this project shall have maintained a Project Management Professional (PMP) certification for the last three years with concurrent experience on at least one project of similar scope and complexity.

The Offeror must disclose any business litigation within the last five years which may have a material impact or effect on the products and services requested. The disclosure will include an explanation, as well as the current status and/or disposition of such litigation in the last five years. If applicable, you must provide this information as an attachment when submitting your response. If the Offeror has no pending litigation that may impact its ability to provide the products and
services requested in this eRFP, please provide a Business Litigation Attestation on company letterhead and signed by an authorized corporate official stating that no pending litigation may impact the company’s ability to provide the products and services requested in this eRFP.

4.2 Offeror Profile

Each Proposal must include a profile of the Offeror’s capability, capacity, and relevant experience working on projects similar to the project outlined by this eRFP.

This eRFP includes Offeror Profile Form as Attachment 14.1 which must be completed for the Offeror. The Offeror must use this form and fill it out completely to provide the Offeror requirement information.

The Offeror shall also provide information on their background as well as evidence that it currently has in place the personnel, internal procedures, and any other resources required under the terms of this eRFP to ensure successful performance and contract compliance. Offerors must describe current operational capacity of the organization and the Offeror’s ability to absorb the additional workload resulting from this Project. Failure to submit the form in its current format may lead to the rejection of the Offeror’s proposal.

The Offeror must document the Mandatory Experience referenced solutions as claimed in Section 4.1 using the Offeror Experience form as provided in Attachment 14.2. The Offeror must, at a minimum, complete the Offeror Experience form for each of the Mandatory Experience referenced solutions and mark each solution that meets the Mandatory Experience requirements as “Yes”. The Offeror may provide additional Offeror Experience forms for other solutions that the Offeror deems relevant and worthy of State examination. These additional forms must be marked as “No” for meeting Mandatory Experience requirements. The Offeror must use these forms and fill them out completely to provide the Offeror requirement information. Failure to submit the form in its current format may lead to the rejection of the Offeror’s proposal.

4.3 Offeror References

The Offeror must include at least three references, with at least one from each of the three organizations used in Section 4.1. This eRFP includes an Offeror Reference Form as Attachment 14.3. Failure to submit the form in its current format may lead to the rejection of the Offeror’s proposal.

Offerors must describe the experience listed in Section 4.1, including the capacity in which the experience was performed and the role of the Offeror on the Project. It is the Offeror’s responsibility to clearly substantiate the qualification. Previous experience must include the contractual performance, management, and coordination of projects. All Offerors must submit a comprehensive proposal; evaluations will not be based on the intrinsic knowledge of evaluation committee members.

The description of the related service should show the Offeror’s experience, capability, and capacity to develop this Project’s deliverables and/or to achieve this Project’s milestones. Details such as the size of the contracting organizations, duration of involvement, level of responsibility,
significant accomplishments, as well as a thorough description of the nature of the experience will be required for appropriate evaluation by the committee. Attachment 14.3 must be completed for each Offeror reference provided.

When contacted, each reference must be willing to discuss the Offeror’s previous performance on projects that were similar in their nature, size, and scope to the project outlined by this eRFP.

4.4 **KEY PERSONNEL**

The Offeror must provide a resume and a minimum of three professional references for each key person the Offeror is proposing to commit to the DRIVES project. The resumes and references must include organizations and/or clients for whom the Offeror has successfully provided services on projects that were similar in their nature, size, and scope to the requirements of this eRFP. Key personnel may include executive oversight personnel, account managers, program managers, project managers, technical architects, database administrators (DBA), etc. The State is particularly interested in the relevant experience and longevity of the Offeror’s key personnel in the roles they will be performing.

The resumes provided for each of the Offeror’s key personnel must be in a consistent format and demonstrate the experience and positions held for a minimum of the past ten years. Each resume must be accompanied by a minimum of three Personnel Profile Summary forms as provided in Attachment 14.4.

4.5 **DUN & BRADSTREET SUPPLIER QUALIFIER REPORT**

The State Entity requires submission of the Vendor’s Supplier Qualifier Report (SQR) prepared by Dun & Bradstreet (D&B). The Supplier Qualifier Report is a standard report detailing financial and operational capability. Please read and follow the instructions carefully. You will be requesting that the report be sent directly to the State Entity from D&B. Step 4 is critical and failure to follow the instructions could result in having to procure a second report so that the SQR is sent directly to the state entity from D&B.

- Go to D&B’s Contractor Management Portal at [https://supplierportal.dnb.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/SupplierPortal?storeId=11696](https://supplierportal.dnb.com/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/SupplierPortal?storeId=11696)
  - For assistance, please call D&B’s Gold Service at (800) 424-2495.
- Step 1: Search for your company
  - Enter your business information and select search
  - You may enter your company’s D-U-N-S Number. If you don’t know your company’s D-U-N-S number, you may use the search feature to find it.
Step 2: Select your company
  - Select your company from the candidate list

Step 3: Complete Registration
  - Confirm your company and confirm your registration

Step 4: Enter Report Recipient Information
  - Recipient's First Name: Jeff
  - Recipient's Last Name: Rolsten
  - email Address: jeffrey.rolsten@doas.ga.gov
  - Address: 200 Piedmont Avenue, Suite 1308 West Tower
  - City: Atlanta
  - Postal Code: 30334
  - Country: United States
  - Click Submit

Step 5: Accept License Agreement

Step 6: Credit Card Payment
  - Enter payment information and click submit. The cost of the preparation of the D&B report shall be the responsibility of the Vendor.

Step 7: View and Print Receipt

Once the process is complete, the D&B Supplier Qualifier Report will be sent to the State Entity. The Vendor should keep a copy of the confirmation page for your documentation. The SQR report shall be a part of the Vendor's Response. It is the duty of the Vendor to ensure the timely submission of a D&B report that accurately reflects the proposing entity.

Vendors are advised to allow sufficient time before the proposal due date for the D&B processing. Vendors should allow a minimum of 10 business days for D&B to process. If the State Entity does not receive an SQR from D&B prior to the Deadline/Closing date of the solicitation as stated in the Event Timeline and a SQR is submitted with the proposal, the Vendor shall be required to demonstrate that the SQR was requested by the Vendor after the posting date of the solicitation. The SQR must be current to this posting.

If the Vendor does not provide a D&B SQR report, or if one cannot be generated by D&B, the State Entity may request financial information from Vendors that are unable to provide a D&B SQR report. These may include (but not be limited to): Audited P/L Statements, Audited Balance Statements, and other corporate financial reports.
4.6 **SUBCONTRACTORS**

The selected Offeror will function as the Prime Contractor, and must accept full responsibility for coordinating and controlling all aspects of performance of the contract, including activities to be performed by any subcontractors. In all contractual matters, the State will consider the Prime Contractor to be the sole point of contact. If contract performance involves the use or modification of one or more products proprietary to another firm, the Prime Contractor will be responsible for acquiring a proper license for the DOR’s and the DDS’ use or modification of such proprietary products, if needed. No such license will be accepted without the prior approval of the specific State agency’s Program Manager. If the proposal includes equipment or services provided by other firms, the Prime Contractor is responsible for acquiring them.

Offeror must agree to accept full Prime Contractor responsibility for coordinating and controlling all aspects of performance of the contract and any Subcontractors. The Prime Contractor will be responsible for compliance with all requirements under the contract, even if requirements are delegated to Subcontractors. The Offeror should review Section 10.1 for important insurance requirements as they pertain to subcontractors.

The Offeror must declare all Subcontractors that will perform at least ten percent of the work to be utilized for this project and provide a detailed description of all work to be performed by the Subcontractor. The Offeror must explain how they will manage and control the work of the Subcontractors as well as provide the amount of work by percentage of the overall project the Subcontractor will be performing. This information must be provided by filling out Attachment 14.5 for each Subcontractor. A “Contractor / Subcontractor Disclosure Form” found in Attachment 14.6 must be completed for each subcontractor utilized. The State must be notified of any changes to Subcontractors and/or Subcontractor status during the tenure of the contract. The State does reserve the right to accept or reject any proposed Subcontractors or changes to Subcontractor status. Such approvals shall not be unreasonably withheld.

4.7 **STAFFING PLAN**

The Offeror must provide a staffing plan that identifies all key personnel required to perform the DOR and the DDS phases of DRIVES and their responsibilities on the Project. The State is seeking a staffing plan that matches the proposed personnel and qualifications to the activities, tasks, and milestones that will be completed. In addition, the plan must have the following information:

- A matrix demonstrating the staffing requirements as perceived by the Offeror for this eRFP. The matrix should demonstrate how the key personnel provided in Section 4.4 are relevant to the overall staffing requirements.
- A contingency plan that shows the ability to add more staff if needed to ensure meeting the due date(s).
- A discussion of the Offeror’s ability to provide qualified replacement personnel.
- A statement and chart that clearly indicate the time commitment of the proposed work team to the Project and any other non-related work during the term of the Contract.
- The Staffing Plan shall identify Offeror positions that will be located on-site during DRIVES development and their time commitment on-site.
• A statement acknowledging that the Key Leaders with special regard to the Program Manager and Project Manager(s) will not be replaced without consent of the DOR and the DDS.
• A statement acknowledging that the Project Manager(s) required to successfully implement DRIVES will be solely dedicated to the project.
• At a minimum, the Project Manager(s) will be on-site during the length of the DRIVES project.
• The Program Manager will available on-site within a maximum of three business days from the date of the request.
• Work requiring State resources will be conducted during State business days and hours.

The DOR and the DDS reserve the right to approve or reject any of the Offeror’s staff assigned to the project and to approve or reject any proposed changes to that staff. Such approvals shall not be unreasonably withheld.

4.8 PROJECT MANAGEMENT
The State will be placing special emphasis on the project approach of the Offeror. The State realizes that although a detailed project plan specific to this eRFP cannot be provided at this point, the State does expect the Offeror to provide a high-level project plan identifying the key activities, milestones, and approximate timelines. The State requires the Offeror to explain the job duties and expectations of their project management personnel. The State is interested in understanding how the Offeror’s project management personnel will manage the project with respect to Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBoK) and Systems Development Life Cycle (SDLC) guidelines and principles.

Of special interest to the State is the methodology and approach the Offeror shall utilize to develop and implement the requirements of the two separate agencies. The preference of the State is that the DOR requirements be developed first with the DDS being developed afterwards. The State realizes that there are many synergies between the two agencies and does not want to jeopardize the integrity of DRIVES based on mandated schedules or timelines.

4.9 WORK PLAN
Offeror must fully describe its current capacity, approach, methods, and specific work steps for doing the Work on this Project. The State encourages responses that demonstrate a thorough understanding of the nature of the Project and what the Offeror must do to complete the DOR and the DDS Project phases satisfactorily.

The Work Plan must demonstrate an understanding of the requirements of the project as described in this eRFP. The Offeror must describe the methodologies, timeframes, processes and procedures it will utilize in the implementation and production of the Scope of Work and give ample description and detail as to how the Offeror proposes to accomplish this project and what resources are necessary to meet the deliverables. The State seeks insightful responses that
describe proven state-of-the-art methods. The Work Plan must identify and quantify the Offeror’s approach to develop and implement solutions for the two agencies.

Recommended solutions should demonstrate that the Offeror would be prepared to successfully perform and complete the required tasks according to the schedule approved by the State. The Offeror’s Work Plan should clearly and specifically identify key personnel assignments. (NOTE: The staffing plan and project schedule should be consistent with the Work plan). Additionally, the Offeror should address potential problem areas, recommended solutions to the problem areas, and any assumptions used in developing those solutions.

4.10 SUPPORT REQUIREMENTS

The Offeror must describe the support it desires from the State other than what the State has offered in this eRFP. Specifically, the Offeror should address the support requirements both during development and after go-live as follows:

- Nature and extent of the DOR and the DDS support required in terms of staff roles, percentage of time available, etc.
- Assistance from the DOR and the DDS staff and the experience/qualification level required.
- Other support requirements.

The DOR and/or the DDS may not be able or willing to provide the additional support the Offeror lists in this part of its proposal. The Offeror must therefore indicate whether its request for additional support is a requirement for its performance. If any part of the list is a requirement, the State may reject the Offeror’s proposal if the DOR and/or the DDS is unwilling or unable to meet the requirements.

4.11 PERFORMANCE BOND

Per Section 10.3, the awarded Offeror shall be required to furnish a performance bond or an irrevocable letter of credit to the State for the faithful performance on the contract in an amount equal to $3,000,000 (three million dollars). The bond shall be issued by a Corporate Surety authorized to do business with the State of Georgia. The performance bond/letter of credit must be submitted to the State within 21 calendar days of the date the contract is awarded, but in any event, prior to the beginning of any contract performance by the awarded Offeror.

A Letter of Bondability for $3,000,000 (three million dollars) must be provided per instructions set forth in Section 10.3.2
5 CURRENT ENVIRONMENT

5.1 DOR OVERVIEW

The MVD conducted a three-part Business Process Analysis (BPA) beginning in January, 2014 and concluding in August, 2014. The BPA was conducted to better ascertain the need for modernization of the GRATIS system. This section will highlight some of the observations made and issues uncovered.

The County Tag Offices and the Georgia Motor Vehicle Division State offices have been impacted by budget cuts and downsizing. The staff is trying hard to adapt to operating under ever changing conditions and is using a combination of GRATIS utilities and manual reports to process their workload. The workload has become so heavy that staff only has the time to quickly process incoming work and very little time exists for verifying and authenticating incoming work.

It is also noted that much of the subject matter expertise, especially within the business group, has been lost over the years due to attrition. Many of the DOR work staff have retired and not passed along the knowledge and procedures used in the past, thus leaving replacement staff to their own resources and limits of experience.

From a transaction perspective, GRATIS is a solid workhorse and performs quite well processing and storing information as designed. The main issue noted with the transactional process is the lack of efficiency. Many transactions are cumbersome and require too much subject matter expertise to execute properly. A newer modernized system would be designed to be more intuitive and require less decision making by operators.

The introduction and implementation of the ETR system has made a profound impact on title processing and is quite effective. The use of partners to process the title work has reduced some of the DOR staffing requirements, but true effectiveness is missed without the requirement of 100% participation. Consistent processes and procedures are difficult to maintain and enforce when combining new streamlined programs while still allowing legacy manual processes to occur. The ETR programs are much quicker and more efficient in processing title transactions; however, validation and authentication issues still exist but are greatly reduced in comparison to the legacy methodology.

The DOR has many interfaces both to business partners and government entities which are listed in Attachment 0.

Numerous efforts have been taken by the DOR to increase support levels to the County staff members, DOR staff, and customers. A comprehensive effort has been placed on increasing customer service and improving performance metrics of the support staff. Many of the consistent issues that are handled by the support staff on a daily basis should be greatly reduced with the introduction of a modernized GRATIS system and modernized processes. It is important to note that many of the support issues reported by the counties did appear to be mitigated and these issues appeared to be riding on the reputation created in the past.
An effort to outsource physical inventory requirements has been implemented and is working well. The DOR believes that this effort is a sound effort and that the inventory is best handled by the vendors that do this type of work every day as a main business function. This new approach has lowered warehousing and distribution costs.

From a financial perspective, the DOR utilizes similar methodologies as the counties for financial accounting and reconciliation. These methodologies do not employ many modern processes for accountability and reconciliation. Modern checks and balances along with targeted reporting would be a significant first step in ensuring the integrity of the financial process at DOR.

5.2 DDS Overview

Starting in the late 1990’s, mainframe/DB2 technology has been the backbone for the issuance of driver’s licenses and identification cards; and maintenance of customer records and other associated data. Processing includes interfaces and manual procedures for data storage and exchange with law enforcement, courts, state and federal agencies, and business partners.

The mainframe applications that are used are for the most part dependable and functional, but cumbersome and complicated because end users access the applications through traditional mainframe terminal emulators, or “green screens,” that are not fully integrated with other in-house or third-party applications the agency uses to complete transactions. The end users insert new information and modify existing information through many various online screens thousands of times per day.

Electronic document scanning is not a fully integrated step in the various automated transactions. The agency has used a variety of techniques, such as bar-coded scan headers and manual indexing, which are prone to error. During migration to another system, documents not indexed or improperly indexed will need to be subjected to a clean-up process.

In addition to DDS’ core responsibility for Driver License (DL) and Identification (ID) issuance and maintaining driver history, the Regulatory Compliance Division of DDS administers a number of programs that have direct or indirect impact on DDS customers. For some of these programs, the interactions between customers and the agency are handled through in-house automated applications. One example is the ability for a customer to apply for a for-hire endorsement and complete the application process online. Another example is the ability for customers to import their DUI and Driver Improvement course completion data into their DDS record in order to satisfy requirements for reinstatement or to reduce points on their records.

Similar to the DOR, the DDS has hundreds of reports that are delivered daily through batch and online processes. Additionally; the logic, data, and notice templates are processed by the mainframe for correspondence and email notifications sent to customers.

Another driving factor is the need to modernize user interfaces to provide a more consistent look and feel. By improving user interfaces, the agency can train new employees quicker. The agency recognizes that the majority of incoming employees struggle to learn, use and embrace applications designed with older technology. Newer employees expect systems to be intuitive and fully integrated. Their expectation is that the systems are easy to develop, implement, learn, and
utilize in order to effectively serve our customers. Over time it becomes more difficult to recruit programmers and developers trained in older technologies and tools.

The diagram below displays the interactions of the system and business processes that have been described herein.

### Secure Environment, Network, AD, Role-Based, 2-factor authentication

#### Driver Record Creation and Maintenance Inputs

- Driver Record Creation
- Driver Record Maintenance
- Driver Record Deletion
- Driver Record Suspension/Restatement

#### Mainframe Processing

- Mainframe Applications
- Mainframe Utilities
- Mainframe Support

#### Issuance Processing

- Issuance Processing
- Issuance Utilities
- Issuance Support

#### Payments Processing

- Payments Processing
- Accounts Receivables
- Reporting/Audit

#### On-line Services

- On-line Services
- On-line Services Processing
- On-line Services Support

#### Issuance Processing

- Issuance Processing
- Issuance Utilities
- Issuance Support

#### Mobile Applications

- Mobile Applications
- Mobile Utilities
- Mobile Support

#### Merchandise Services

- Merchandise Services
- Merchandise Utilities
- Merchandise Support

#### Miscellaneous

- Miscellaneous
- Miscellaneous Utilities
- Miscellaneous Support

### 5.3 System Topology

The DOR and the DDS utilize data centers in four locations with the primary data center being a Tier IV data center. The secondary data centers are relatively small and are primarily used for development and test environments. The primary location is the home of the Internal Business Machines Corporation (IBM) mainframe from which most DOR and DDS data is stored. There are also production-level web servers, document depository servers, application servers, and database servers located within the primary facility.

The DOR and the DDS network domains are independently controlled by Microsoft Windows 2008 Enterprise servers running Active Directory per agency. Internal access to the DOR and the DDS domains and file systems are controlled by independent internally managed active directory services per agency. Internal access to the mainframe is managed independently by agency
through Resource Access Control Facility (RACF) via DOR and DDS personnel. External access to the mainframe, DOR, and DDS network domains is managed by GTA.

The county tax commissioner offices are connected to the DOR via the Multi-Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) network and are primarily on their own locally managed Local Area Networks (LANs), although they can elect to participate in MPLS connectivity solutions for their private networks. The county LANs and their individual devices communicate to the Wide Area Network (WAN) through translated Internet Protocol (IP) addresses managed by the MPLS solution. Most of the counties analyzed were utilizing Transmission System 1 (T-1) lines for connectivity, with some ranging from Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) style up to Transmission System 3 (T-3) lines. The use of the MPLS network essentially creates Virtual Private Networks (VPNs) between the counties and the DOR thus eliminating need for frame relay or dedicated VPN solutions. Some counties have multiple connectivity interfaces due to the various business requirements separate from the DOR; such as water, electric, and local tax payments.

The DDS CSCs are connected to the DDS network via the MPLS network and are on the AT&T managed LANs and communicate to the WAN through translated IP addresses managed by the MPLS solution. Most of the CSCs are utilizing DSL 3Mbs x 384K. Some smaller sites are frame-relay 1.5Mbs with larger centers running 6mps AVPN. The DDS Conyers Headquarters’ location is connected to the MPLS network via DS3 45mbs circuit. The use of the MPLS network essentially creates Virtual Private Networks (VPNs) between the CSCs and the DDS Conyers facility, thus eliminating the need for frame relay or dedicated VPN solutions.
The DOR currently utilizes DB2, MSSQL, and Oracle databases. The DOR has recently acquired two Oracle Exadata database machines that could be used for future development.

The DOR and the DDS have been exploring expanded use of the Cloud. The State shall not allow Offerors to propose Cloud solutions for this eRFP. The State has determined that the data being stored and transmitted for this effort is too sensitive to entertain Cloud based solutions.

5.4 PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

The physical infrastructure refers to the hardware platforms and methodologies being used for networking, databases, and applications in all regions including development, testing, and production. This section is intended to provide a high-level view of the current infrastructure utilized by the DOR and the County Tax Commissioner offices as well as the DDS and its 66 remote CSCs.

The mainframe system for the DOR is located at the primary datacenter and is an IBM mainframe with a z/OS operating system. The mainframe uses Interactive System Productivity Facility (ISPF/MVS 6) as its screen editor and user interface. The mainframe also utilizes a Customer Information Control System (CICS) for Online Transaction Processing (OLTP) and web services. This mainframe is the core platform for the GRATIS program which is utilized for the majority of Motor Vehicle business functions. This mainframe is also the core platform used by DDS for issuing licenses and identification cards and providing related services. The primary datacenter is a complete Tier 1 datacenter and is one of the largest data centers in the country, thus providing a secure and reliable location for the mission critical requirements for GRATIS. Disaster recovery services for the mainframe are provided by IBM.

Most of the DOR and the DDS production level servers are outsourced IBM servers located within the primary data center and are managed within the GTA contract. The DOR does maintain limited production level servers as well as numerous test and development servers. The DDS does have several production document depository servers maintained by IBM at a secondary facility. Most servers are IBM servers, although some Dell and Oracle servers are being utilized.

The DOR maintains high availability of its server applications via use of Windows Clustering Services and Load Balancing methodologies. DOR web servers and mainframe services are load balanced, but the application servers are not. The DOR employs access control via Windows Active Directory and RACF services. The DOR offers Secure File Transfer Protocol (SFTP), web service applications, and web applications when necessary via the primary data center server banks.

A DDS secondary facility supports the core DDS network as well as a DDS third-party issuance vendor. The third-party issuance vendor network is isolated on the DDS network via an AT&T managed firewall. The third-party issuance vendor also has a backup site/central issuance facility with the third-party issuance vendor resources connected via a metro E circuit managed by AT&T.

The DOR Tax Commissioner offices have a wide array of local area networks with some using servers and some just direct connecting PC’s to the GRATIS system via the AT&T infrastructure.
The DOR is primarily utilizing a Dell PC platform running Windows 7 for its desktop environment. The GRATIS printers utilize Printer Command Language – Level 5 (PCL 5) compatible printers.

Currently the DDS has 66 remote CSCs requiring access to the resources listed above for issuance and related services. The DDS primarily utilizes a Dell PC platform running Windows 7 at the DDS primary facility and in the remote CSCs. The CSCs also utilize Hewlett-Packard (HP) desktops managed by the third-party issuance vendor, and Google chrome appliances used for testing and as customer business workstations.

As detailed in previous section, AT&T maintains most of the responsibility for the LAN’s and WAN of the DOR and the DDS. This infrastructure employed by AT&T utilizes a solid infrastructure of Cisco managed switches and Juniper Networks Service Gateways that provide firewall and routing services. All of these network devices are managed by AT&T personnel under an umbrella contract with GTA. These devices are all part of the MPLS network and only provide encrypted data transport for sensitive tax information, although it is important to note that the very structure of the MPLS network does provide stronger security for data than common networks.

After one of the state's most competitive and transparent procurements, the state privatized IT infrastructure services with IBM beginning April 1, 2009, and managed network services with AT&T beginning May 1, 2009. At the same time, GTA shifted its focus from providing technology services to managing service delivery and downsized from 660 employees to 165. Through the Georgia Enterprise Technology Services (GETS) program, state agencies have outsourced most of the IT infrastructure. Offerors are encouraged to read Section 14.11 for more information about GETS. There are two major challenges that Offerors should be aware of:

1. The cost of IT services requires stringent monitoring and can be difficult to estimate.
2. The process to build an environment for a new application is complex, involves multiple outsource vendors across infrastructure, networking, and desktop platforms. The timeframes of standing up new environments typically takes months. Changes to an environment can typically take weeks. For example, a standard firewall change request takes a minimum of six to eight weeks. Planning for development, test, QA, and production environments must start very early in the project.

5.5 DATABASE INTEGRITY

5.5.1 DOR Database Integrity

As previously stated, the DOR conducted a Business Process Analysis that did include the analysis of the data integrity; following are the findings during that analysis.

The GRATIS database is a well normalized structure that consists of over 210 tables with approximately 23 that were analyzed to be orphaned or used for development purposes. Overall, the data table structure is well organized with good relational integrity. The design of the database with regard to normalization and the use of identity columns across the different components within the database demonstrate a well thought out approach.
During the analysis, numerous issues were found with data integrity, but almost all of the integrity issues are due to relaxed controls at the application level. The validity and completeness of the data does not appear to be an issue as would be expected with a well-designed database and application integrity. Over the years, it appears that controls have been attempted to be established but due to evolving procedures and ever changing policies, most of these controls have been relaxed to a level that record redundancy has become overwhelming. The amount of duplicity of customer records is staggering in the database and is a labor intensive task to clean up. Users of the system have found numerous work-arounds to achieve their goals within GRATIS which has created redundant customer records. For example, customer records for the same entity with different names or addresses were found occurring numerous times.

The DOR IT staff estimated the duplicity of records to be about 15% for individual (personal ID) records and approximately 35% for commercial records.

The list below is an example of current record counts that can be dramatically reduced through archival or deletion of obsolete or duplicate records. This information is being provided to assist the Offeror in understanding the re-platform effort that will be required as part of this project.

- Address records – 30 MM
- Audit records – 88 MM
- Financial records – over 74 MM
- Customer records – over 28 MM
- Insurance history records – 125 MM
- Inventory records – over 86 MM
- Registration records – 96 MM
- Service Transaction records – over 196 MM
- Title records – 64 MM
- Vehicle specific records – over 30 MM
- Correspondence records – over 6 MM

5.5.2 DDS Database Integrity

The Database Management System (DBMS) utilized by DDS is IBM’s DB2, running version 11 of their z/OS operating system. Database constraints are widely used to ensure data validation. As of this writing, there are 174 tables with 2,779 columns. The table structure is generally well designed and easily understandable. Much of the data validation exists in business rules within the application layer, the majority of it written in COBOL.

The data migrated from older non-relational DBMS systems has resulted in missing data elements, duplicate records, and data integrity issues (i.e. no social security number on older drivers, duplicate driver records for one individual, dates that may not fit their applicability due to defaulting old records as new functionality was added). Additionally, in some cases, previous migration decisions have contributed to gaps in data integrity. While these data integrity issues do exist in DDS data, they represent a small percentage of data, and their impact to normal operations is negligible.
The Georgia driver records have never been archived. There is opportunity to reduce the active data if an archival/purge approach can be identified that preserves quick, easy access to important information while allowing reduced-importance information to take a less active role.

The mainframe database has a total of 1.3 billion rows and consumes approximately 300 gigabytes of space. For reference, current row counts for several key components of the database are listed below.

- License table rows – 70 MM
- Driver table rows – 14 MM
- Citation table rows – 31 MM
- Suspension table rows – 27 MM
- Motor Vehicle Report Request table rows – 87 MM
- Activity Log table rows – 37 MM
- Address table rows – 28 MM
- Application table rows – 19 MM
- Application Test Results table rows – 16 MM
- Correspondence table rows – 9 MM
- DB2 Log table rows – 662 MM
- Course table rows – 3 MM
- Message Log table rows – 6 MM
- Notepad table rows – 14 MM
- Payment table rows – 17 MM
- Receivable table rows – 19 MM
- RI Enrollment table rows – 34 MM
- Social Security Audit table rows – 4 MM

There are two Structured Query Language (SQL) Server 2005 back-end database servers acting as relational repositories for front end applications. These front end applications are Web forms, Web Services and Windows (Thick) Applications.

5.6 TRUSTED PARTIES

Trusted parties are defined as non-DOR and non-DDS entities that are approved by the DOR and the DDS to exchange data. All data exchanges are system interconnections created for Federal entities, other jurisdictional entities, vendor programs, and end user customers. A system interconnection is defined as the direct connection of two or more IT systems sharing data and other information resources, a complete list of all system interconnections and their functions is provided in Attachment 0. The DOR and the DDS ensure that trusted party requests are based on business necessity and/or benefit to the public, and are supported by legal authority to release or obtain the data prior to granting access. Establishing trusted parties and interconnections with the DOR and the DDS is a well-defined process and requires both the individual agency and GTA to approve after the following data has been provided:
Georgia Department of Revenue and Department of Driver Services

- Interconnection Statement of Requirements
- Systems Security Considerations
- Topological Drawing
- Impact Analysis
- Signatory Authority

Georgia DOR and DDS Network Topology Accreditation Level

- Internet
- Primary Data Center
- DOR County Offices
- AT&T MPLS
- GTA Accreditation Boundary
- DOR Accreditation Boundary
- DDS Accreditation Boundary
- DOR Century Center
- DOR Southmeadow
- DDS Headquarters
- DDS Forest Park
- DDS Customer Service Centers
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6 **SCOPE OF WORK**

6.1 **OVERVIEW**

DRIVES must be a customer-centric and fully integrated system designed to manage and provide DMV services to the customers of Georgia. The State requires that DRIVES is built on a service-oriented architecture that is state-of-the-art, secure, and intelligent to re-engineer core business processes and support core functions of the DOR and the DDS. The State expects an architecture that is robust and easily adaptable to allow the DOR and the DDS staff the ability to modify or implement services as required by market demand or legislative change as well as respond effectively to emergency system conditions. The State expects a solution that will provide enhanced performance, efficiency, and productivity through new technology, enhanced business processes, and an improved service delivery model. The State expects an architecture that can be scaled or customized to introduce new services on the web, via mobile devices, via kiosks, and provide mobility of services to expand customer outreach to mobile stations or special events. The State requires the DRIVES solution to specifically embrace the customer trend of performing transactions and gaining information via mobile and web applications and/or devices.

The State requires a stable, load-balanced, and fault tolerant solution using proven methods that utilize next-generation technologies. This design must incorporate rich data mining and reporting to support the business intelligence, audit, and investigative functions for both the DOR and the DDS. The design must utilize forecasting and predictive analytics to aid the DOR and the DDS in managing system utilization and transaction processing.

DRIVES shall be a fully integrated system with common graphical interfaces to provide a unified user interface and technical architecture throughout the varying processes and work units, yet still maintain segregation of duties. The delivered system shall provide functionality that is comprehensive, tightly integrated, and designed specifically to manage each agency’s respective business transactions. The State requires a web-based solution that requires no client site software installations, plugins, Active X controls, Java, etc.

DRIVES must be efficiency oriented utilizing advanced components to improve productivity, decrease fraud, and improve the integrity of the system. Such components include Document Imaging and Retrieval, Insurance Compliance, ELT, and ETR. The aforementioned components exist in the current DOR and DDS systems and are in need of upgrade, with enhanced business processes, and a modernized architecture.

DRIVES must be service-oriented, utilizing automated and consistent work flows that ensure transaction integrity. The DOR and the DDS expect an intuitive, easy to use transaction process that allows the County Tax Commissioners and the Customer Service Centers to process customers correctly the first time and every time they do business. The DOR and the DDS expect an intelligent transaction process that will guide end users through the transaction process and provide real-time alerts and communications relevant to the customer records. The DOR and the DDS encourage Offerors to present solutions that involve automated data entry.
DRIVES must include enhanced end-user training environments and capabilities that will equip the DOR and the DDS staff quickly and effectively. The State requires innovative and extensive training and refresher training processes.

DRIVES must provide strong financial management services that handle revenue collection, reconciliation, and distribution; accounts receivable and payable; invoice processing; refund processing and reconciliation; returned check notifications; billing processes; and inter-agency transfers of funds.

DRIVES must include infrastructure services to provide advanced internal controls, audit trails, overt and covert fraud detection, and real-time preventative alerts. The proposed solution must include strong business intelligence to provide the ability to retrieve and report information on DOR and DDS data in a real-time environment. The business intelligence component must be able to compile and report data in a user-friendly format that is meaningful and targeted.

DRIVES must include administrative services that provide the ability to revise business rules, workflow, standardize forms, and correspondence at the end user level. These services must include the ability to administer system security, manage access rights and program-level user profiles, and employ multi-factor authentication through a secure and simple user management module. System security must meet the minimum security standards set forth in Section 8.9.

DRIVES must be implemented in a phased format by agency. A “Big Bang” implementation is not desired by either the DOR or the DDS. This will require the software to interconnect with the legacy systems as well as existing legacy interconnections for both agencies until it has been fully implemented.

6.2 COMMON AGENCY SCOPE

Offerors should be aware that legislative changes may be introduced during the development life cycle of this project. Some of these legislative changes may impact the project effort. Offerors will need to be prepared to incorporate these changes.

The DOR and the DDS share a number of functions that shall be developed as common functions but with data segregation for each agency. The following common functions shall be included in the scope of this eRFP:

- Cash Management and Financial Functions
- Interfaces with Trusted Parties
- Report and Business Intelligence Functions
- Fee Management
- System Management and Configuration
- Business Process Workflow Management
- Integrated Application Support
- Automated Data Entry
- Customer Correspondence
• Customer Management
• User Management
• Training Programs
• Support Services
• Security Functions and User Access Controls
• Audit and Fraud Investigation Tools
• Tools for Data Exchange with Authorized Subscribers

6.2.1 DOR Scope
The following core DOR functions shall be included in the scope of this eRFP:

• Vehicle Registration Functions
• Watercraft Registration Functions*
• Vehicle Titling Functions to include:
  o New Vehicle Titling
  o Title Transfer
  o Salvage Titling
  o Abandoned Vehicle Processing
  o Electronic Lien and Title (ELT)
  o Lien Processing
  o Issuance of Replacement Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) Plates
  o Overt and Covert Vehicle Title & Registration Fraud Administration
• Watercraft Titling*
• Electronic Title and Registration (ETR)
• Dealer Licensing
• Motor Vehicle Records Management
• Federal DPPA Compliance
• Insurance Compliance
• Emissions Processing
• Permit Issuance such as Disability Placards
• Inventory Management and Auditing
• Interface to existing Imaging/Document Management

* See Section 6.5 for more details.

Queue management is not required but desired by the DOR.

The following components are not in the scope of the eRFP and are not required by the DOR:

• International Registration Plan (IRP)
• International Fuel Tax Agreement (IFTA)

6.2.2 DDS Scope
The following core DDS functions shall be included in the scope of this eRFP:
• Driver Licensing/Issuance to include:
  o Driver License or Limited Permit Eligibility
  o Driver Eligibility Utilizing Electronic Verification Systems
  o Test Administration
  o Applicant Photograph and Signature Collection
  o Photographic Comparison
  o Motor Voter processing as required under the Help America Vote Act (HAVA)
  o Interface with External Vendor Card Production Service
• Maintain Driver and/or Applicant History
• Produce driver history report (MVR)
• Citation Processing from Court Convictions to include:
  o Electronic Receipt from Courts
  o Electronic Receipt from CDLIS
  o Key from scanned image of paper or fax citation
• Driver Suspension (withdrawal) Processing to include:
  o Generated by Citation Processing
  o Failure to Appear
  o Non-Citation Related Suspensions Processing
  o Hearing Requests and Results
• Reinstatement Processing to include:
  o Special Risk (SR) Insurance
  o Court Ordered Permits and/or Reinstatements
  o Driver Improvement Courses
  o License Surrender (voluntary/involuntary)
• Interface to existing Imaging/Document Management
• Job Qualifications Monitoring
• Inter-Agency Data Sharing
• Business Partner Data Exchange

6.3 Governance

6.3.1 DRIVES Governance
The State of Georgia has established an Enterprise Governance Council to support the different phases and operational lifecycle of the system(s) delivered as a result of this procurement and subsequent contract(s). A phased delivery of the DOR and the DDS functions is anticipated to span approximately four years, with DOR being developed, delivered and accepted in Phase I and DDS being developed, delivered, and accepted as Phase II. Each phase will also have a phase specific governance framework established which will report to the enterprise Governance Council so that each agency’s needs and management structures can be accommodated.
6.3.2 DOR Governance
The DOR will establish an Executive Steering Committee to govern the Vehicle Titling and Registration phase of the project. The DOR Executive Steering Committee will be comprised of the DOR Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Chief Financial Officer, Motor Vehicle Director, Chief Information Officer, and Program Manager. The DOR Executive Steering Committee will be primarily responsible for setting governance policies, setting and maintaining the strategic direction, and providing ultimate authority for all decision making for the Vehicle Titling and Registration phase of the project.

6.3.3 DDS Governance
The DDS will establish an Executive Steering Committee to govern the Driver License phase of the project. The DDS Executive Steering Committee is envisioned to be comprised of the DDS Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Field Operations Director, Regulatory Compliance Director, Project Management Office (PMO) Director, Chief Information Officer, and Chief Financial Officer. The DDS Executive Steering Committee will be primarily responsible for setting governance policies, setting and maintaining the strategic direction, and providing ultimate authority for all decision making for the Driver License phase of the project.

6.4 Project Management
Under the strategic direction of State Enterprise Governance Council and each agency’s governance body, the Offeror’s team will be comprised of the necessary project, systems and software roles charged with the day-to-day accountabilities and responsibilities associated with the tactical deployment of the modernizations.
All Offeror personnel shall have relevant experience, qualifications, and knowledge that enables the individual(s) to successfully provide the services required. The Offeror’s project manager will have a PMP certification for at least the last three years with concurrent project management experience on at least one project of a similar scope and complexity.

The DOR and the DDS reserve the right to approve or reject any of the Offeror’s staff assigned to the project and to approve or reject any proposed changes to that staff. Such approvals shall not be unreasonably withheld. The Offeror, on request from the DOR or the DDS, shall provide a resume of any of its staff assigned or proposed to be assigned to any aspect of this project. The Offeror agrees to supply this information in a timely manner, as well as any other such professional or personal information as may be required by the DOR or the DDS. The Offeror’s personnel are subject to background screening.

If a staff resource proposed in the Offeror’s bid response is not available for engagement, the DOR or the DDS reserves the right to have the Offeror provide an equivalent replacement that is acceptable to the DOR or the DDS.

All personnel selected and assigned by the Offeror shall have the required skills, ability, willingness and experience (collectively “requisite qualifications”) to perform the services required in the scope of this project. It is the State’s expectation that the personnel assigned to perform the engagement will be the resources identified in the Offeror’s bid proposal. If, at any time, based upon evaluation of the Offeror’s progress and performance, the agency determines that any of the Offeror’s assigned personnel are unacceptable, the DOR and the DDS may request replacements. The Offeror shall replace such personnel. If the Offeror is unwilling or unable to provide acceptable replacement(s), either the DOR or the DDS may immediately terminate its contract without further obligation.

6.5 PENDING STATE INITIATIVES
The State has several initiatives pending that may or may not have an impact on the design and/or delivery of the DRIVES solution. It is important that Offerors are aware of the pending projects and analyze the potential impact to the solution being offered in response to this eRFP. The State has identified three projects as listed in Sections 6.5.1 through 6.5.3 below.

6.5.1 Watercraft Certificate of Title Act

6.5.2 DDS Card Production
The current Driver’s License Card Production System (CPS) used by DDS was implemented in December 2009 through Morpho Trust USA, with the last annual contract extension expected to be executed in July 2016. Furthermore, the underlying CPS solution is in need of replacement in order to take advantage of advances in technology, provide improvements to the security of the Driver’s License card, replace the aging Information Technology infrastructure supporting the CPS, and to provide the ability for DDS to easily change business processes that are currently within Morpho Trust’s realm of control. DDS anticipates having a new CPS in place during the summer of
2017 in advance of phase II of DRIVES starting. DDS recognizes that the new CPS will need to integrate with the current mainframe based Driver’s License system for some period of time, and that the new CPS will need to be integrated with DRIVES mid-contract.

6.5.3 License Plate Fulfillment Contract
Currently the fulfillment and inventory requirements associated license plates, handicap placards, temporary operating permits, and registrations associated with IRP and license plates are handled by a third party vendor.

6.6 REQUIREMENTS
Functional and Technical Requirements are listed in Sections 7 and 8. The intent of these requirements is to allow the Offeror to describe how their solution meets each requirement in an expressive fashion that portrays the Offeror’s knowledge of the requirement. Offerors are encouraged to be detailed in their responses. The State will be evaluating the responses to determine experience, knowledge, and capability. The requirements are not designed to be a complete list of detailed requirements, but a comprehensive baseline for Offerors to outline their respective solutions. Each requirement must be addressed individually and in detail.
7  **TECHNICAL PROPOSAL - FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

Section 7 of the eRFP is a Mandatory Scored Response section for all Offerors and is designed to allow Offerors the ability to thoroughly detail how their solution will satisfy all of the DOR and the DDS requirements and functions as listed herein. The State encourages Offerors to identify existing solution components and components that would need to be developed for this project. The DOR and the DDS are also interested in an Offeror’s solution features that are not represented in this section. The Offeror response to the Offeror Requirements, Functional Requirements and Technical Requirements sections will be the primary criteria for the Evaluation Committee to decide which Offeror to choose for this project. The Offeror is required to respond to each part of Sections 4, 7 and 8 in a detailed, clear, and thorough fashion. This will demonstrate to the Evaluation Committee how well the Offeror understands the requirements of this eRFP. The State will not accept any sales, marketing, or promotional literature as part of their proposal.

Each Offeror must complete the Mandatory Functional Requirements table found in Attachment 14.8 by answering each question with a Yes or No.

7.1  **COMMON REQUIREMENTS**

7.1.1  **Solution Architecture**

The DOR and the DDS requires a state of the art, customer-centric solution that will utilize a fully integrated and consistent interface throughout all components of the solution. Both agencies have encountered many issues over the years with the integrity of data entry; therefore, the State prefers a solution that incorporates automated data entry wherever possible. The use of barcode scanners for scanning driver license, title documents, license plates, renewal notices, and other agency generated correspondence to automate data entry is required. The State requires implementation of document scanning at the point of transaction to directly link the documents to the customer or vehicle record. The DDS, the DOR, and County Tax Commissioners require a system that offers real-time document retrieval from the solution interface.

The State requires a solution that employs strong business intelligence at all levels with special emphasis on transaction and reporting components to help each agency, County Tax Commissioners, and other authorized users to ensure transaction integrity and prevent fraudulent activities.

7.1.2  **Cash Management and Financial Services**

The cash management and financial services include all revenue collected or generated by business units such as County Tax Commissioner offices, DOR offices, Commercial and Business Registration Unit, ETR vendors, DDS offices, and DDS business units, as well as other internal and external business units. Accounting activities include the recording, reconciliation, distribution, invoicing external parties, and refund of revenues collected. In addition, the accounting system shall allow users to research historical financial data and create detailed reports as needed.

Requirements for cash management include:
Cash drawer services for business units
- Payment processing integration
- Initiate refund for overpayments
- Tracking of non-sufficient funds
- End of day processing and reconciliation
- Multi-tiered reconciliation from work units up to each agency’s finance unit

Requirements for financial activities include:
- Tracking of all revenue
- Tracking relevant expenses
- Allocation of fees, fines, surcharges, and interest
- Disbursement of funds
- Analysis, budgeting, and forecasting
- Integration with each agency’s financial system

The State requires DRIVES to provide tight controls and services for cash management. The State requires a system in which the varying business units, including the County Tax Commissioners and CSCs, can access financial and audit information in real-time.

The State requires a more customer-centric accounting module with the ability to record and view all transactions.

The County Tax Commissioners require the ability to manage the values for the complex tax calculations and to mass update customer records. The County Tax Commissioners all have independent financial accounting packages for managing their respective operations. The DOR requires a common interface to the counties for obtaining financial information stored within the DRIVES system.

### 7.1.3 Customer Management

Although not a current requirement, the long-term vision of the State is a solution in which multiple agencies’ services are presented to the customer in a single visit. DRIVES must include business logic when aggregating cross-agency data to enforce compliance with each agency’s data sharing agreements.

Inquiries must be able to be performed both within and independent of the transaction. The customer management component of DRIVES must provide strict business logic to prevent the creation of multiple same-customer records at individual and commercial entity levels. The State requires a mechanism for managing customer records that traverse in State and out-of-State statuses and the ability to identify these individual or commercial entities as duplicate customer records.

The State requires a customer management design that allows each agency to leverage pertinent data changes that affect the other agency’s records.
7.1.3.1 Individual Customer Identification

The State has established that the source of authority for individual customer identification will be established at two levels. One level is Trusted Authentication, and the second is a Temporary Authentication which is valid for 180 days. DRIVES must be able to identify, track, and prevent subsequent transactions after the 180 day Temporary Authentication has expired.

It is important that all Offerors understand and design their solutions with the understanding that the DOR and the DDS are two separate agencies. The driver license customer data is the sole ownership of the DDS. The DDS will allow the sharing of this data with the DOR.

The State has established multiple address components as part of the individual customer record as follows:

- **Residential Address**—the primary physical address where the customer resides.
- **Mailing Address**—used for customer convenience and established by customer request. DOR and DDS may have different mailing address for one customer.
- **Functional Address**—alternate vehicle location address
- **One-time Mailing Address**—customer-specific or vehicle-specific address for special circumstances.

7.1.3.2 Commercial Entity Identification

The DOR and the County Tax Commissioners have established a three tier trust level to identify and manage commercial entities.

- **Trust Level One**—A valid Georgia Business License to be authenticated annually
- **Trust Level Two**—An authenticated and valid Secretary of State registration. Out-of-state commercial entities are to be considered Level Two and must have a Federal Tax ID number and an authenticated Secretary of State registration. Authentication of all commercial records must be performed annually.
- **Trust Level Three**—A temporary (180 day) authentication which can only be allowed by County Tax Commissioner Offices. Allowable documents are Federal Tax ID forms and Personal Property Tax forms.

Each commercial entity record must contain a Master ID and Location ID(s). Each Master and Location ID must be able to accommodate address information as follows:

- Commercial address based upon documentation presented for each record ID.
- Optional Mailing Address based upon customer request.
- One-time Mailing Address that is configurable for use with renewal notices, special documentation, etc. This address component is only available to the DOR Dealer Unit and County Tax Commissioner Offices.

It is important to note when considering system design that County Tax Commissioners need to collect fees and revenue for vehicles located in their county. For this reason, the County Tax Commissioners have requested the following business logic for the new solution:
7.1.4 User Management

The State requires that customer information interfaces be simple and intuitive while providing information in a logical and relevant manner based on priority and importance of the customer information. The State strongly encourages all Offerors to thoroughly and clearly explain their solution approach to customer management as this component currently is the primary source of transaction errors, data management issues, and fraudulent activity. User Management.

Currently there are over 6,000 users of the GRATIS system comprised of County Tax Commissioner personnel, trusted parties, ELT customers, ETR customers, DOR personnel, Investigators, and auditors. Additionally, DDS has approximately 900 users of the Digital Driver License System. All of these groups shall require varying levels of access to data and components of the system. The State requires the DRIVES to provide a centralized interface to manage users at individual, group, and system component levels. The State requires this interface to be simple and intuitive, as well as compliant with the Security Guidelines in Section 8.9. The State requires that the DRIVES user management component employ comprehensive audit controls and proactive business intelligence for detection of unauthorized or fraudulent activity. User access levels should be driven by group and individual access rights with proactive controls and reports in place to test and audit these rights.

7.1.5 Reports and Audit

The State requires a solution that will provide an audit trail and report on transaction processing, inquiries, modifications to customer and vehicle records, and anomalies such as back-outs, overrides, reversals, and credits. The State requires a solution that can provide configurable, proactive alerting capabilities that can detect potential issues at a user, office, business unit, and system level. Proactive alerts include tags on customer records and vehicle records, email alerts, text alerts, and specialized reports. The State requires a robust system that supports running reports during normal business hours without negative impact on system performance.

The State requires a reporting function that provides users with powerful reports that are displayed initially in a high-level view but allow users to filter and drill down into the data details. This type of reporting function allows rich levels of information while keeping the number of reports manageable. The State requires this reporting function to allow each page view to be exported into a spreadsheet format based on the content and the user access level. This functionality would give the County Tax Commissioners the ability to integrate their financial and transaction data with their internal proprietary software systems. Reports and audit information required include:
Georgia Department of Revenue and Department of Driver Services

- Transaction reports with following detail elements:
  - Transaction types
  - Transaction times
  - Transaction details
  - Transaction anomalies (overrides, back-outs, credits, etc.)
  - Incomplete transactions

- Executive Dashboard reports
  - Transaction metrics
  - Transaction anomaly metrics
  - System performance
  - Tax Commissioner metrics

- Anomaly Reports
  - Overrides, back-outs, credits, reversals, voids, refunds, etc.
  - User Tracking and Inquiry Report
  - Unauthorized access attempts
  - Overt and Covert Fraudulent activity
  - Financial discrepancies
  - Inventory discrepancies

- Inventory Reports
  - Inventory levels
  - Inventory movement
  - Inventory forecast
  - Inventory discrepancies
  - Cycle counts

- Financial Reports
  - Fee reports
  - Cashier reports
  - Discrepancy reports
  - Cage reports
  - Payment types
  - Deposit reports
  - GL reports
  - Balance Sheet

- Operation Reports
  - Historical metrics
  - Transaction metrics
  - Performance metrics
  - Employee Retention

- ELT and ETR transaction and performance reports

- System performance reports

The State is interested in a solution that provides report writer and ad-hoc reporting components as well as any other innovative concepts. Offerors are required to explain their reporting and auditing solution in significant detail.
7.1.6 Training

The DOR and the DDS require a comprehensive and detailed training plan for the solution being proposed. The Training Plan should account for the immediate availability of training resources during the entire roll-out and for a mutually agreeable period of time after each agency’s implementation phase. The Training Plan shall identify all phases of training. The State realizes that a formal comprehensive plan cannot be offered at this time, but the State requires the Offeror to detail their methodology and ideology for training. Training requirements will include each agency’s IT division, impacted work units, and the County Tax Commissioners. The Training Plan should include at a minimum:

1. Identification of training components as related to Offeror’s deliverables.
2. Anticipated phases and timelines for training components as related to the Offeror’s development and implementation schedule.
3. Training methodologies and approach per training component.
4. Depth of training per component with regard to number of sessions and training time per session.
5. Training resources for both Offeror and State personnel required per training component.
6. Offeror approach to establish training criteria, acceptance, and certification at component and trainee levels.
7. Offeror approach to training on shared components of both the DOR and DDS.
8. Performance tools and metrics that the Offeror shall utilize for the DOR and DDS to measure the effectiveness of training.
9. Offeror approach to on-going training and onboarding of new DOR and DDS personnel.

Training must be modularized based on functional roles to support implementation and adjustment of job responsibilities throughout the life of the system. Training shall consist of conventional classroom training led by the Offeror in each agency’s supplied facilities, with supplemental web-based training available for internal users. The web-based training system must support adding or modifying training content by each agency, supporting operational and procedural changes throughout the life of the system.

The State requires training that will allow users to conduct transactions as if they were in the production environment. The training environment must mimic the production environment in terms of workflow, transaction flow, process flow, data, and interfaces and be readily available to support each agency’s training needs without advanced scheduling between the Offeror and the agency. All training materials shall be owned by the State. Each agency will review and approve their specific training materials, curricula, evaluation materials, quizzes, tests, etc.

The Offeror must identify and develop evaluation materials including student and course evaluations. The Offeror shall electronically compile evaluations and attendance reports immediately after completing the training classes. Course materials and presentations must be adjusted as needed to ensure the effectiveness of the training and the participant’s comprehension of the materials. The Offeror shall supply trainers who have both system knowledge and training skills. The DOR and the DDS will approve the Offeror’s trainers assigned to their respective agency. The agency may require the replacement of any trainer who is viewed as
unacceptable by the agency after the completion of any class. A suitable replacement approved by the agency must be provided within five business days of the request.

7.1.7 Customer Relationship Management
The DOR and the DDS require a joint Customer Relationship Management (CRM) platform to track, store, and record customer interactions and data throughout the service and support departments. The State requires a platform that allows the agencies to:

- Gain actionable customer insights with a back-end analytical engine.
- View service and support activities with predictive analytics.
- Personalize customer service based on the customers’ known history and prior interactions.

7.1.8 Support Services
The State requires a solution that provides for support functions to supplement the needs of the support services listed below for each agency. The system should provide detailed research and inquiry functions to assist in troubleshooting issues. Specific support functions include:

- In-line documentation during transaction processing such as customer instructions and relevant information documents.
- Ability to add notes to transaction records and retrieve as part of customer inquiry.
- Support utilities that allow transaction, vehicle, license, and customer edits by user or group access level.
- Reports that show all transaction and inquiry history at the transaction level.

7.2 DOR Agency Specific Requirements

The Georgia DOR office at Southmeadow currently provides many different types of services to customers. Some of the services are provided directly to customers who visit the IRP branch and call in to the State DOR Call Center. Most services are handled indirectly, through processing mail-in work and title processing, most of which originates at the County offices. This is a list of the services the DOR State Office provides:

- Title Processing
- Call Center Support
  - County support
  - GRATIS technical support
  - Citizens calls on DOR questions
  - Auto Dealer transactions
  - Commercial Vehicles
- Document Imaging (FileNet)
- Payment processing (on-site fees and Lock Box exceptions)
- Refund processing
- IRP Registrations
7.2.1 Title

Titling processing is one of the primary functions of the DOR. Title processing includes creating, updating, transferring, and changing the status of a vehicle Certificate of Ownership. The DOR currently outsources most of the printing and fulfillment of titles to a third-party vendor. Title transactions and operations include but are not limited to:

- New vehicle issuances
- Issuance of duplicate or replacement title
- Salvage titles
- Rebuilt*
- Junk titles
- Transfer of title
- Auto dealer transactions
- Managing lease information
- Managing lien information
- Managing owner(s) information
- Managing brand information
- Managing seller information
- Issuing and managing security stops
- Supporting investigative efforts
- Maintaining historical data
- Court Order and Bond transaction
- Abandoned vehicle processing
- NMVTIS reporting
- Ability to provide authenticated and certified copies to authorized parties

*The Salvaged and Assembled Vehicle Inspection (SAVI) is currently a separate program and should be included into DRIVES.

The DOR requires DRIVES to proactively detect and report overt and covert fraudulent activity with special regard to out-of-state vehicles. The DRIVES solution must address fraudulent activity such as the “washing” of titles. The DRIVES solution should employ features to reduce input errors and provide tight controls on titling functions. Please see Section 14.13 for further transaction information.
The DOR desires a title and lien processing solution that shall employ enhanced automatic background checks on all title transactions such as:

- Internal data historical checks against vehicle, title, and owner history
- National Crime Information Center (NCIC)
- Georgia Crime Information Center (GCIC)
- National Insurance Crime Bureau (NICB)
- NMVTIS

These checks must be performed automatically in DRIVES. The DOR seeks an innovative solution in the verification process of title transactions. Please see Section 14.13 for further transaction information.

7.2.2 ELT and ETR Processing

The DOR GRATIS system already supports electronic conversion of titles and expects this system to be upgraded in DRIVES. This system supports the addition, release, and assignment of liens to a vehicle. DRIVES shall have the ability to maintain a history of lien information for a vehicle and securely manage lienholder information such as contact information and bank or other financial institution routing numbers. The DOR currently images all non ETR transactions centrally at its Southmeadow location, the DOR desires the Offeror solution to provide the ability for transaction level imaging at the Tax Commissioner offices and the DOR office in Southmeadow. The current ETR vendors provide imaging for all of their clients and this information is transmitted to the DOR and stored within the IBM FileNet P8 image archive. All imaged documents are linked to the vehicle records.

7.2.3 Registration

All vehicles operating on the Georgia public infrastructure must be registered with the DOR. Once a vehicle is properly registered, a license plate is assigned to the vehicle and a certificate of registration is issued. Most vehicle registrations are required to be renewed annually and DRIVES must be able to accommodate multi-year registration renewals across varying vehicle types. Typical registration transactions and operations include:

- License plate issuance
- Issuance of Homemade Trailer Vehicle Identification Number (TVIN) Plates
- Renewal of existing license plate
- Transfer of license plate
- Registration of Out-of-state vehicle (T17)
- Duplicate or replacement of license plate/decal
- Leased vehicles
- Update of registration codes and registration information
- Specialty and personalized plate issuance
- Insurance information maintenance and verification
- Issuing and managing security stops
- Issuance of temporary operating permit
- Lock box processing of registration services
Most vehicle registration processes staggered across an annual cycle; however, a few of the County Tax Commissioners offer four month staggered and non-staggered registration cycles. As a general rule, all vehicles must be registered in the county they are located within.

The DOR requires an innovative and efficient approach to sending renewal notices and processing registrations in bulk for fleet services. The DOR requires a common interface that can be leveraged by the County Tax Commissioners and Business Partners for their respective batch mail processing systems.

The DOR requires a solution that will proactively detect and report potential overt and covert fraudulent activity. The DOR requires a solution that will provide the capability to automatically input vehicle and owner information as well as provide vehicle verification information such as valuation and manufacturer gross vehicle weight class. Please see Section 14.13 for further transaction information.

7.2.4 ETR and Temporary Operating Permits
The DOR issues Temporary Operating Permits (TOPS) through its Electronic Title and Registration (ETR) application.

DRIVES must provide stringent controls on the following:

- Vehicle valuations of the vehicle being sold and the potential vehicle trade-in
- A standardized transaction worksheet
- Strict controls and tracking of TOPS issuances and reissuances
- Verification of dealer status both in-State and out-of-state.
- Strict controls for customer identification and input
- Standard controls on plate issuances, including plates with restrictions
- Enhanced processes for overt and covert fraud control and tracking
- Real-time access to imaged documents for title research and investigation
- Collection of back taxes prior to issuing TOPS
- Auction sales
- Prevention of multiple issuances of TOPS for same vehicle (Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) alteration)

7.2.5 Fees and Taxes
DRIVES must be able to effectively and efficiently handle the distribution of the fees and taxes collected by the DOR, County Tax Commissioners, and Business Partners. The distributions can be quite complex depending on the type of transaction and the source of the transaction. DRIVES must be flexible and configurable to accommodate current distribution calculations and future changes to the calculation of distributions. Fees and taxes include Ad Valorem Tax, Title Ad Valorem Tax (TAVT), title fees, registration fees, and other various taxes and fees. The solution must be able to provide for and calculate exemptions in accordance with DOR rules and regulations. Please see Attachment 14.13 for further fee information.

Ad Valorem and Sales Tax are collected by the DOR. Ad Valorem tax can be assessed in three ways, Traditional Ad Valorem Tax, TAVT, and AAVT. Traditional Ad Valorem Tax is an annual
property tax charged to the registrants based on the current fair market and wholesale value of the vehicle. TAVT was implemented in March 2013 and is calculated based on purchase/ fair market price and charged at the time of title application. AAVT is the alternative Ad Valorem Tax that is charged for commercial vehicle which registered with International Registration Plan (IRP).

The application for title and TAVT payment must be submitted to the county of residence of the purchaser. The TAVT must be paid at the time application for title and registration are made. If a vehicle is purchased at a dealership, the dealer must accept the application for title and TAVT payment on the owner’s behalf and deliver the title application and TAVT payment to the county tag agent in the county where the vehicle will be registered. The value can be appealed in the same manner as values for Ad Valorem Tax purposes are appealed. The appeal takes place at the county level.

7.2.6 Motor Vehicle Insurance
Georgia law mandates that all registered vehicles maintain continuous insurance coverage. The current system receives batch updates from most insurance providers licensed to do business in the State on private vehicles. Failure to maintain continuous insurance results in lapse fees and possible suspension of registration. The DOR requires DRIVES to enforce insurance compliance either utilizing the existing processes for collection of insurance information or by introducing new processes. All vehicle registrations issued for personal vehicles require either electronic proof of insurance or an insurance binder to be presented. The DOR requires DRIVES to provide strict controls, auditing, and enhanced business processes to ensure that all vehicles are properly insured as mandated by law.

7.2.7 Business registration
Licensed businesses (vehicle dealers, manufacturers, distributors, etc.) may submit documents for vehicle tags and titles to their local counties, but the counties are not authorized to process requests for dealer license plates. Franchised Dealers and Motorcycle Dealers do not have to be licensed through the Secretary of State’s office. The Business Registrations Unit oversees the processing of vehicle tags for the following businesses:

- Franchise Dealers
- Independent Dealers
- Used Motor Vehicle Parts Dealers
- Used Parts Dealers
- Motorcycle Dealers
- Manufactured Home Dealers
- Vehicle Distributers
- Transporters

The DOR requires DRIVES to provide enhanced capabilities such as:
• Interface with the Secretary of State system so new licenses, license renewal, suspension and revocation information can be interfaced without the need for manual entry.
• Generate electronic renewal notices and payments.
• Broadcast updates and important information to licensees.
• Create a web portal for commercial entities to apply for new licenses, renew existing licenses, pay fees and other dealer related services including upload and submitting of documentation.

7.2.8 International Registration Plan (IRP)
DRIVES will be the central repository of all customer, titling and registration information for all Georgia vehicles. Commercial registration includes IRP for motor carriers and charter buses.

The DOR requires DRIVES to provide capabilities such as:
• Provide the capability of creating Commercial customer and title information in DRIVES.
• Interface with the existing IRP system for vehicle registration and customer administration.
• Inventory assignment will be done in DRIVES as detailed in Section 7.2.9 and interfaced with the existing IRP system.

7.2.9 Inventory Management
The State requires an inventory system that tracks inventory movement in real-time, maintains chain of custody, and can accurately forecast inventory usage via historical analysis or methods of predictive analysis. DRIVES must utilize real-time reporting to demonstrate inventory location, shipments, receiving, and discrepancies. The DOR is interested in inventory solutions that enable the use of barcode scanners or smartphone applications that can scan barcodes to assist in tracking chain of custody. DRIVES should be able to set par levels as well as minimum and maximum levels for each product per distribution point.

Current inventory requirements for the DOR include license plates, titles, registration forms, handicap placards, serial number plates and temporary operating permits. The inventory component of the DRIVES solution should be flexible and scalable to accommodate both current and future inventory requirements.

7.2.10 Document Management
The DOR uses the IBM Enterprise Content Management (ECM) product FileNet as the primary means to store electronic images that will be scanned by DRIVES. FileNet currently stores 700+ million electronic images.

DRIVES must be able to integrate with the FileNet system. DRIVES must provide the ability for DOR and County Tax Commissioner users to scan and attach documentation to transaction records and provide users with real-time access to documents attached to customer and vehicle records. The Offeror is required to describe in detail how their approach to document management will increase the efficiency of the transaction processing and its potential for reducing and identifying fraudulent activity. The Offeror must describe specific features of their
document management system such as abilities to mark documents for follow up actions and track documentation deficiencies.

The agency desires that all routine “scan last” situations be eliminated in favor of integrating scan processes at the point of transaction, directly indexing the documents to the customer record. This will significantly reduce the need for barcode scanning. The DOR requires a solution that will provide the ability to view scanned documents before they have been uploaded to the document repository, with view permissions associated with document types.

The DOR will work with the Offeror to integrate the DRIVES solution, and the DOR shall provide all necessary scanning equipment to ensure proper integration. The Offeror must provide specifications for all equipment necessary to support the proposed DRIVES solution.

DRIVES must be compliant with Georgia Technology Authority SA-06-006 Design Criteria for Electronic Records Management Applications (RMA’s) and Department of Defense Standard DoD5015.2. Other standards and guidelines that should be reviewed by the Offeror include:

- O.C.G.A § 40-2-130. Federal Driver’s Privacy Protection Act
- Department of Defense Standard DoD5015.2

7.2.11 Queuing
Queuing is not required, but desired by the DOR. Queuing functionality would include the following:

- Ability to assign and reassign daily work flow to individual processors
- Ability to see items that have not yet been worked
- Ability to see individual processor productivity
- Ability to generate ad-hoc reports

7.3 DDS AGENCY SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

7.3.1 Issuance
The issuance and management of driver licenses and identification cards is the core responsibility of DDS. With approximately three million issuance events occurring in fiscal year 2014, issuance makes up most of the agency’s customer facing workload. Please see Section 14.14 for further transaction information. Currently, Georgia is a Real ID compliant state issuing Fully Compliant DL/IDs. The agency anticipates that nearly all valid DL/ID holders will be enrolled into the Real ID program within the next three years.

To issue a license or ID document, workstations are provided by a third-party issuance vendor with two-factor user authentication software that includes fingerprint scanning to control
workstation access. The operator’s fingerprint is also used to verify authorization for each transaction.

An interface with the mainframe prompts the vendor’s application to capture a photo and signature. For existing customers, the photo is compared immediately against the last stored image using the vendor’s one-to-one comparison software.

Customers typically provide documents that prove identity, lawful presence in the United States, Social Security Number, and residency in Georgia. The user enters the data via mainframe screens that check for eligibility and use real-time interfaces to reach State and Federal agencies. There are other documents that may be required as well, such as proof of completion of a Driver Education Course by a teen or a commercial driver’s documentation verifying that they meet Federal eligibility. In some cases, this documentation is provided electronically.

For knowledge testing, a testing application interfaces with the mainframe to assign a workstation and required test based on the services requested. The testing application then provides results back to the mainframe. After a skills test is completed, non-commercial results are manually entered by the user. Commercial skills test results are generally passed to the mainframe via a third-party tablet/application. The results are recorded in the customer’s record and an e-form of the test is stored in the DDS document imaging depository.

To collect fees, the mainframe interfaces to the third-party issuance vendor’s standalone point-of-sale application, which the operator launches to collect and process the customer’s payment. When payment is complete, the mainframe program interfaces again with the issuance vendor’s application to confirm issuance of the interim document which is then generated on the issuance vendor’s printers.

To complete the issuance transaction, the operator scans the interim DL/ID document and the customer’s breeder documents. The scanning process uses an application that interfaces with the mainframe and with the document depository system for storage and retrieval, if necessary. There is another interface that uses the bar code on the interim document to send to the issuance vendor for inventory tracking. The issuance vendor is responsible for the entire supply chain for all consumables to produce a DL/ID. This includes toner cartridge, receipt paper, and interim stock. Please see Section 6.5 for more information on the card production contract.

The agency faces a challenge matching scanned documents with customer records. Document scanning is not a fully integrated step in the various automated transactions. The agency has used a variety of techniques, such as bar-coded scan headers and manual indexing, which are prone to error. During migration to another system, documents not indexed or improperly indexed will need to be subjected to a clean-up process.

To print the permanent card, the mainframe interfaces with the issuance vendor to complete a one-to-many facial search and provides results back to the mainframe. The mainframe makes a final determination on eligibility and sends print approval or denial for production of the card. Upon production of the requested card, the vendor’s system sends a print confirmation back to the mainframe.
The issuance process is supported by a number of disparate systems consisting of in-house applications, commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) products, and vendor services. One such system is the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlement (SAVE). This verification is invoked as an automated step in the issuance process when immigration status is required. If the verification is not successful, a SAVE case is opened. Some SAVE cases ultimately require submission of an information packet to the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) by the DDS. Another function for some driver’s is the reporting of information for U.S. Selective Service eligibility to the Department of Defense (DOD). The varying systems have varied levels of integration with the State’s mainframe system. The mainframe system contains all the business rules for issuance as well as being the system of record.

The hardware utilized is provided by both DDS and vendors under contract with the agency. An extensive hardware investment has been made by DDS, which the Successful Offeror must leverage without requiring DDS or the agency’s vendor(s) to replace.

As of the release of this eRFP, the different components of the DL/ID issuance system are:

- **State of Georgia Mainframe**
  - Custom Cobol Applications
  - CICS™ screens for end user interface
  - DB2™ database
  - Web services for real-time interfaces
  - File Transfer Protocol (FTP) and Secure File Transfer Protocol (SFTP) for bulk and scheduled interfaces
  - Various utilities for job scheduling, testing, debugging, etc.

- **State of Georgia Knowledge Test system developed by DDS**
  - Software Application
    - Test Management Application
    - Driver Applicant Testing Application
  - Hardware
    - WINTEL hosting IIS™ at each location
    - Chromebox™

- **Morpho Trust**
  - Software Applications
    - Interim Issuance / Image Capture Application
      - Digital Persona™ fingerprint scanner
      - Photo and signature collection
      - Real-time photo comparison
      - Interim document printing
      - Communications interfaces to mainframe
    - iNovah™ payment application
    - Attachmate Extra™ TN-3270 emulator
    - Interim and consumable inventory management
    - One-to-many facial match/search
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- Image exchange to law enforcement
- Central issuance management
- Road Test™ for CDL scoring (through separate contract)
  - Hardware
    - Image repository
    - Facial match/search engines
    - Infrastructure to support interim issuance and payment processing
    - Interim Issuance
      - WINTEL Desktop workstations
      - Keyboard with embedded fingerprint reader
      - Mouse
      - Monitor
      - Signature pad with embedded credit card swipe device
      - Camera
      - Hand-held barcode scanner
      - Interim printer
      - Check scanner
      - Receipt printer with embedded check endorser
    - In Motion™ J3500 tablets for Road Test (through separate contract)
    - In Motion™ R12 tablets for Road Test (through separate contact)
  - Permanent DL/ID card production via central issuance facility
  - Document imaging (owned and supported by DDS). Prior to the integration or replacement of the current DDS imaging system, the DDS will provide the Offeror with an updated equipment list.
    - OnBase™ COTS
    - Hardware
      - Scanners
        - Fujitsu 7260
        - Fujitsu 6230
        - Fujitsu 6130
        - Panasonic KV-S1027C
      - WINTEL Desktop

External to the issuance process, the issuance vendor sends voter registration data to the Georgia Secretary of State and provides driver photos to law enforcement agencies upon request.

The DDS requires a comprehensive issuance solution that addresses all of the components and issues detailed in this section.

7.3.2 Citation Processing and Withdrawals
Court convictions are received in citation format; heretofore, all citations disposed with the intention of being processed to driver history will be referred to as “convictions.” Convictions may be received from a court via GECPS electronic transmission or as a paper copy of the
citation issued. Electronic citations that are unable to process successfully are reported back to the submitting court. DDS requires the ability to track submission of corrected citations.

Approximately 1.2 million citations were added to driver history during fiscal year 2014, of which nearly 1 million were received electronically. Offenses that occur in a Commercial Motor Vehicle (CMV) may result in writing a CDLIS pointer.

Paper citations are scanned to the document imaging system and indexed to the driver record; the scanned image takes the place of the source document for data entry purposes. Images are routed through the Data Management System (DMS) utilizing a proven system of workflow queues to assign work and balance the workflow by document type. The DMS gives management of the work unit flexibility in controlling work assignments and the ability to prevent or control backlogs.

7.3.2.1 Resulting Withdrawals
When processed onto the driver record, some convictions will generate one or more driving privilege withdrawals to be added to the driver’s record. Driving privilege withdrawals include suspension of all privileges, revocation of all privileges, commercial disqualification (loss of commercial driving privilege only), cancellation/revocation of limited permit privileges, denial of license, and cancellation of license. Withdrawals can result directly from one conviction, such as a DUI suspension, or they can result indirectly from an accrual of offenses, such as a points suspension. In many cases, a driver may receive both a suspension/revocation of privileges and a commercial disqualification triggered by one conviction. Approximately a half million withdrawals were added to driver history as a result of citation processing in fiscal year 2014.

In general, most withdrawals will generate a legal notice of suspension listing the specific terms of the suspension, which is mailed to the driver. Withdrawal processing will write a pointer to the Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS) for reportable offenses.

7.3.2.2 Stand-Alone Withdrawals
Non-conviction related withdrawals are added as a result of another agency submitting data electronically to the DDS. For example, the Georgia Department of Human Services sends child support non-compliance data electronically. When processed to driver history, each non-compliance case results in a driving privilege suspension.

Additionally, withdrawals are sometimes manually added based on DDS internal information such as an order from an authorized federal agency or a court order. Some stand-alone withdrawals will generate a notice to the customer. Some will write a pointer to the PDPS database.

7.3.2.3 Reinstatement/Expiration of Withdrawals
Some withdrawals naturally expire when a specified date is reached. Most require the driver to satisfy reinstatement requirements before driving privileges are restored. In addition to time served under the withdrawal, various additional reinstatement requirements may apply.
When all requirements have been met, the suspension is passively reinstated. If the last outstanding requirement is payment of the reinstatement fee, passive reinstatement can occur as a result of an Online Services transaction.

Reinstatement modernization in 2013 simplified reinstatements by streamlining the mainframe screens. All requirements that apply to a driver are presented on one screen. The requirement descriptions are clear, and data is shared across interfaces to ensure that the driver is given the same information in person, by phone/fax, email, or by using Internet Services.

The DDS requires a comprehensive citation and withdrawals solution that addresses all of the components and issues detailed in this section.

7.3.3 Driver Record Maintenance
Driver record maintenance falls into three categories:
- Driver Record Combines
- History Record Maintenance
- Citation and Suspension Error Correction

7.3.3.1 Driver Record Combines
The most challenging transaction involved in maintaining driver history is the act of combining two separate records into one. The two records may have resulted from deliberate fraudulent activity on the part of the driver, operator error during issuance, or from other benign situations.

Combining the records is an extremely intricate and highly error prone process. The combine transaction requires that a skilled team member analyze every citation and suspension on the combined record to verify accuracy and legality of the results. Errors may remain unnoticed for months or years until an error occurs during subsequent conviction processing, or until the driver attempts, unsuccessfully, to reinstate a suspension.

7.3.3.2 History Record Maintenance
Approximately 40 CICS screens are used to handle driver record exceptions and corrections. These screens provide a manual method (in some cases the only method) for entering/updating the following data:
- Driver personal information
- Real ID documents
- Centralized issuance
- DLN survey of other states
- Driver address records
- Previous identity records
- Previous/other state license number records
- Non-citizen verification (SAVE) inquiry
- Social Security number verification through Social Security Online Verification (SSOLV)
- License surrender information
- Commercial test records (written & road test)
7.3.3.3 **Citation/Suspension Error Correction**

The majority of citations and withdrawals received electronically are returned to the originating court if they fail to pass edits. However, some conditions will cause the citation or withdrawal to be retained by DDS and written to an online error correction file for resolution internally.

The DDS requires a comprehensive driver record maintenance solution that addresses all of the components and issues detailed in this section. The DDS requires the Offeror to provide a tool for analyzing the combined history of driver records to assure that the outcome is correct and flag any potential errors or duplications.

7.3.4 **Motor Vehicle Reports**

DDS customers may purchase a certified copy of their driving history at a DDS office. Customers also have the option to purchase a certified or non-certified copy through Online Services or by mail. The MVR provides license status, privileges, and driving history including violations and suspensions.

Several methods exist for producing MVRs:

- Online services for a driver’s personal MVR (driver abstract)
- Online services for requesting a driver’s certified MVR to be mailed to the driver
- State certified business partner web portal for third party
- Printing a driver’s individual MVR at a DDS office
- Printing third party requested MVRs at a DDS office

Another function available to business partners is the ability to identify changes in drivers’ records, which may prompt the business partner to request full MVRs.

The DDS requires a comprehensive motor vehicle report solution that addresses all of the components detailed in this section.
7.3.5 **Online Services**

Online services are available for many transaction types. Drivers can do the following online:

- Create customer profile
- Check license status
- Submit DL/ID application
- Renew, replace or upgrade license
- Change address
- Submit DL/ID breeder documents
- Submit commercial medical certification cards
- Purchase a driver abstract
- Order a certified MVR
- Check reinstatement requirements
- Pay reinstatement fees
- Subscribe for email notifications
- Submit For-Hire driver application

Real-time interfaces are used to exchange information about transactions with the mainframe. Drivers can use Online Services to pre-apply for a DL/ID to be issued in a CSC. A software application and interface are used to temporarily hold the DL/ID application data until the customer comes to a CSC to complete the transaction. At that point, the data is passed to the mainframe for the user to verify during the issuance process. When the transaction is completed, the application is stored as an e-form in the document depository.

For-Hire drivers can submit applications through Online Services to apply for the endorsement. The customers must meet fingerprinting requirements and provide proof of lawful presence. DDS requires support for tracking these requirements.

Documents that are uploaded through Online Services are put into queues to be matched manually to customer records and stored in the document depository. Online payments are handled by a credit card processor. This includes MVR, license and reinstatement fees.

The DDS requires a comprehensive Online Service solution that addresses all of the components and issues detailed in this section.

7.3.6 **CDLIS and PDPS Processes**

The Commercial Driver’s License Information System (CDLIS) is a nationwide system that enables the driver license entity in each U.S. jurisdiction to ensure commercial drivers have only one driver’s license, one complete driver record, and that the commercial driver’s history is accurately maintained throughout the life of the driver. Processing and vetting of Commercial Driver License (CDL) or Commercial Learner’s Permit (CLP) applicants is supported through CDLIS to complete various procedures, including:

- Obtaining an initial CDL/CLP;
- Renewing a CDL/CLP;
- Recording FMCSA requirements that allow a CDL holder to remain qualified to operate a commercial vehicle;
- Adding or deleting CDL/CLP endorsements;
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- Maintaining and supporting the CDLIS pointer as the state of record
- Transmitting out-of-state convictions and withdrawals for commercial drivers;
- Transferring the driver record when a commercial driver changes state;
- Responding to requests for driver status and history;
- Inactivating a CDLIS pointer due to voluntary surrender or when a CDL holder becomes deceased.

CDLIS processing resides on the State of Georgia’s mainframe and is tightly integrated with the DDS’ license issuance system. The DDS utilizes AAMVA™ and associated protocols (AMIE and UNI) to connect to the CDLIS infrastructure. Business logic and administrative tools used by the DDS to support CDLIS functions have been developed in-house using Cobol, which in addition to transparent in-line CDL issuance processing, includes several administration applications to resolve conflicts and support manual exception processing.

When servicing driver license applicants, the DDS vets all driver license applicants through the Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS) to ensure the applicant has no outstanding driving withdrawals before they receive a new or renewed Georgia driver’s license. A PDPS response during the issuance process may result in a withdrawal being placed on the driver’s Georgia record. DDS utilizes AAMVA™ to communicate with PDPS. This process is tightly integrated with the DDS’ license issuance system.

Approximately twenty CICS programs are used to maintain PDPS and CDLIS pointer records and to communicate driver status and history data to and from other states. These programs support AAMVA and FMCSA requirements. The DDS requires that these programs be rewritten by the Offeror. The DDS requires the CDLIS and PDPS processes be rewritten in DRIVES.

7.3.7 Document Management

The DDS’s document management system (DMS) incorporates document scans, workflow queuing, document retrieval, and data entry management. Documents are stored in OnBase, which provides electronic content management. Nearly 40 million documents exist in the OnBase repository.

Approximately 6 million documents have been scanned during the last fiscal year; the majority of these were scanned directly to OnBase, which is not integrated within the associated transaction. Documents enter the OnBase repository using one of three methods:
- Scanned to a DMS queue
- Scanned directly on OnBase (scan last)
- Faxed to a DMS queue

DDS prefers the document management and scanning functions of DRIVES to be an integrated function provided by the Offeror. DDS does not intend to continue the utilization of OnBase as the document scanning component of DRIVES. DRIVES must ensure that each required document is scanned as a requirement for completing the issuance event. The agency desires that all routine “scan last” situations be eliminated in favor of integrating scan processes at the point of transaction, directly indexing the documents to the customer record. This will significantly reduce the need for barcode scanning. The DDS requires a solution that will provide
the ability to view scanned documents before they have been uploaded to the document repository, with view permissions associated with document types.

DDS will provide the document scanning equipment necessary to support the Offeror solution and will work with the Offeror to implement scanning equipment that is compatible with the Offeror solution both at time of DRIVES deployment and throughout the lifecycle of DRIVES. The Offeror must provide specifications for all equipment necessary to support the proposed DRIVES solution.

The Offeror must include details in their proposal on how their solution will satisfy the DDS requirements listed in Sections 7.3.7.1, 7.3.7.2, and 7.3.7.3.

7.3.7.1 Scanned to a DMS Queue

When documents are scanned by the Headquarters mail and archive group, they are identified by document type and automatically placed in workflow queues for data entry. The data entry operators have side-by-side screens that display the scanned documents on one side and a data entry screen on the other. This eliminates the need to perform data entry from source documents and provides the ability to monitor work volumes. Work/queue assignments can be changed in response to volumes in the various document queues.

The following document types/data entry transactions are supported by DMS workflow queues:
- Commercial eligibility certification records
- Citations
- Other states’ citations
- Hearing requests and results
- Withdrawal of driving privilege orders including:
  - Court ordered suspension or commercial disqualifications
  - Failure-to-Appear (FTA) suspensions and releases
  - Administrative License Suspensions
  - Safety responsibility suspension orders
  - Deceased cancellations
  - Commercial disqualifications from Federal agencies
- Lost license affidavits
- Surrendered licenses
- Certified mail green cards
- Driver improvement certificates
- Proof of insurance and insurance cancellations

7.3.7.2 Scanned Directly to OnBase

In some cases, document scanning is not integrated into the various automated transactions. Instead of a document scan entering a workflow queue and ultimately resulting in a transaction, a process referred to as “scan last” occurs when a data entry transaction is completed first, followed by source document scan directly into OnBase. Scan last documents may be manually indexed or indexed by scanning a scan header. “Scan last” documents include:
- License and ID card applications (issuance)
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- Commercial driver certifications (issuance)
- Proof of residence documents (issuance)
- Proof of identity documents (issuance)
- Hearing results
- Medical and Vision-related Withdrawals
- Driver improvement course certificates
- Ignition interlock reports
- Safety Responsibility reinstatement orders
- Exception handling for driver maintenance activities
- Record combine requests
- Motorcycle safety program-related documents

The most common examples of “scan last” are documents scanned at Customer Service Centers during issuance of DL/IDs. These documents are subject to multiple issues and inconsistencies:

- 2D barcodes are scanned to populate customer and transaction index fields. Frequently, the scanner does not read the barcode properly, which forces the operator to manually input index information. If this information is entered incorrectly, the document may be incorrectly classified or associated with the correct driver.
- When non-AAMVA-compliant barcodes (such as other states’ licenses) are read by the scanners, the index fields may be filled with irrelevant data. There is limited feedback for the operator to know if this occurred.
- The DDS only allows certain employees to view customer identity documents. If the barcodes are not read correctly by the scanner, these identity documents may be misclassified and be available for viewing by all operators.

7.3.7.3 Faxed to a DMS Queue

While documents received by mail are scanned, some documents are received via fax, using twenty dedicated phone numbers, each for a specific record/transaction type. These faxed documents are routed into DMS workflow queues and treated as source documents for data entry.

7.3.8 Non-Integrated or Partially Integrated Components

The following components are either partially integrated or non-integrated components of the current DDS system. Offerors are required to detail their experience and history with each of these components and identify whether or not these components can be integrated into DRIVES.

- INovah™
- OnBase™
- Global Gateway™ (CDL road test reservations)
- PeopleSoft™ State-wide Accounting System
- Office of State Administrative Hearings (OSAH)
- For-Hire Driver Applications (completely unintegrated; no ability to know Real ID or lawful presence status for applicant; includes manual interface to Cogent vendor for fingerprint analysis results. Would benefit from automated interface to Cogent; with indicator for
fingerprint requirement and fingerprint status on driver record to indicate fingerprint not submitted, submitted and in process, match found, or no match found. Need for-hire application status of applied, in review, rejected, or approved; and application expiration date (not aligned to license expiration date).

- OCRA Driver Improvement Companies’ interface for scheduling & driver certificate transmission; separate database for vehicle registration card tracking of school vehicles used for tests. Would benefit from ability to know insurance info (DOR) and monitor vehicle inspection expiration date
- Motorcycle Safety program course scheduling & waiver transmission
- Multiple types of business partners may request info on multiple drivers in bulk, including insurance companies and employers, driver training and driver improvement schools, for-hire companies. Need to manage at both company and individual levels.
- Returned mail (DL/ID)
- Driver Services Reservation system
8 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL - TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

Section 8 of the eRFP is a Mandatory Scored Response section for all Offerors and is designed to allow Offeror’s the ability to clearly and thoroughly detail their solution and how their solution will integrate with the requirements and functions as described in this eRFP. The State encourages Offeror’s to identify existing solution components and components that would need to be developed for this project. The DOR and the DDS are also interested in an Offeror’s solution features that are not represented in this section but may enable each agency to further enhance their goals. The Offeror response to the Offeror Requirements, Functional Requirements and Technical Requirements sections will be the primary criteria for the Evaluation Committee to decide which Offeror to choose for this project. The Offeror is required to respond to each part of Sections 4, 7 and 8 in a detailed, clear, and thorough fashion. This will demonstrate to the Evaluation Committee how well the Offeror understands the requirements of this eRFP. The State will not accept any sales, marketing, or promotional literature as part of this section’s response.

Each Offeror must complete the Mandatory Technical Requirements table found in Attachment 14.9 by answering each question with a Yes or No.

8.1 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

The goal of this procurement is to secure an Offeror solution that will modernize the DOR and the DDS with industry supported technology that will effectively support the business applications and systems described throughout this eRFP. The State is seeking an Offeror that will share the vision of the DOR and the DDS, and provide a solution that will serve the residents of Georgia efficiently and effectively. The Offeror’s solution approach is of special interest to the State; as stated previously the DOR and the DDS have conducted extensive research into system modernizations across the country and are well aware of the many challenges and issues encountered. Project approach, business continuity, risk mitigation, communications, and solution design are key factors in the State’s decision making process. Offerors must carefully explain their philosophy and methodology to ensuring that these points and the key technical objectives are addressed with respect to developing and implementing a large enterprise project.

The key technical objectives of the State are as follows:

- Eliminate reliance on outdated technology.
- Provide proven technologies that are well supported within the industry. The DOR and the DDS are not open to solutions that rely on open source technology.
- Provide a scalable and efficient Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) solution.
- Reduce complex embedded business logic in core system-level code.
- Implement a solution that will be organized in an n-tier fashion to create separate layers for user presentation, data access, enterprise data store, business logic, and other middle-tier processing. All applications should reside on a separate server from the enterprise data store.
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- Provide a .NET web-based solution that will not require local installations of software or utilities at DOR county offices or DDS customer service centers. The DOR does not want to manage local client installations across 159 counties. Computer equipment used by DDS to service customers is provided by a third-party party vendor and the complexity in planning, managing and supporting client installations with multiple vendors is cumbersome.
- Provide strong business continuity and disaster recovery to reduce risk of catastrophic failure.
- Obtain a solution that is flexible and modular in nature and capable of supporting current and future automated processing and capacity needs of each agency’s core business processes and functions.
- Provide greater extensibility of each agency’s processes to Internet users and other alternate delivery sources.
- Reduce dependency on specialized resources through common technologies.

The DRIVES proposal must include any perceived development, implementation, or operational risks and solutions to mitigate these risks. The DRIVES proposal must detail the performance and testing tools that will be provided and utilized by the vendor in order to benchmark performance and ensure a defect-free system is delivered. The State is especially interested in the Offeror’s past history with said risk(s) and how each risk was overcome. Offeror’s are encouraged to provide any other materials that may help the State understand the proposed solution, such as solution diagrams, topologies, workflows, etc. These materials should be attached to the Offeror response as Appendices and clearly designated within the proposal response.

8.2 INFRASTRUCTURE

The DOR and the DDS utilize four data centers with the primary data center being managed by IBM for the infrastructure, and by AT&T for the network and telecommunications. The State’s mainframe is also located at the primary data center and is managed by IBM. More information about the primary data center may be found in Section 14.11. The Georgia Technology Authority (GTA) oversees and manages the contracts for both IBM and AT&T. There are two additional secondary data centers at DOR locations which are relatively small, and one secondary data center at DDS headquarters. All secondary data centers’ infrastructures are under the same management and support contracts with IBM and AT&T. Most of DOR’s and DDS’ production web servers, application servers and database servers, including the DOR’s Oracle Exadata Database appliance, are located at the primary data center.

The DOR and the DDS network domains are controlled by a combination of Microsoft Windows and Enterprise servers running Active Directory. Internal access to each agency’s domain and file systems is controlled by internally managed active directory services. Internal access to the mainframe is managed through RACF via respective agency personnel. External access to the mainframe and to each agency’s network domain is managed by GTA, but access is authorized by each agency independently. The State envisions system integration utilizing single sign-on.
The State has made a significant investment in an Oracle Exadata database appliance which is preferred to use as part of the implementation of the modernized system. The new modernized system will have a large number of users and a heavy amount of on-line transactions being processed. Additionally, a robust batch process needs to be accommodated on a 24X7 basis. Offerors should consider an overall design that can utilize the Oracle Exadata appliance housed at the primary data center.

This information has been provided to assist Offeror’s in analyzing their solutions as to how they would fit with the current direction of the DOR and the DDS. The State will entertain other environments as long as the Offeror can prove the reliability, scalability, and cost effectiveness of said environment. The DRIVES proposal must detail all necessary hardware, third party software, and infrastructure requirements necessary to the proposed solution. Offerors are encouraged to provide hardware specifications, infrastructure specifications, network topologies, and any costs associated to third party software not included with the Offeror’s cost proposal. The State will be providing the necessary solution hardware, infrastructure, and third party software for the DRIVES project. It is important that the State be able to assess the total cost of ownership as proposed by the Offeror.

8.3 DATABASE MANAGEMENT
DRIVES should provide powerful, flexible, and secure data manipulation tools that allow the support staff to quickly append, modify, or delete any data element in the solution. The proposed solution should allow appointed users of the system the ability to take snapshots of data, build summaries of data, and refresh data requirements as needed by applications.

DRIVES utilize strong business intelligence to proactively determine data issues such as duplicity of customer or vehicle records, proper validation of input data, integrity checks on stored data, and detection of incomplete data. The business intelligence should protect the integrity of the business and transaction logic utilized in the solution.

The State requires an intelligent solution that will provide built in data protections, proactive alerting of potential issues, data change tracking, and historical views.

Offerors are required to explain in their proposal how their solution will provide the aforementioned functionality and provide any other details that will allow the evaluation team to assess how the proposed solution improves the process of data management.

8.4 DATABASE CLEANSING
A considerable amount of database cleansing will be necessary for this project. Each agency is already planning preliminary measures to reduce the multiplicity of the customer and vehicle records in their respective databases. The Offeror’s approach for database cleansing as well as their historical experience and lessons learned are of considerable interest to the agencies. The Offeror should provide a detailed discussion of this component with any “before and after” metrics that can be referenced.
8.5 DATABASE CONVERSION

Offerors are required to explain their proposed approach to converting the data and files from the current mainframe and external databases to the database environment of the proposed solution. Both agencies are especially interested in safeguards to protect the data and the verification process of the converted data. The State is also interested in the risk of the Offeror approach and the plan for mitigation of said risk. A carefully planned and thought out implementation strategy that takes into account specific agency’s risks, constraints and condition of data will govern the data conversion and implementation approach for each agency.

The State desires an implementation approach that can be phased in and reliably measured for performance and accuracy prior to implementation. Offerors are required to provide a detailed description of how they will collaborate, evaluate, and plan with each agency in order to develop an implementation plan tailored to the agency’s specific conditions. The solution should consider phased implementation for both the DOR and the DDS. A “Big Bang” implementation is not desired for either agency. Data conversion should keep this phased approach in mind so the data integrity of the old and new systems co-exist until the whole DOR portion and whole DDS system is implemented.

8.6 PROCESSING AND OPERATIONS

DRIVES shall be comprised of the various business and operational components required in this eRFP. These components shall be fully integrated to create a homogenous solution. The State will not accept a solution with several varying foundation technologies that would make management, scalability, and adaptability difficult. The State requires a solution that is quick and efficient with regard to processing speed at transaction and operation levels. The DOR and the DDS require the solution to provide utilities for each agency to assess their respective processing metrics to ensure proper system functionality. Said utilities should include, at a minimum, metrics such as data query analysis, transaction processing time, reporting responsiveness, and error conditions. Offerors are required to provide details in their proposal as to how their solution provides processing efficiency in a high-volume enterprise environment and what metrics can be analyzed within their solution. Offerors are required to explain maintenance routines that are required to keep their solution running at peak efficiency and provide any other details that will help the State evaluate the Offeror’s solution with regard to the large volume of users and data involved.

Each Offeror is also required to include in their proposal two examples of metrics from previous client installations in high-volume enterprise environments, with sensitive information redacted. The example metrics should include data quality analysis, transaction processing time, reporting responsiveness, and error conditions as well as any other quantifiable criteria that will assist the DOR and the DDS in evaluating the Offeror’s experience.

8.7 INTERCONNECTIONS

System Interconnections are defined by both the DOR and the DDS as interfaces with Federal entities, other jurisdictions, vendors, and end users. A current listing of the system connections
that exist with each agency can be found in Attachment 0. Establishing interconnections with the State is a well-defined process and includes having all parties executing formal Security Agreements. Additional interconnections may be developed during the course of the DRIVES project.

Most interconnections are currently set up with CICS, FTP, Connect Direct, webMethods, and SFTP connections. The DOR and the DDS will require the Successful Offeror to work with all interconnection entities to upgrade all current interconnections to secure web services or SFTP connections.

8.8 Interfaces

DOR Interface:

The DOR requires the Offeror to propose a Graphical User Interface (GUI) that is simple, intuitive, and consistent for the end users. The DOR is seeking a GUI solution that is user friendly and configurable that provides in-line help, and handles transaction processing in a targeted fashion. The interfaces will be simple to manage and easily adapted for transaction level changes as well as adding new transactions. A well-designed and intuitive GUI will help offset training costs and improve efficiency.

DDS Interface:

The DDS anticipates that several external vendor-provided functions will be supported outside of DRIVES, and delivered as a result of this eRFP. Specifically, functions to capture the customer’s photograph and signature, facial comparison processes, and card production processes will remain a contractual obligation with the agency’s third-party vendor for card production services. DDS desires a unified user interface that will tightly integrate functions and processes that are both internal to the modernized system and external with DDS’ third party vendors. The interface must be intuitive and easy-to-use, making the incorporated third-party components appear to be a single application. The interface should also ensure that steps and pre-conditions required for the active transaction, including document scan steps, are satisfied before allowing the user to continue to subsequent steps.

For job roles where activities are driven by workflow queues, the unified user interface should manage and effectively distribute work load to active authorized users. The interface must provide efficiencies, reduce manual interaction, and ensure data accuracy. Offerors must include in their proposal detailed and specific requirements necessary for their solution to be integrated with DDS’ third party card production vendor.

8.9 Security

The DRIVES project will be subject to the Information Security Policies of the State of Georgia, the DOR, and the DDS. The DOR and the DDS Information Security Policies can be found in Section 14.12. The State of Georgia Information Security Policies are located at http://gta.georgia.gov/psg/all-security-policies. All Offerors must read and thoroughly familiarize themselves with all of the security policies, standards, and guidelines. The DOR and the DDS both
require all controls within the PA-DSS Program Guide version 3.1 that are directly affected by the Offeror, to be compliant. Each agency’s respective Information Security Officer (ISO) will be responsible for identifying, monitoring and certifying each control that is related to the DRIVES solution.

Each agency’s ISO requires that each Offeror has a complete understanding of the importance of security standards and the application thereof. As part of this eRFP response, and to be included as an Attachment within the Offeror response, each Offeror is required to submit a System Security Plan (SSP). The State fully realizes that a comprehensive SSP cannot be provided at this time, but does realize that any qualified Offeror should have an SSP developed for other clients or for internal purposes. The State is asking for an outline from an SSP that demonstrates all addressed components, with sensitive or confidential information redacted. The intent is to prove the knowledge and capability of the Offeror. The Offeror will be required to submit a comprehensive SSP to the ISO’s for the DOR, the DDS, and the GTA approval. DRIVES will not be able to move into any user acceptance testing (UAT) or production environment without approval of the SSP.

Each Offeror is also required to include in their proposal a sample incident response plan and an architectural security (final network) diagram, developed for a previous client, with sensitive information redacted.

The Offeror shall clearly explain their solution requirements for the development, UAT, and production environments with regard to accessing the data infrastructure of the DOR and the DDS. The State has the following rules in place for the Offeror solution and the Offeror employees:

- No remote access will be granted to foreign development centers outside US States or territories.
- The Offeror needs to realize that the counties and other agencies are not DOR employees and are actually agents of the DOR. Both agencies require a strict and flexible access management system.
- On-site project personnel assigned to each the DOR or the DDS will require security screening by the respective agency every two years.
- All security personnel will need to supply a resume to the ISO.
- The Successful Offeror is required to immediately notify the DOR or the DDS when employment of Offeror’s personnel assigned to either agency is terminated, regardless of the reason for termination.
- All data must be stored in the United States.
- The Offeror shall conduct criminal background checks and not utilize any staff, including subcontractors, to fulfill the obligations of the contract who have been convicted of any crime of dishonesty, including but not limited to criminal fraud, or otherwise convicted of any felony or any misdemeanor offense for which incarceration for up to 1 year is an authorized penalty.
- The Offeror shall promote and maintain an awareness of the importance of securing the public jurisdiction’s information among the Offeror’s employees and agents.
- Report any breach or compliance issue immediately to each agency’s ISO.
8.10 TECHNICAL AUDITING
The DOR and the DDS require a solution that implements extensive audit logging and utilities for managing the audit functions. The State requires a solution that employs business intelligence to proactively alert users to potential issues. If the audit logging is wrapped with business intelligence functions, DRIVES must provide proactive controls and/or targeted discrepancy reports. Audit requirements for this project, at a minimum, are as follows:

- DRIVES must provide audit trails and reports that identify who accessed (or failed authentication to) the system, time of login, duration of time on the system, and transactions/actions performed by a user. Audit history shall be maintained for a predefined period of time. It shall be a complete log and not just the last action taken by a user.
- DRIVES must provide Real-time notification of failed authentication at agreed-upon thresholds.
- DRIVES must provide the ability to track changes made to data on the system, the dates, and ID of the user who worked on a transaction and what fields were modified.
- DRIVES must maintain an audit trail of all transactions and inquiries, including those performed by contracted third parties.
- DRIVES must maintain detailed audit trails when any form of tender is received, disbursed, or refunded, or any controlled stock item is issued. At a minimum, the audit trail will include the identifier of the user performing the transaction, the nature, data, and time of the transaction, and the location where the transaction took place.

Offerors are required to detail their auditing solution approach in their proposal.

8.11 DISASTER RECOVERY
The Offeror proposal must describe its approach to Disaster Recovery (DR) Planning. At a minimum, proposals must detail:

- Overall approach
- Data back-ups (real-time; intervals)
- Offsite storage for back-ups
- Back-up medium required
- Risk identification
- Mitigation strategy
- Evaluation methodology
- Annual true DR exercise to validate DR processes
- Constraints
- Assumptions
- Tools or utilities required
- Personnel requirements
- Service level standards
- Capacity – Ability to support all DOR/DDS users/functions
For the purposes of this RFP, Disaster Recovery services with respect to physical infrastructure already exist, and do not need to be solutioned as part of your response. However Offerors agree and understand that design and work needed to implement a comprehensive Disaster Recovery configuration for DRIVES with the State’s infrastructure vendor is within the scope of DRIVES and it should be accounted for in the Offeror’s proposal. The State has recovery services in the form of an off-site recovery facility, for synchronized data, and tape recovery. In addition to the existing recovery services, the State is in the process of rebidding many infrastructure towers, including Disaster Recovery. The State intends to equal or exceed its capabilities of its current recovery services, once the new services are acquired. Existing services will remain in place until new services are available.

8.11.1 Disaster Recovery Environment

In the event that adequate recovery services cannot be acquired within the State’s infrastructure environment to support DRIVES, the State will consider having the Successful Offeror provide all services necessary to establish and provide an Active / Passive Disaster Recovery solution for DRIVES. The Offeror should describe this solution and any requirements that the State must satisfy to implement an Offeror-provided Disaster Recovery environment. Selection of Disaster Recovery Environment services will be at the sole discretion of the State.

8.12 Mobile

The State expects an architecture that can be scaled or customized to introduce new services on the web, via mobile devices, via kiosks, and provide mobility of services to expand customer outreach to mobile stations or special events. The State requires the DRIVES solution to specifically embrace the customer trend of performing transactions and gaining information via mobile and web applications and/or devices.

8.13 System Documentation

The DOR and DDS require the Offeror to provide comprehensive and detailed system documentation for the DRIVES solution. The Offeror is expected to provide system documentation during the development process and throughout the SDLC. The Offeror shall provide a comprehensive and well organized technical manual prior to UAT testing. System documentation shall include but not be limited to:

- Architectural drawings
- Network topologies
- Workflow diagrams per component
- Application process flows per component
- Data process flows per component
- Screen flows and wireframes
- Database schemas and definitions
- WSDL specifications
- File specifications
- System Security Plan
8.14 SOFTWARE RIGHTS

8.14.1 Source Code
The State is interested in acquiring all DRIVES source code. If an Offeror is willing to provide the source code to the State, the Offeror must state this in the Executive Summary of the eRFP response and provide separate pricing to include all source code in their cost proposal. Offerors understand that the acquisition of the source code will be at the sole discretion of the State and that this is not a mandatory requirement of this eRFP.

8.14.2 Title of Software
By submitting a proposal, the Offeror represents and warrants that it is the sole owner of the software or, if not the owner, has received all legally required authorizations from the owner to license the software, as well as the full power to grant the rights required by this eRFP. Neither the software nor its use in accordance with the contract will violate or infringe upon any patent, copyright, trade secret, or any other property rights of another person or organization.

8.14.3 Term of Software License
Unless otherwise agreed to in writing among the parties, all licenses granted shall be purchased on a non-exclusive, irrevocable perpetual license basis and shall commence upon the acceptance of the system. However, the State reserves the right to terminate the license at any time. All licenses granted to the State are for use of the Software Products at any of the State’s computing facilities, on any equipment, by any number of users, and for any purposes for which it is acquired. The State further reserves the right to transfer all rights under the license to another state agency to which some or all of its functions are transferred. This license is perpetual and in no event shall the vendor’s remedies for any breach include the right to terminate any license or support services hereunder. There shall be no relocation charge to the State in the event of the transfer of licensed Software Product(s) to another location and the licensed Software Product(s) is to be discontinued at the old location.

8.14.4 State Rights to Software
The State’s right to use software developed entirely at private expense may be limited by the vendor as stipulated in this Scope of Work. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary however, the State shall have at a minimum: use of the software on a secondary system for backup purposes should the primary system become unavailable, malfunctions, or is otherwise rendered inoperable; use of the software at another State site should the system be entirely transferred to that location; the right to make a backup copy for safekeeping; the right to modify or combine the software with other programs or materials at the State’s risk; and the right to reproduce any and all documentation provided. Such reproduction is for the sole use of the State. These rights are perpetual and irrevocable; in the event of any actual or alleged breach by the State, the Offeror’s sole remedy shall be to pursue a monetary claim in accordance with Georgia law. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to restrict or limit the State’s rights to use any...
technical data in which the State may already possess or acquire under proper authorization from other sources. A mutually agreed upon third party shall possess the source code, graphics, resources, tools used, design specifications, etc. for the development of the DRIVES application in an escrow account, to be used by the State in the event the vendor is unable to meet contract requirements.

8.15 SOFTWARE CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT
Large complex software systems such as the DRIVES solution require the engineering discipline of Software Configuration Management (SCM). The DOR and DDS require the Offeror to explain its approach to using SCM in identifying individual elements and configurations, tracking changes, version selection, control, and baselining. The Offeror is required to explain which components of the system it places under SCM such as software objects, program code, test data, test output, design documents, etc..

8.16 SYSTEM ENVIRONMENTS
The State envisions that the DRIVES solution will include numerous environments such as Unit Testing, System Testing, QA Testing, Training, and Production. The State requires the Offeror to clearly identify all proposed environments of the DRIVES solution along with a detailed description of the purpose and functionality of each environment.
9 GENERAL INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS

9.1 TEAM GEORGIA MARKETPLACE™ REGISTRATION SYSTEM
DOAS requires all companies and/or individuals interested in conducting business with the State of Georgia to register in the State’s web-based registration system, through Team Georgia Marketplace™. Registration is free and enables the registering company to gain access to certain information, services and/or materials maintained in Team Georgia Marketplace™ at no charge to the registering company. All registering companies must agree to be bound by the applicable terms and conditions governing the Offeror’s use of Team Georgia Marketplace™. In the event DOAS elects to offer certain optional or premium services to registered companies on a fee basis, the registered company will be given the opportunity to either accept or reject the service before incurring any costs and still maintain its registration. Companies may register at https://saofn.state.ga.us/psp/sao/SUPPLIER/ERP/?cmd=login

9.2 RESTRICTIONS ON COMMUNICATING WITH STAFF
From the issue date of this eRFP until the final award is announced (or the eRFP is officially cancelled), Offerors are not allowed to communicate for any reason with any State staff except through the Issuing Officer named herein, or during the Bidders/Offerors’ conference (if any), or as defined in this eRFP or as provided by existing work agreement(s). Prohibited communication includes all contact or interaction, including but not limited to telephonic communications, emails, faxes, letters, or personal meetings, such as lunch, entertainment, or otherwise. The State reserves the right to reject the response of any Offeror violating this provision.

Offerors who currently perform services for the State understand and agree to maintain isolation between their Bidding Team and their Operational Staff assigned to the state.

9.3 SUBMITTING QUESTIONS
All questions concerning this eRFP must be submitted in writing via email to the Issuing Officer identified in Section 3.1 of this eRFP. No questions other than written will be accepted. No response other than written will be binding upon the State. All Offerors must submit questions by the deadline identified in the Schedule of Events for submitting questions. Offerors are cautioned that the State may or may not elect to entertain late questions or questions submitted by any other method than as directed by this section. All questions about this eRFP must be submitted in the following format:

Company Name
Question #1 Question, Citation of relevant section of the eRFP
Question #2 Question, Citation of relevant section of the eRFP

Attachment 14.20 Question and Answer Form can be used to submit questions.

Do not use the comments section of the Sourcing Event to submit questions to the issuing officer.
9.4 **ATTENDING BIDDERS/OFFERORS CONFERENCE**

The Bidders/Offerors Conference or any other information session (if indicated in the schedule of events) will be held at the offices referred to in Section 3.6 of this eRFP. Unless indicated otherwise, attendance is not mandatory; although Offerors are strongly encouraged to attend. However, in the event the conference has been identified as mandatory, then no more than three representatives of the Offeror must attend the conference in its entirety to be considered eligible for contract award. The Offeror is strongly encouraged to allow ample travel time to ensure arrival in the conference meeting room prior to the beginning of any mandatory conference. The State reserves the right to consider any representative arriving late to be “not in attendance.” Therefore, all Offerors are strongly encouraged to arrive early to allow for unexpected travel contingencies.

9.5 **STATE’S RIGHT TO REQUEST ADDITIONAL INFORMATION – OFFEROR’S RESPONSIBILITY**

Prior to contract award, the State must be assured that the selected Offeror has all of the resources to successfully perform under the contract. This includes, but is not limited to, adequate number of personnel with required skills, availability of appropriate equipment in sufficient quantity to meet the on-going needs of the State, financial resources sufficient to complete performance under the contract, and experience in similar endeavors. If, during the evaluation process, the State is unable to assure itself of the Offeror’s ability to perform, if awarded, the State has the option of requesting from the Offeror any information deemed necessary to determine the Offeror’s responsibility. If such information is required, the Offeror will be so notified and will be permitted approximately seven business days to submit the information requested.

9.6 **FAILING TO COMPLY WITH SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS**

Responses received after the identified due date and time or submitted by any other means than those expressly permitted by the eRFP will not be considered. Offeror’s responses must be complete in all respects, as required in each Section 11 of this eRFP. Failure to comply with all requirements in Section 11 can lead to the rejection of the Offeror’s eRFP.

9.7 **REJECTION OF PROPOSALS: STATE’S RIGHT TO WAIVE IMMATERIAL DEVIATION**

The State reserves the right to reject any or all responses, to waive any irregularity or informality in an Offeror’s response, and to accept or reject any item or combination of items, when to do so would be to the advantage of the State of Georgia. It is also within the right of the State to reject responses that do not contain all elements and information requested in this eRFP. An Offeror’s response will be rejected if the response contains any defect or irregularity and such defect or irregularity constitutes a material deviation from the eRFP requirements, which determination will be made by the State on a case-by-case basis.

9.8 **STATE’S RIGHT TO AMEND AND/OR CANCEL THE ERFP**

The State reserves the right to reject any or all responses, to waive any irregularity or informality in an Offeror’s response, and to accept or reject any item or combination of items, when to do so
would be to the advantage of the State. It is also within the right of the State to reject responses that do not contain all elements and information requested in this eRFP. An Offeror’s response will be rejected if the response contains any defect or irregularity and such defect or irregularity constitutes a material deviation from the eRFP requirements, which determination will be made by the State on a case-by-case basis.

9.9 PROTEST PROCESS

9.9.1 Offeror Participates in Protest Process
An Offeror may file a written protest challenging a state entity’s compliance with applicable procurement procedures subject to the Offeror’s compliance with the following provisions. Any such written protest will be resolved in accordance with the following subsections.

9.9.2 Types of Challenges
There are several different challenges an Offeror may make; however, the types of challenges are generally organized as follows:

- **Challenge to the Solicitation**: Any aggrieved Offeror interested in and capable of responding to a competitive solicitation may file a protest with respect to the competitive solicitation process, including but not limited to a challenge to specifications or any events or facts arising during the solicitation process.

- **Challenge to a Sole-Source Notice**: Any aggrieved Offeror interested in and capable of providing the goods/services identified in a sole source notice may file a protest challenging the sole source determination.

- **Challenge to the State’s Intended or Actual Contract Award**: Any aggrieved Offeror submitting a timely written response to a competitive solicitation may file a protest with respect to the state entity’s intended or actual contract award, including, but not limited to, events or facts arising during the evaluation and/or negotiation process.

9.9.3 Form of Protest
At a minimum, the protest must be submitted in writing and must include the following:

- The name and address of the protestor;
- Appropriate identification of the solicitation/sole source notice;
- A statement of reasons for the protest;
- Supporting exhibits, evidence or documents to substantiate any claims unless not available within the filing time (in which case the Offeror must proceed to file the protest when the filing period identified below, but state the expected availability of the material); and
- The desired remedy.

To ensure the protest process may be conducted efficiently and in a manner fair to all parties, DOAS requires a protesting Offeror to identify all grounds for protest during the protest filing period. DOAS at its discretion, may deem issues not raised in the protest filing period as voluntarily relinquished by the protesting Offeror. After the protest filing period expires, any grounds for protest voluntarily relinquished by the protesting Offeror may not be introduced by the protesting Offeror at any time during the protest process or any subsequent litigation.
9.9.4 Filing Protests

A protest is considered to be properly filed when it is in writing, signed by a company officer authorized to sign contracts on behalf of the Offeror, and is received by State Purchasing Division within the filing period. The protest may be sent by any of the means outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protest Method</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIL</td>
<td>Attn: Assistant Commissioner - Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Purchasing Division, Department of Administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 Piedmont Ave., SE, Suite 1308.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Tower, Atlanta, GA 30334-9010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAX</td>
<td>404-657-8444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:protests@doas.ga.gov">protests@doas.ga.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.9.5 Filing Deadlines

The Offeror must observe the deadlines outlined in Table 6.9 when filing a protest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Protest</th>
<th>Protest Filing Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to Competitive Solicitation Process</td>
<td>Two business days prior to the closing date and time of the solicitation as identified on the Georgia Procurement Registry or eSource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to Sole-Source Notice</td>
<td>Prior to the closing date and time of the Sole-Source Notice as published on the Georgia Procurement Registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to an Intended or Actual Contract Award</td>
<td>In the event the state entity posts an Notice of Intent to Award, the protest must be filed within ten calendar days of the date the Notice of Intent to Award is posted. In the event the state entity does not post Notice of Intent to Award, the protest must be filed within ten calendar days of the date the Notice of Award is posted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Checklist for Bid Posting Times and Protest Filings, SPD-SP014, can be viewed on the DOAS State Purchasing web site for more details. If an aggrieved Offeror fails to file a protest by the applicable deadline, DOAS may, at its discretion, deem such failure as the Offeror’s voluntary relinquishment of any grounds the Offeror may have for protesting through DOAS’ protest process or through subsequent litigation.

9.9.6 Stay of Procurement During Protest Review

When a protest challenging the competitive solicitation process has been timely filed at least two business days prior to the closing date and time, the solicitation will not close until a final decision resolving the protest has been issued, unless the State Purchasing Division Deputy Commissioner makes a written determination that the closing of the solicitation without delay is necessary to protect the interests of the state.
When a protest challenging a sole-source notice or an intended contract award has been timely filed, the state entity will not proceed to actual contract award unless the State Purchasing Division Deputy Commissioner makes a written determination that the issuance of a contract or performance of the contract without delay is necessary to protect the interests of the state. If it is determined that it is necessary to proceed with contract performance without delay, the Offeror with this contingent contract may proceed with performance and receive payment for work performed in strict accordance with the terms of the contract; however, such Offeror will not be entitled to reimbursement for any capital outlay costs, or other up front expenditures incurred in performing the contract. The provisions of this paragraph are not applicable to a protest pertaining to events or facts arising during the solicitation process.

9.9.7 Protest Resolution
The State Purchasing Division Deputy Commissioner will review and issue a written decision on the protest as expeditiously as possible after receiving all relevant requested information from the state entity and/or issuing officer. Available remedies for sustained protests are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protest Remedies</th>
<th>Then, available relief includes, but is not limited to,...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to Competitive Solicitation Process</td>
<td>• Modification of the solicitation document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extension of the solicitation closing date and time (as appropriate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cancellation of the solicitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to Sole-Source Notice</td>
<td>• Revision or cancellation of the sole-source notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to an Intended or Actual Contract Award</td>
<td>• Revision or cancellation of the Notice of Intent to Award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Re-evaluation and re-award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Re-solicitation with appropriate changes to the new solicitation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.9.8 Costs
In no event will an Offeror be entitled to recover any costs incurred in connection with the solicitation or protest process, including, but not limited to, the costs of preparing a response to the solicitation, the costs of participating in the protest/request for formal review process or any attorneys’ fees.

9.9.9 Requests for Formal Review/Appeal Process
All protest decisions concerning solicitations, sole-source notices, and/or intended/actual contract awards with an estimated value of $100,000.00 or more will be subject to formal review by the DOAS Commissioner upon request. In the event the estimated value of the solicitation, sole-source notice, and/or intended/actual contract award is less than $100,000.00, it will be within the DOAS Commissioner’s discretion whether such request for formal review will be granted.
The parties listed in the table below may file a request for formal review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parties Eligible to Request Formal Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If protest concerns...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to Competitive Solicitation Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to Sole-Source Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge to an Intended or Actual Contract Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any request for formal review must be received by the DOAS Commissioner within three business days of the issuance of the protest decision. The request for formal review must be in writing and will identify any errors in the protest decision as well as the factual and legal grounds upon which reversal or modification of the protest decision is deemed warranted. The table below identifies the methods to use for requesting a formal review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request for Formal Review Methods</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MAIL                              | Attn: DOAS Commissioner Department of Administrative Services  
|                                  | 200 Piedmont Ave., SE, Suite 1804  
|                                  | West Atlanta, GA 30334-9010 |
| FAX                               | 404-651-9595 |
| EMAIL                             | protests@doas.ga.gov |

The DOAS Commissioner, in his/her sole discretion, may allow the party requesting formal review to make an oral presentation, and may solicit whatever other information he/she deems appropriate. However, issues not raised in the initial protest by the protestor or issues not raised in the initial request for formal review by the party requesting formal review may, at the discretion of the DOAS Commissioner, be deemed voluntarily relinquished by the Offeror. In the event the DOAS Commissioner elects to grant the request for an oral presentation and the DOAS Commissioner determines the oral presentation must be transcribed, the requesting party will be required to pay the costs of the transcriptionist services, including one copy of the transcribed materials for the DOAS Commissioner’s records.

9.9.10 Partnership with Georgia State Finance and Investment Commission

DOAS has entered into an intergovernmental agreement with the Georgia State Finance and Investment Commission (GSFIC) transferring to GSFIC the authority to administer procurements and contracts for certain construction projects due to GSFIC’s expertise in construction matters. DOAS and GSFIC will jointly determine what construction projects GSFIC will handle. In the event an Offeror desires to file a protest as defined by Section 9.9.2 and the protest concerns a solicitation handled by GSFIC pursuant to the intergovernmental agreement between DOAS and GSFIC, the Offeror will file the protest in accordance with the instructions provided in GSFIC’s solicitation. GSFIC will make a decision on the protest as expeditiously as possible after receiving all relevant requested information. Before issuing a written decision resolving the protest, GSFIC will notify the State Purchasing Division Deputy Commissioner of the intended resolution of the protest. After issuing a written decision resolving the protest, GSFIC will send a copy of the written decision to the State Purchasing Division Deputy Commissioner.

9.10 Costs for Preparing Responses

Each Offeror’s response should be prepared simply and economically, avoiding the use of elaborate promotional materials beyond those sufficient to provide a complete presentation. The cost for developing the response and participating in the procurement process (including the protest process) is the sole responsibility of the Offeror. The State will not provide reimbursement for such costs.
9.11 ADA GUIDELINES
The State of Georgia adheres to the guidelines set forth in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Offerors should contact the Issuing Officer at least one day in advance if they require special arrangements when attending the Bidders/Offerors Conference (if any). The Georgia Relay Center at 1-800-255-0056 (TDD Only) or 1-800-255-0135 (Voice) will relay messages, in strict confidence, for the speech and hearing impaired.

9.12 PUBLIC ACCESS TO PROCUREMENT RECORDS
Solicitation opportunities will be publicly advertised as required by law and the provisions of the Georgia Procurement Manual. Information submitted in response to this solicitation will be processed in accordance with applicable State of Georgia procurement procedures, including O.C.G.A. §50-5-67 and the Georgia Open Records Act. Requests for copies of bids and proposals prior to final award of a contract shall be handled in accordance with the procedures outlined in O.C.G.A. § 50-5-67, the State Purchasing Act, whereas requests for procurement-related documents after final contract award or upon cancellation of a bid without intent to rebid are handled in accordance with the Georgia Open Records Act as provided in O.C.G.A. 50-18-71 et. seq. Proposals and bids, including documents pertaining to the solicitation, become the property of the State and shall be open to public inspection as follows:

9.12.1 State Purchasing Act
The State Purchasing Act delays the release of certain procurement records in the event the public disclosure of those records prior to the State Entity’s public announcements of the results of a solicitation would undermine the public purpose of obtaining the best value for the State such as cost estimates, proposals/bids, evaluation criteria, Offeror evaluations, negotiation documents, offers and counter-offers, and certain records revealing preparation for the procurement. Pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 50-5-67, bids and proposals shall be made available for public inspection, upon request, within one business day of the State Entity’s posting of the Notice of Intent to Award (or the Notice of Award in the event the State Entity does not issue the Notice of Intent to Award). Exceptions provided under the Georgia Open Records Act are not applicable to the disclosure requirements under the State Purchasing Act; therefore, all information other than audited financial statements, will be subject to public disclosure upon request, including information marked as “confidential”, “proprietary”, etc. The State is under no obligation to notify the Offeror of disclosure of records under the State Purchasing Act.

9.12.2 Georgia Open Records Act
After final contract award has been made or after a bid has been cancelled without intent to rebid, requests for access to Offeror proposals shall be subject to the disclosure provisions of Georgia’s Open Records Act. Pursuant to O.C.G.A. 50-18-71(a), DOAS must make all public records, including bid proposals, open for personal inspection and copying, except those records which by order of a court of this state or by law are specifically exempted from disclosure.

9.12.2.1 Marking Submissions as “Confidential”, “Proprietary”, or “Trade Secret:
If an Offeror considers any portion of the documents, data, or records submitted in response to this solicitation to be exempt from disclosure under Georgia law, the Offeror must clearly mark
each such submission, or portions of the submission, considered to be exempt from disclosure as “Confidential,” “Proprietary”, or “Trade Secret.” All markings must be conspicuous; use color, bold, underlining, or some other method in order to conspicuously distinguish the mark from the other text. Wholesale designation of a response or substantial parts of a response as “Confidential” will not be accepted by the State. If only portions of a page are subject to some protection, the Offeror should not mark the entire page. If an Offeror’s response, or any part thereof, is improperly marked as confidential, the State may, in its sole discretion, determine it nonresponsive.

9.12.2.2 Submission of Redacted Copies
If an Offeror considers any portion of its bid/proposal to the solicitation to be trade secret or otherwise not subject to public disclosure under Georgia Open Records Act, the Offeror must, in addition to the required original documents, provide a separate redacted electronic copy of its bid/proposal, preferably in PDF format, and briefly describe in a separate writing, as to each item redacted, the grounds for claiming exemption from the public records law, including citation to the appropriate exemption form disclosure requirements provided under Georgia law. This redacted copy should be clearly marked “Redacted Copy-Available for Public Review.” In addition, the electronic file name should include the words “Redacted Copy” at the beginning of the file name. The redacted copy shall be submitted at the same time the Offeror submits its bid/proposal and must only exclude or redact those specific portions that are claimed not subject to disclosure. The redacted copy should reflect the same pagination as the original and show the location from which information was redacted. Except for the redacted information, the redacted electronic copy must be identical to the original bid/proposal. The redacted copy will be open to public inspection under the Georgia Open Records Act without further notice to the Offeror. If the Offeror fails to submit a redacted copy with its bid/proposal, the State is authorized to produce the vendor’s bid/proposal with the exception of audited financial statements in answer to any public records request under the Georgia Open Records Act. Even through information) submitted by an Offeror may be marked as "confidential", "proprietary", “trade secret” etc., the State will make its own determination regarding what information may or may not be withheld from disclosure. If the State of Georgia deems redacted information to be subject to disclosure under the Georgia Open Records Act, the Offeror will be contacted prior to the release of this information. Please note that the redacted version will be utilized for purposes of responding to requests for records pursuant to the Open Records Act. The State Entity will provide access to copies of original bids and proposals in response to requests made pursuant to the State Purchasing Act.

9.12.2.3 Trade Secret
In addition, if the Offeror claims that certain information in its bid/proposal may be withheld as trade secret pursuant to O.C.G.A. 50-18-72(a)(34), the Offeror shall include with its bid/proposal submission, an affidavit indicating the specific information that the Offeror identifies as trade secret, affirmatively declaring that such information is trade secret. Along with the affidavit, the Offeror shall provide a justification regarding how and why each redaction request constitutes a trade secret pursuant to Georgia Law. Designation of a “trade secret” shall not be binding on the State, but the State will review and consider the designation. If the
Offeror does not include an affidavit with its bid/proposal submission, the State is authorized to produce the vendor’s bid/proposal with the exception of audited financial statements in answer to any public records request under the Georgia Open Records Act. Wholesale designation of a response or substantial parts of a response as “trade secrets” will not be accepted by the State. In general, the State does not consider pricing information to be trade secret.

9.13 REGISTERED LOBBYISTS

By submitting a response to this eRFP, the Offeror hereby certifies that the Offeror and its lobbyists are in compliance with the Lobbyist Registration Requirements in accordance with the Georgia Procurement Manual.
10 General Business Requirements

This section contains general business requirements. By submitting a response, the Offeror is certifying its agreement to comply with all of the identified requirements of this section and that all costs for complying with these general business requirements are included in the Offeror’s submitted pricing.

10.1 Standard Insurance Requirements

If awarded a contract, the Offeror shall procure and maintain insurance which shall protect the Offeror and the State of Georgia (as an additional insured) from any claims for bodily injury, property damage, or personal injury covered by the indemnification obligations set forth in the contract attached to this solicitation throughout the duration of the contract. The Offeror shall procure and maintain the insurance policies described below at the Offeror’s expense and shall furnish the State an insurance certificate listing the State of Georgia as certificate holder and as an additional insured. The insurance certificate must document that the Commercial General Liability insurance coverage purchased by the Offeror includes contractual liability coverage applicable to the contract. In addition, the insurance certificate must provide the following information: the name and address of the insured; name, address, telephone number and signature of the authorized agent; name of the insurance company (authorized to operate in Georgia); a description of coverage in detailed standard terminology (including policy period, policy number, limits of liability, exclusions and endorsements); and an acknowledgment of notice of cancellation to the State.

The Offeror is required to maintain the following insurance coverage’s during the term of the contract:

1. Workers Compensation Insurance (Occurrence) in the amounts of the statutory limits established by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia (A self-insurer must submit a certificate from the Georgia Board of Workers Compensation stating that the Offeror qualifies to pay its own workers compensation claims.) In addition, the Offeror shall require all subcontractors occupying the premises or performing work under the contract to obtain an insurance certificate showing proof of Workers Compensation Coverage with the following minimum coverage:

   - Bodily injury by accident - per employee: $100,000;
   - Bodily injury by disease - per employee: $100,000;
   - Bodily injury by disease – policy limit: $500,000.

2. Commercial General Liability Policy with the following minimum coverage:

   - Each Occurrence Limit: $1,000,000
   - Personal & Advertising Injury Limit: $1,000,000
   - General Aggregate Limit: $2,000,000
   - Products/Completed Ops. Aggregate Limit: $2,000,000
   - Cyber breach Liability and Notification: $10,000,000
3. Automobile Liability
   Combined Single Limit $1,000,000

The foregoing policies shall contain a provision that coverage afforded under the policies will not be canceled, or not renewed or allowed to lapse for any reason until at least thirty days prior written notice has been given to the State. Certificates of Insurance showing such coverage to be in force shall be filed with the State prior to commencement of any work under the contract. The foregoing policies shall be obtained from insurance companies licensed to do business in Georgia and shall be with companies acceptable to the State, which must have a minimum A.M. Best rating of A-. All such coverage shall remain in full force and effect during the term and any renewal or extension thereof.

Within ten business days of award, the awarded Offeror must procure the required insurance and provide the State with two Certificates of Insurance. Certificates must reference the contract number. The Offeror’s submitted pricing must include the cost of the required insurance. No contract performance shall occur unless and until the required insurance certificates are provided.

10.2 PROJECT ASSURANCE REQUIREMENTS

Information Technology projects may be subject to state-mandated project assurance processes governed by the Georgia Technology Authority (GTA). A determination will be made by the GTA Enterprise Portfolio Management Office with input from the agency, the Governor’s Office, State Purchasing Division and the Office of Planning and Budget. Assurance requirements are based on an assessment of the size, complexity and criticality of the initiative.

The three primary processes for which vendor involvement would be required are Critical Panel Review, Independent Validation and Verification (IV&V), and GEMS Reporting (described below). If the project defined in this eRFP meets the criteria for either (or all) of these assurance processes, the following information must be inserted into the eRFP and vendors must validate their willingness and ability to comply with associated activities.

10.2.1 Critical Panel Review

The Enterprise Critical Projects Review Panel provides a business context for large, critical technology investments. It provides a forum for the agency head to ensure they have the commitments and resources needed to deliver on their initiative successfully. The Georgia Technology Authority (GTA) facilitates this forum and discussion through a disciplined approach and presents the results to the Governor’s Office on a monthly basis.

Successful Offerors will be required to:

- Assist agency with data collection (e.g. schedule updates, budget updates, risk and issue status updates and/or completion of web-based status questionnaires) to create monthly dashboard reporting
- Attend GTA critical panel review meetings, either in person or via teleconference, as required. These meetings last less than 1 hour and occur no more than once per month. The vendor’s Project Manager and/or appropriate designee must attend.
Attend Governor’s Office critical panel review meetings, if requested. These meetings last less than 1 hour and occur no more than once per month. Vendor attendees should include the Project Manager and Engagement Manager or appropriate designee. Note: Vendor attendance at the Governor’s panel review is very rare.

**10.2.2 Independent Validation and Verification (IV&V)**

IV&V is a set of activities performed by an entity not under control of the Offeror. GTA (in collaboration with the offering agency) will select an IV&V Vendor that is technically, managerially and financially independent to check that the deliverables provided by the Offeror, meet the users’ needs (Validation), and check that the deliverables are well engineered (Verification). During all phases of the project, the IV&V Vendor will be acting with the full authority of the State in performing activities.

Successful Offerors will be required to:

- Provide project management deliverables to IV&V vendor as requested for review
- Respond to requests from IV&V vendor for project information
- Make project resources available for periodic meetings and/or interviews with the IV&V vendor (no more than 1-2 hours per month)

**10.2.3 Enterprise Portfolio Reporting (GEMS Reporting)**

Information on technology investments and implementation is maintained in the enterprise portfolio management tool – Georgia Enterprise Management Suite (or GEMS). GEMS holds the state’s inventory of investments and provides dashboard reporting on project progress for the duration of the project lifecycle.

Successful Offerors will be required to:

- Provide regular status updates to the agency project manager
- Respond to automated survey questionnaires generated monthly from the GEMS tool; only select project team members will be asked to respond. (Less than ½ to 1 hours per month)

**10.3 Bonds and/or Letter of Credit**

**10.3.1 Bid Bond**

A Letter of Bondability for an amount equal to $3,000,000 (three million dollars) must be issued by a Corporate Surety authorized to do business in the State of Georgia. This bond must be obtained in order to guarantee that the Offeror will enter into a contract to deliver products and/or related services outlined in this solicitation, strictly within the terms and conditions stated in the contract.

Prior to the closing date of this solicitation, the Offeror must submit a Letter of Bondability for in a sealed envelope to:

Jeff Rolsten
Director – Agency Contract Sourcing
10.3.2 Performance Bond/Letter of Credit

The awarded Offeror(s) shall be required to furnish a performance bond or an irrevocable letter of credit to the State for the faithful performance on the contract in an amount equal to three million dollars. The bond shall be issued by a Corporate Surety authorized to do business with the State of Georgia. The performance bond/letter of credit must be submitted to the State within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the date the contract is awarded, but in any event, prior to the beginning of any contract performance by the awarded Offeror.

10.4 Proposal Certification

By responding to this solicitation, the Offeror understands and agrees to the following:

1. That this electronically submitted proposal constitutes an offer, which when accepted in writing by the State, and subject to the terms and conditions of such acceptance, will constitute a valid and binding contract between the Offeror and the State; and
2. That the Offeror guarantees and certifies that all items included in the Offeror’s response meet or exceed any and all of the solicitation’s identified specifications and requirements except as expressly stated otherwise in the Offeror’s response; and
3. That the response submitted by the Offeror shall be valid and held open for a period of one hundred and twenty (120) days from the final solicitation closing date and that the Offeror’s offer may be held open for a lengthier period of time subject to the Offeror’s consent; and
4. That the Offeror’s response is made without prior understanding, agreement, or connection with any corporation, firm, or person submitting a response for the same materials, supplies, equipment, or services and is in all respects fair and without collusion or fraud. The Offeror understands and agrees that collusive bidding is a violation of state and federal law and can result in fines, prison sentences, and civil damage awards; and
5. That the provisions of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, Sections 45-10-20 et seq. have not been violated and will not be violated in any respect.
11 PROPOSAL RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS

Submittal Instructions for Team Georgia Marketplace™

Listed below are key action items related to this eRFP. The eRFP Schedule of Events in Section 3.6 identifies the dates and time for these key action items. This portion of the eRFP provides high-level instructions regarding the process for reviewing the eRFP, preparing a response to the eRFP and submitting a response to the eRFP.

11.1 eRFP RELEASED

The release of the eRFP is formally communicated through the posting of this eRFP as an event in Team Georgia Marketplace™ and by a public announcement posted to the Georgia Procurement Registry, which is accessible online as follows: http://ssl.doas.state.ga.us/PRSapp/PRindex.jsp

This eRFP is being conducted through Team Georgia Marketplace™, an online, electronic tool, which allows an Offeror to register, logon, select answers and type text in response to questions, and upload any necessary documents. Team Georgia Marketplace™ permits an Offeror to build and save a response over time until the Offeror is ready to submit the completed response. Each Offeror interested in competing to win a contract award must complete and submit a response to this eRFP using Team Georgia Marketplace™. Therefore, each Offeror MUST carefully review the instructions and training information from the following link for a comprehensive overview of the functionality of Team Georgia Marketplace™:

http://doas.ga.gov/Training/Pages/OfferorTraining.aspx

11.2 eRFP REVIEW

The eRFP (or “Sourcing Event”) consists of the following: this document, entitled “The State eRFP Document“, and any and all information included in the Sourcing Event, as posted online on Team Georgia Marketplace™, including any and all documents provided by the State as attachments to the Sourcing Event or links contained within the Sourcing Event or its attached documents.

Please carefully review all information contained in the Event, including all documents available as attachments or available through links. Any difficulty accessing the Event or opening provided links or documents should be reported immediately to the Official Issuing Officer (See Section 3.1) and/or the Help Desk (Section 11.8). Attached documents may be found as follows:

1. First, the State will provide documents at the “header” level of the Event. Please select “View/Add General Comments & Attachments”, which appears at the top of the screen of the Event under the “Event Details” Section. Next, by selecting “View Event Attachments”, the Offeror may open and save all of the available documents. Please thoroughly review all provided attachments.
2. Second, the State may also provide documents at the “line detail” level of the Event. Please navigate to “Step 2: Enter Line Bid Responses”, which appears towards the bottom of the screen of the Event. Please access any provided documents as follows:
   a. First Method:
      i. To the right of each line appearing under Step 2, the Event contains a “Bid” link. By selecting the “Bid” link, the Offeror will navigate to a new page of the Event.
      ii. On this new page, the Offeror can select “View/Add Question Comments and Attachments” to locate attached documents.
   b. Second Method:
      i. To the right of each line appearing under Step 2, the Event contains a “Line Comments/Files” icon (appears as a bubble with text). By selecting the “Line Comments/Files” icon, the Offeror will navigate to a new page of the Event.
      ii. On this new page, the Offeror can locate attached documents.

Please thoroughly review all provided attachments.

11.3 PREPARING A RESPONSE

The Offeror response to this eRFP will be required to be uploaded electronically to the Team Georgia Marketplace in portable document format (PDF). Offerors will be required to provide physical copies of the response exactly as described in Section 11.9. The Offeror shall provide seven (7) physical copies of the Technical response and three (3) physical copies of the Cost Proposal. All physical copies must be delivered to the Official Issuing Officer at the address provided in Section 3.1 by the date and time specified in Section 3.6 eRFP Schedule of Events. The required electronic copy of the Offeror response must be uploaded as described in Section 11.4 by the date and time specified in Section 3.6 eRFP Schedule of Events. The State reserves the right to reject an Offeror response that is not submitted by the date and time specified in Section 3.6 eRFP Schedule of Events or an Offeror response that is not formatted per the directions in Section 11.9. When preparing a response, the Offeror must consider the following instructions:

1. Use the instructions in Sections 11.4 through 11.6 to properly submit the electronic copy of the response.
2. Use the instructions in Section 11.9 to properly form your response.
3. Answer each required section and complete each required form in sufficient detail for evaluation while using judgment with regards to the length of response.
4. Proofread your response and make sure it is accurate and readily understandable.
5. Use caution in creating electronic files to be uploaded. If the State is unable to open an electronic file due to a virus or because the file has become corrupted, the Offeror’s response may be considered incomplete and disqualified from further consideration.
6. Use commonly accepted software programs to create electronic files. The State has the capability of viewing documents submitted in the following format: Microsoft Word or WordPad, Microsoft Excel, portable document format file (PDF), and plain text files with the
file extension noted in parentheses (.txt). Unless the eRFP specifically requests the use of another type of software or file format than those listed above, please contact the Issuing Officer prior to utilizing another type of software and/or file format. In the event the State is unable to open an electronic file because the State does not have ready access to the software utilized by the Offeror, the Offeror’s response may be considered incomplete and disqualified from further consideration.

7. Continue to save your response until the response is ready to be submitted. Select the “Save for Later” button at the top of the page under “Event Details” of the Event.

11.4 UPLOADING THE FORMS

Once the Offeror is ready to upload electronic files (completed forms or worksheets, product sheets, etc.), please following the directions within the eRFP to upload these documents in the proper location. There are three places to upload completed documents:

1. First, the “View/Add General Comments & Attachments” link contains a place for the Offeror to upload all of the documents and worksheets which were provided by the State under the “View Event Attachments” link. Once the Offeror has completed the Event Attachments, the Offeror can then select “Add New Attachments” to upload the completed documents. The Offeror can upload as many documents as necessary in this section of the Event.

2. Second, the Offeror can also upload documents in response to each question or bid factor which appears on the main page of the Event, which appears below the “View/Add General Comments & Attachments” link of the Event. To the right of each question or bid factor, the Offeror can select the “Add Comments or Attachments” link to either enter a written response or upload an electronic document in response to the question or bid factor. After selecting “Add Comments or Attachments”, the Offeror should select “Upload” under the “Add New Attachments” section to browse and upload an electronic file.

3. Third, the Offeror can also upload documents in the bottom portion of the Event where pricing is requested. After selecting the comment bubble icon, the Event allows the Offeror to select “Upload” in order to include an attachment as part of the Offeror’s response. In the alternative, the Offeror can also select the link “Bid”, which also appears to the right of any line items provided in the “Enter Line Bid Responses” portion of the Event. After selecting the “Bid” link, the Offeror can select “View/Add Question Comments and Attachments” to upload a document.

11.5 REVIEWING THE RESPONSE PRIOR TO SUBMISSION

Each Offeror is responsible for ensuring all questions have been answered appropriately and that all necessary documents have been uploaded. Prior to final submission of your response, please review the following checklist:
1. Please review and confirm that the Offeror has answered all questions appropriately. Many questions require a “yes” or “no” response. Please ensure that the correct response has been selected.
2. Please review and confirm that the most competitive response has been provided.
3. Please confirm that all necessary files have been uploaded.
4. Please select the “Validate Entries” button under “Event Details” at the top portion of the Event. While the “Validate Entries” feature cannot verify whether the Offeror has attached files, attached the correct files, or entered the correct responses, the “Validate Entries” feature will alert the Offeror if one or more questions in the “Event Questions” section of the Event have not been answered. The “Validate Entries” feature is a useful tool; however, it is no substitute for careful preparation and review by the Offeror. The State will not consider the Offeror’s use of the “Validate Entries” feature as an excuse for an error committed by the Offeror in the preparation of its response.

11.6 SUBMITTING THE COMPLETED RESPONSE/BID

Once the completed response has been reviewed by the Offeror, click the “Submit Bid” button at the top of the page under the “Event Details” section of the Event. Any information entered by an Offeror into Team Georgia Marketplace™ but not submitted prior to the submission deadline will not be released to the State and will not be considered for award. Only after the Offeror selects the “Submit Bid” button, will the response to the eRFP be sent electronically, time stamping the Offeror’s response and sending a confirmation email to the email address of the Offeror. Please note that submission is not instantaneous; therefore, each Offeror must allow ample time for its response to be submitted prior to the deadline.

11.7 REVIEWING, REVISING OR CANCELING A SUBMITTED RESPONSE

After the response has been submitted, the Offeror may view and/or revise its response by logging into Team Georgia Marketplace™ and selecting the eRFP event number and the “View/Edit” feature for the Offeror’s previous response. Please take note of the following:

1. REVIEW ONLY. In the event the Offeror only wishes to view a submitted response, the Offeror may select “View/Edit”. Once the Offeror has finished viewing the response, the Offeror may simply exit the screen. DO NOT SELECT “Save for Later.” Team Georgia Marketplace™ recognizes any response placed in the “Save for Later” status as a work in progress and withdraws the originally submitted bid. As a result, unless the Offeror selects “Submit” prior to the closing date and time, no response will be transmitted to the State.

2. REVIEW AND REVISE. In the event the Offeror desires to revise a previously submitted response, the Offeror may select “View/Edit” and then revise the response. If the revisions cannot be completed in a single work session, the Offeror should save its progress by selecting “Save for Later.” Once revisions are complete, the Offeror MUST select “Submit” to submit its corrected response. Please permit adequate time to revise and then resubmit the response. Please note submission is not instantaneous and may be
affected by several events, such as the Offeror temporarily losing a connection to the Internet.

AS EACH OFFEROR IS SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR RESUBMITTING ITS RESPONSE PRIOR TO THE eRFP END DATE AND TIME TO ENSURE THE RESPONSE MAY BE CONSIDERED BY THE STATE, PLEASE USE CAUTION IN DECIDING WHETHER OR NOT TO MAKE REVISIONS. The State will assume no responsibility for an Offeror’s inability to correct errors or otherwise make revisions to the submitted response or the Offeror’s inability to resubmit a response prior to the eRFP end date and time.

3. **WITHDRAW/CANCEL.** In the event the Offeror desires to revise a previously submitted response, the Offeror may select “View/Edit” and then select “Save for Later”. Team Georgia Marketplace™ recognizes any response placed in the “Save for Later” status as a work in progress and withdraws the originally submitted bid. As a result, unless the Offeror selects “Submit” prior to the closing date and time, no response will be transmitted to the State. In the event an Offeror desires to withdraw its response after the closing date and time, the Offeror must submit a request in writing to the Issuing Officer.

### 11.8 HELP DESK SUPPORT

For technical questions related to the use of Team Georgia Marketplace™, Offerors have access to phone support through the **DOAS Customer Service Help Desk at 404-657-6000**, Monday through Friday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM excluding State Holidays or any other day state offices are closed such as furlough days or closings in response to inclement weather. Offerors can also email questions to: [ProcurementHelp@doas.ga.gov](mailto:ProcurementHelp@doas.ga.gov).

### 11.9 RESPONSE FORMAT

The DOR requires that each Offeror response be comprised of two PDF files, one for the Technical Response and one for the Cost proposal. Each file should be clearly named as GADOR eRFP 47400-DOR0000066 Technical Response and GADOR eRFP 47400-DOR0000066 Cost Proposal respectively.

#### 11.9.1 Technical Response

The Technical Response file must be formatted as follows:

1. Cover Letter
2. Executive Summary
3. Business Litigation Attestation or Disclosure Letter
4. Tab – Offeror Requirements
   a. Insert Form from Attachment 14.7
   b. Response to Section 4
5. Tab – Functional Requirements
   a. Insert Form from Attachment 14.8
b. Response to Section 7

6. Tab – Technical Requirements
   a. Insert Form from Attachment 14.9
   b. Response to Section 8

7. Tab – Offeror Profile Forms
   a. Insert Form from Attachment 14.1
   b. Insert Forms from Attachment 14.2

8. Tab – Offeror Reference Forms
   a. Insert Forms from Attachment 14.3

9. Tab – Key Personnel Forms
   a. Insert Forms from Attachment 14.4 and Resumes

10. Tab – Dun & Bradstreet
    a. Request Supplier Qualifier Report per Section Error! Reference source not found.

11. Tab – Subcontractors
    a. Insert Forms from Attachments 14.5 and 14.6

12. Tab – Staffing Plan
    a. Insert staffing plan per instructions in Section 4.7

13. Tab - Project Schedule
    a. Insert project schedule per instructions in Section 4.8

14. Tab – Work Plan
    a. Insert Work Plan per instructions in Section 4.9

15. Tab – Supporting Documents
    a. Include any supporting documentation for responses in this section. All documentation provided in this section must be clearly referenced in the Offeror’s response.

DO NOT INCLUDE ANY COST/PRICING INFORMATION IN YOUR TECHNICAL RESPONSE.

11.9.2 Cost Proposal Response
The Offeror should submit all pricing information in U.S. Dollars using the Cost Proposal document. The three physical copies of the pricing information shall be submitted in a separate sealed envelope clearly labeled “Pricing Proposal”. There shall be no pricing information included in the Technical Proposal. Failure to adhere to these submission requirements will result in disqualification of the proposal submission. The Cost Proposal document must be completed in its current format without deviation.

11.9.3 Additional Information
The State has determined that it is best to define its own needs, desired operating objectives, and desired operating environment. The State will not tailor these needs to fit particular solutions Offerors may have available; rather, the Offerors shall propose to meet the State’s needs as defined in this eRFP. All claims shall be subject to demonstration. Offerors are cautioned that conditional proposals, based upon assumptions, may be deemed non-responsive.

As noted in Section 11.2, please access and review all of the attachments provided by the State within the Event. If supplemental materials are requested by the State to be submitted by the
11.10 COST PROPOSAL

11.10.1 Cost Proposal

Each Offeror is required to submit a cost proposal as part of its response. The cost proposal will be evaluated and scored in accordance with Section 12 of this eRFP. By submitting a response, the Offeror agrees that it has read, understood, and will abide by the following instructions/rules:

1. The submitted cost proposal must include all costs of performing pursuant to the resulting contract; and
2. Cost proposals containing a minimum order/ship quantity or dollar value, unless otherwise called for in the eRFP, will be treated as non-responsive and may not be considered for award; and
3. In the event there is discrepancy between the Offeror’s unit price and extended price, the unit price shall govern;
4. In the event there is a discrepancy between (1) the Offeror’s pricing as quoted on the eRFP’s provided cost worksheet and (2) the Offeror’s pricing as quoted by the Offeror in one or more additional documents, the former shall govern; and
5. The prices quoted and listed in the cost proposal shall be firm throughout the term of the resulting contract, unless otherwise noted in the eRFP or contract.

11.10.2 Cost Structure and Additional Instructions

The State’s intent is to structure the cost format in order to facilitate comparison among all Offerors and foster competition to obtain the best market pricing. Consequently, the State requires that each Offeror’s cost be in the format outlined below. Additional alternative cost structures will not be considered. Each Offeror is cautioned that failure to comply with the instructions listed below, submission of an incomplete offer, or submission of an offer in a different format than the one requested may result in the rejection of the Offeror’s proposal.

Enter all information directly into the cost sheet(s). Enter numbers on each cost sheet in “number” (two-place decimal), not “currency” or other format unless otherwise stated. That is, omit dollar signs, commas, and any other non-essential symbols. (e.g., $7.90 should be entered as 7.90) Prices must be in US Dollars. Enter “n/a” to indicate not available or “0” if there is no charge. Cells left blank will be interpreted as “no offer”.

Download the cost worksheet, complete the worksheet and then upload the worksheet by following the instructions in section Section 11.4 of this eRFP.

Part of the cost proposal evaluation criteria is the qualifications of the Offeror which include, as a component, the Offeror’s financial ability to perform the requirements outlined by this eRFP. This eRFP requires the submission of audited financial statements for the past three years to alleviate concerns that an Offeror may not have the financial ability to carry out the Contract.
12 PROPOSAL EVALUATION, NEGOTIATIONS AND AWARD

All timely proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the following steps. The objective of the evaluation process is to identify the proposal which represents the best value to the State based on a combination of technical and cost factors. Based on the results of the initial evaluation, the State may or may not elect to negotiate technical and/or cost factors as further described in the eRFP. In the event negotiations of the technical and/or cost factors occur, the revised proposals will be reevaluated in accordance with the provisions of Section 12.5 of this eRFP. Once the evaluation process has been completed (and any negotiations the State desires to conduct have occurred), the apparent successful Offeror(s) will be required to enter into discussions with the State to resolve any exceptions to the State’s contract. The State will announce the results of the eRFP as described further in Section 12.9 of this eRFP.

12.1 ADMINISTRATIVE/PRELIMINARY REVIEW

First, the proposals will be reviewed by the Issuing Officer to determine the proposal’s compliance with the following requirements:

1. Proposal was submitted by deadline in accordance with Section 3.6
2. Proposal is complete and contains all required documents
3. Offeror meets or exceeds all mandatory requirements in accordance with Section 4.1
5. Technical Proposal does not include any pricing from the Cost Proposal

The Issuing Officer will review each proposal in detail to determine its compliance with Mandatory eRFP Requirements. Responses to Mandatory General, Mandatory Functional, and Mandatory Technical Questions will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis. If a proposal fails to meet a mandatory eRFP requirement, the State will determine if the deviation is material. A material deviation will be cause for rejection of the proposal. An immaterial deviation will be processed as if no deviation had occurred. All proposals which meet the requirements of the Mandatory General, Mandatory Functional, and Mandatory Technical Questions are considered “Responsive Proposals” at this point in time and will be scored in accordance with the point allocation in “Scoring Criteria” of this eRFP.

Due to the extensive scope and highly technical nature of this eRFP, the Issuing Officer reserves the right to consult the DRIVES governance council to verify the mandatory requirements set forth in Section 4.1. The Issuing Officer reserves the right to contact Offerors for clarification or further detail of the mandatory requirements information provided prior to determining the proposal’s compliance.

12.2 EVALUATING PROPOSAL FACTORS

If the Offeror’s proposal passes the Administrative/Preliminary Review, the Offeror’s responses to will be submitted to the Evaluation Team for evaluation.
12.2.1 Review of Mandatory Scored Questions
The Evaluation Team shall review and assess the Mandatory Scored Requirements found in Sections 4, 7, and 8. These sections and all required supporting documentation form the Technical Proposal. The Evaluation Team shall utilize the process defined in Section 12.3 to assess and score the Technical Proposal.

12.2.2 Review of Additional Scored Information Questions
For all proposals determined to be “Responsive Proposals”, the Evaluation Team will review and score the responses to the Additional Scored Information (if any) in accordance with the point allocation in Section 12.5 of this eRFP.

The Offeror will receive a total technical score at the conclusion of the evaluation of the eRFP Proposal Factors.

12.3 Evaluation Committee Process

12.3.1 Communication With Offerors
Evaluation Committee Members are strictly prohibited from participating in individual meetings, lunch, entertainment, or any other direct contact with Offerors after appointment to the Evaluation Committee. If a Member’s job requires contact with an Offeror, the Member may work with the Offeror as required by the job duties. However, the Member is strictly prohibited from discussing the solicitation responses under evaluation.

12.3.2 Site Visits and Oral Presentations
The State reserves the right to conduct site visits or to invite Offerors to present their proposal factors/technical solutions to the Evaluation Team.

- Offerors are prohibited from disclosing the contents of their Cost Proposal at the Oral Presentation and they will be disqualified if such disclosure occurs.
- Evaluators will be given their Technical Evaluator Guide for reference purposes during Oral Presentations and Site Visits.
- Demonstrations will cover the key aspects of the Offeror’s qualifications, proposed technical solution, project plan, and services. Offerors will not be able to alter, amend, or modify their proposal in any way during demonstrations.
- Site visits will provide an opportunity for selected evaluators to verify the Offeror has delivered a comparable solution with another jurisdiction.
- Clarifying questions will be posed to the Offeror by the meeting Facilitator. Clarifying questions will be allowed by Evaluation Committee members only in an effort to qualify the response in terms of the original question.

12.3.3 Final Scoring
- The Evaluation Committee will meet following each Oral Presentation or site visit to debrief and discuss the Offeror’s presentation.
- Evaluators will review and, if necessary, adjust ratings based on the demonstrations and site visits.
The DOAS Issuing Officer will enter the agreed-upon final rating and any applicable justification comments into the FINAL Technical Evaluator Guide.

Each Evaluator must return their Technical Evaluator Guide to the DOAS Issuing Officer at the completion of the final meeting. BOTH individual and Final Technical Evaluator Guides will be retained in the Procurement File.

The DOAS Issuing Officer will enter revised scores into the Technical Evaluation Summary Workbook to calculate a total score for the Offeror’s proposal.

Offerors which score at least fifty percent (50%) of 700 available points (350 points minimum) will proceed to Cost Proposal evaluation stage.

**12.3.4 Cost Proposal Evaluation**

- The Cost Evaluation team will open and score Offeror Cost Proposals.
- Each Offeror’s final technical score (adjusted after demonstrations) will be added to the Cost Proposal score to determine the Vendor’s Final Score and identify the Apparent Successful Offeror.

**12.4 Evaluating Cost Proposal and Total Combined Score**

The cost proposals will be reviewed and scored in accordance with Section 12.5. To expedite the evaluation process, the State reserves the right to analyze the cost proposals independently, but at the same time the Evaluation Team is analyzing the technical proposals, provided neither the cost proposals nor the cost analysis is disclosed to the Evaluation Team until the Evaluation Team completes its initial evaluation and scoring of the eRFP Proposal Factors.

**12.4.1 Cost Scoring**

The State may utilize lowest cost, lowest total cost, and total cost of ownership (TCO) or greatest savings to determine the most competitive cost proposal. The cost proposal may be scored on an overall basis or at the category/subcategory/line level (as applicable) relative to other proposals. The Offeror deemed to have the most competitive cost proposal overall, as determined by the State, will receive the maximum weighted score for the cost criteria. In the alternative, in the event the cost proposal is scored at the category, subcategory or line level, the State may assign the maximum score per category/subcategory/line for the most competitive proposal at that level. Other proposals will receive a percentage of the weighted score based on the percentage differential between the most competitive cost proposal and the specific proposal in question.

**12.4.2 Georgia Enterprises for Products and Services (GEPS)**

In the event the issuing officer has received a response from GEPS, the issuing officer must factor in a price preference of 8% for purposes of cost evaluation. The price preference of 8% has been approved by DOAS in accordance with the State Use Law set forth at O.C.G.A. 50-5-135 et seq., which is intended to create opportunities for disabled persons employed by community-based rehabilitation programs and training centers that are certified by the State Use Council. To implement the price preference, the issuing officer must lower GEPS’ price by 8% when comparing GEPS’ price with any other Offeror’s response. However, in the event GEPS wins the contract award, GEPS must be paid at its actual bid price.
12.4.3 Total Score
The Offeror’s cost score will be combined with the Offeror’s technical score to determine the Offeror’s overall score (or “total combined score”).

12.5 Scoring Criteria
The evaluation is comprised of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Cost of proposed products and/or services</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Proposal Factors</td>
<td>Mandatory Requirements</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Proposal Factors</td>
<td>Mandatory Scored Response for Section 4</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Proposal Factors</td>
<td>Mandatory Scored Response for Section 7</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Proposal Factors</td>
<td>Mandatory Scored Response for Section 8</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visits and Demonstrations</td>
<td>For top two qualified responses by score.</td>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.6 Georgia Based Business/Reciprocal Preference Law O.C.G.A. §50-5-60(b)
For the purposes of evaluation only, Offerors resident in the State of Georgia will be granted the same preference over Offerors resident in another state in the same manner, on the same basis, and to the same extent that preference is granted in awarding bids for the same goods or services by such other state to Offerors resident therein over Offerors resident in the State of Georgia. NOTE: For the purposes of this law, the definition of a resident Offeror is an Offeror who is domiciled in the State of Georgia.

12.7 Negotiations of Proposals and/or Cost Factors
DOAS possesses discretionary authority to conduct one or more rounds of negotiations of technical proposal and/or cost factors as permitted by Georgia law and DOAS’ established procurement policy. This section of the eRFP describes DOAS’ process for utilizing its discretionary negotiation authority as defined by O.C.G.A. Section 50-5-67(a)(6). No state entity is permitted to conduct negotiations of proposal and/or cost factors without DOAS’ supervision unless DOAS has expressly authorized the state entity to conduct negotiations on its own. Although this section addresses DOAS’ right to negotiate in accordance with O.C.G.A. §50-5-67(a)(6), DOAS/State Entity reserves the right to conduct any other negotiations authorized by law.

The objective of negotiations is to obtain the Offeror’s best terms. PLEASE NOTE: NEGOTIATIONS ARE DISCRETIONARY; THEREFORE, THE STATE ENTITY URGES THE OFFEROR (1) TO SUBMIT ITS BEST RESPONSE AND (2) NOT TO ASSUME THE OFFEROR WILL BE GRANTED AN OPPORTUNITY TO NEGOTIATE.

12.7.1 Overview of Negotiations
After the Evaluation Team has scored the Offerors’ proposals, the State may elect to enter into one or more rounds of negotiations with all responsive and responsible Offerors or only those Offerors identified by the Evaluation Team as being in the competitive range. The competitive
range will not be selected arbitrarily and those Offerors included in the competitive range must have highly scored proposals.

After each round of negotiations (if any), the Offeror will submit revisions to its proposal factors and/or cost proposal, which revisions will be scored by the Evaluation Team in accordance with the same criteria used to evaluate the initial responses from the Offerors. Offerors may be removed from further participation in the negotiation process in the event the Evaluation Team determines the Offeror cannot be considered responsive and responsible or based on the competitive range as defined in Section 12.7.3.

The State reserves the right to proceed to award without further discussions after receipt of the initial proposals, in which case, negotiations and Proposal Revisions will not be required.

12.7.2 Negotiation Instructions

Listed below are the key action items related to negotiations. The State’s Negotiation Committee may consist of the State’s Evaluation Committee or may be comprised of different people. However, evaluation of proposals or revised proposals shall be completed only by the State’s Evaluation Committee.

1. **Negotiation Invitation:** Those Offerors identified by the Evaluation Committee to negotiate will be notified and invited to attend negotiations. Offerors will be notified in writing: (i) the general purpose and scope of the negotiations; (ii) the anticipated schedule for the negotiations; and (iii) the procedures to be followed for negotiations.

2. **Confirmation of Attendance:** Offerors who have been invited to participate in negotiations must confirm attendance.

3. **Negotiations Round(s):** One or more rounds of negotiations may be conducted with those Offerors identified by the State’s Evaluation Team.

12.7.3 Competitive Range

If the State elects to negotiate pursuant to Section 12.7.2, the State may either (1) elect to negotiate with all responsive and responsible Offerors, (2) limit negotiations to those Offerors identified within the competitive range, or (3) limit negotiations to the number of Offerors with whom the State may reasonably negotiate as defined below. In the event the State elects to limit negotiations to those Offerors identified within the competitive range, the State will identify the competitive range by (1) ranking Offeror’s proposals from highest to lowest based on each Offeror’s Total Combined Score and (2) then looking for breaks in the scores such that natural groupings of similar scores may be identified. In the event the State determines the number of responsive and responsible Offerors is so great that the State cannot reasonably conduct negotiations (which determination shall be solely at the State’s discretion and shall be conclusive), the State Entity may elect to limit negotiations to the top two (2) ranked Offerors as determined by the Total Combined Score.

12.7.4 Negotiation Round Completion

As part of each round of negotiation, the State may or may not engage in verbal discussions with the Offerors. However, whether or not the State engages in verbal discussions, any revisions the Offeror elects to make to its response must be submitted in writing via email by the end date
and time identified by the Issuing Officer. All revisions received by the due date and time will be evaluated and re-scored by the Evaluation Team in accordance with the same criteria used to evaluate the initial responses from the Offerors. Revisions which are not received prior to the due date and time cannot be considered; however, any Offeror failing to submit timely revisions will not be disqualified from consideration for award based on its final proposal as accepted by the State.

12.8 SELECTION AND AWARD

The primary intent of this eRFP is to identify a single source to provide all of the needed goods and/or services desired by both the DOR and the DDS. The responsive and responsible Offeror receiving the highest Total Combined Score and with whom the State is able to reach agreement as to contract terms will be selected for award.

The State reserves the right to make a split award, a split award is defined as allowing this eRFP to be awarded to only the needed goods and/or services desired by either the DOR or DDS. A split award does not allow this eRFP to be awarded to multiple Offerors. Should the State deem that a single Offeror cannot provide the needed goods and/or services of both the DOR and the DDS, the State reserves the right to award the applicable needed goods and/or services to either the DOR or to the DDS. Should a split award be awarded, a separate eRFP will be released at a later date to address the needed goods and/or services of the agency not involved with the split award.

12.9 PUBLIC AWARD ANNOUNCEMENT

The preliminary results of the evaluation will be announced through the public posting of a Notice of Intent to Award (in the event the value of the contract(s) is estimated to be $100,000 or more in the first year) to the Georgia Procurement Registry. The Notice of Intent to Award (“NOIA”) is not notice of an actual contract award; instead, the NOIA is notice of the State’s expected contract award(s) pending resolution of the protest process. The NOIA (if any) will identify the apparent successful Offeror(s), unsuccessful Offeror(s), and the reasons why any unsuccessful Offerors were not selected for contract award. NO OFFEROR SHOULD ASSUME PERSONAL NOTICE OF THE NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD (“NOIA”) WILL BE PROVIDED BY THE STATE. INSTEAD, ALL OFFERORS SHOULD FREQUENTLY CHECK THE GEORGIA PROCUREMENT REGISTRY FOR NOTICE OF THE NOIA.

The Notice of Award (“NOA”) is the State’s public notice of actual contract award(s). The NOA will be publicly posted to the Georgia Procurement Registry.

12.10 CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The contract that the State expects to award as a result of this eRFP will be based upon the eRFP, the successful Offeror’s final response as accepted by the State and the contract terms and conditions, which terms and conditions can be downloaded from the Sourcing Event. The “successful Offeror’s final response as accepted by the State” shall mean: the final cost and technical proposals submitted by the awarded Offeror and any subsequent revisions to the awarded Offeror’s cost and technical proposals and the contract terms and conditions due to
negotiations, written clarifications or changes made in accordance with the provisions of the eRFP, and any other terms deemed necessary by the State, except that no objection or amendment by the Offeror to the eRFP requirements or the contract terms and conditions shall be incorporated by reference into the contract unless the State has explicitly accepted the Offeror’s objection or amendment in writing.

Please review the State’s contract terms and conditions prior to submitting a response to this eRFP. Offerors should plan on the contract terms and conditions contained in this eRFP being included in any award as a result of this eRFP. Therefore, all costs associated with complying with these requirements should be included in any pricing quoted by the Offerors. The contract terms and conditions may be supplemented or revised before contract execution and are provided to enable Offerors to better evaluate the costs associated with the eRFP and the potential resulting contract.

Exception to Contract

By submitting a proposal, each Offeror acknowledges its acceptance of the eRFP specifications and the contract terms and conditions without change except as otherwise expressly stated in the submitted proposal. If an Offeror takes exception to a contract provision, the Offeror must state the reason for the exception and state the specific contract language it proposes to include in place of the provision. Any exceptions to the contract must be uploaded and submitted as an attachment to the Offeror’s response. Proposed exceptions must not conflict with or attempt to preempt mandatory requirements specified in the eRFP.

In the event the Offeror is selected for potential award, the Offeror will be required to enter into discussions with the State to resolve any contractual differences before an award is made. These discussions are to be finalized and all exceptions resolved within the period of time identified in the schedule of events. Failure to resolve any contractual issues will lead to rejection of the Offeror. The State reserves the right to proceed to discussions with the next best ranked Offeror.

The State reserves the right to modify the contract to be consistent with the apparent successful offer, and to negotiate other modifications with the apparent successful Offeror. Exceptions that materially change the terms or the requirements of the eRFP may be deemed non-responsive by the State, in its sole discretion, and rejected. Contract exceptions which grant the Offeror an impermissible competitive advantage, as determined by the State, in its sole discretion, will be rejected. If there is any question whether a particular contract exception would be permissible, the Offeror is strongly encouraged to inquire via written question submitted to the Issuing Officer prior to the deadline for submitting written questions as defined by the Schedule of Events.
# 13 GLOSSARY OF TERMS

The following glossary of terms is included in this proposal for clarification and is to be considered in any subsequent agreement between the DOR and the Offeror.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABN</td>
<td>American Bank Note</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>Automated Clearing House</td>
<td>A secure payment transfer system that connects all U.S. financial institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Directory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Microsoft directory service developed for Windows domain networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-hoc</td>
<td>&quot;For This&quot; (Latin Translation)</td>
<td>Used as an adjective to describe something as being uniquely specific to a given purpose. Makeshift, capable of shifting contexts to suit improvised situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD Valorem</td>
<td>&quot;According to Value&quot; (Latin Translation)</td>
<td>Taxing structure used by DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act</td>
<td>The ADA is a wide-ranging federal civil rights law that prohibits, under certain circumstances, discrimination based on disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>American Multinational telecommunications corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA</td>
<td>Business Process Analysis</td>
<td>Research discipline of identifying needs and determining solutions to business problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDLIS</td>
<td>Commercial Driver License Information System</td>
<td>Transaction Server that runs primarily on IBM mainframe systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>Customer Information Control System</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td>Cisco Systems, Inc.</td>
<td>American multinational computer technology company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Computing metaphor based on utility and consumption of computing resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Resulting lawful agreement resulting from acceptance by the State to the given Offeror(s) response to the eRFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Customer Relationship Management Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Family of database server products developed by IBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBA</td>
<td>Database Administrator</td>
<td>A person responsible for the installation, configuration, upgrade, administration, monitoring and maintenance of databases in an organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDLS</td>
<td>Digital Driver License System</td>
<td>The system that produces the driver license and ID card credentials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>Georgia Department of Driver Services</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>American multinational computer technology company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIP</td>
<td>Driver Improvement Program</td>
<td>The educational programs to rehabilitate drivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>Driver License.</td>
<td>A credential, issued by a state, authorizing an individual to operate a motor vehicle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV</td>
<td>Department of Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>The commonly used generic term for government organizations that provide motor vehicle administration. In Georgia, this government organization is known as the Motor Vehicle Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOAS</td>
<td>Department of Administrative Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Form of computer network in which all user accounts, computers, printers and other security principals are registered with a central database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Department of Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSL</td>
<td>Digital Subscriber Line</td>
<td>A family of technologies used to provide internet access by transmitting digital data over telephone lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Licensing System</td>
<td></td>
<td>The comprehensive integrated system for driver license and ID issuance, driver records, and driver control and improvement, excluding the DDLS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>Electronic Lien and Title</td>
<td>An application that allows lienholders and motor vehicle agencies to electronically exchange lien and title information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eRFP</td>
<td>Electronic RFP</td>
<td>Electronic format of an RFP. See RFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETR</td>
<td>Electronic Title and Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>Enterprise Content Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exadata</td>
<td>Oracle Exadata</td>
<td>Database appliance with support for both OLTP (transactional) and OLAP (analytical) database systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel</td>
<td>Microsoft Excel</td>
<td>Spreadsheet application developed by Microsoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTP</td>
<td>File Transfer Protocol</td>
<td>A standard for the exchange of program and data files across a network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBI</td>
<td>Georgia Bureau of Investigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEICS</td>
<td>Georgia Electronic Insurance Compliance System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPS</td>
<td>Georgia Enterprises for Products and Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR</td>
<td>Georgia Procurement Registry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRATIS</td>
<td>Georgia Registration and Titling Information System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>Georgia Technology Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUI</td>
<td>Graphical User Interface</td>
<td>A type of user interface that allows users to interact with electronic devices using images rather than text commands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVA</td>
<td>Help America Vote Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Hewlett-Packard</td>
<td>American multinational information technology corporation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-94 CARD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A form denoting the Arrival-Departure Record of particular foreigners used by U.S Customs and Border Protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>International Business Machines Corporation</td>
<td>American Multinational technology and consulting corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBML</td>
<td>Imaging Business Machines, LLC</td>
<td>Global provider of end-to-end information capture solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>A credential that is considered proof or evidence of a person’s identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFTA</td>
<td>International Fuel Tax Agreement</td>
<td>The multi-jurisdictional fuel tax agreement allowing a motor carrier to pay their interstate motor fuel taxes through their base jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;IP&quot; or &quot;IP Address&quot;</td>
<td>Internet Protocol Address</td>
<td>Numerical label assigned to each device participating in a computer network that uses the Internet Protocol for communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Intellectual Property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP</td>
<td>International Registration Plan</td>
<td>The multi-jurisdictional registration agreement allowing a motor carrier to pay their proportional registration fees to member jurisdictions through their base jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>Information Security Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISPF/MVS 6</td>
<td>Interactive System Productivity Facility /MVS 6</td>
<td>Software product for the z/OS operating system that runs on IBM Mainframes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>The use of computers and telecommunications equipment to store, retrieve, transmit and manipulate data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVR</td>
<td>Interactive Voice Response</td>
<td>A technology that allows a computer to interact with humans through the use of voice and dual-tone multi-frequency input via keypad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV&amp;V</td>
<td>Independent Validation and Verification</td>
<td>A set of activities performed by an entity not under control of the Offeror.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN</td>
<td>Local Area Network</td>
<td>Computer network that interconnects computers within a limited area such as a home, school, computer laboratory, or office building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSR</td>
<td>Legacy Systems Replacement</td>
<td>The temporary name given to the future project to replace core Department systems including Driver Licensing, Vehicle Title and Registration, and related systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPLS</td>
<td>Multi-protocol Label Switching</td>
<td>A mechanism in high-performance telecommunications networks that directs data from one network note to the next based on short path labels rather than long network addresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSQL</td>
<td>Microsoft SQL Server Database</td>
<td>Responsible for implementation of statutes regulating driver licensing, identification card issuance and the titling and registering of vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVD</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Division of the Georgia Department of Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVR</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Report</td>
<td>Report of driver history produced by the DDS on request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>National Crime Information Center</td>
<td>United States’ central database for tracking crime-related information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICB</td>
<td>National Insurance Crime Bureau</td>
<td>North American non-profit membership organization that addresses insurance-related crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIST</td>
<td>National Institute of Standards and Technology</td>
<td>A non-regulatory federal agency within the U.S. Department of Commerce. NIST’s mission is to promote U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness by advancing measurement science, standards, and technology in ways that enhance economic security and improve quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLETS</td>
<td>National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System</td>
<td>The premiere interstate justice and public safety network in the nation for the exchange of law enforcement, criminal justice, and public safety-related information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMVTIS</td>
<td>National Motor Vehicle Title Information System</td>
<td>A system that allows titling agencies to instantly and reliably verify information on a paper title against the electronic data from the state that issued the title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>Notice of Award</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOIA</td>
<td>Notice of Intent to Award</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Tier</td>
<td>Multitier Architecture</td>
<td>Model by which developers can create flexible and reusable applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offeror(s)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Offerors submitting eRFP responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLTP</td>
<td>Online Transaction Processing</td>
<td>A class of information systems that facilitate and manage transaction-oriented applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle</td>
<td>Oracle Corporation</td>
<td>American multinational computer technology corporation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSAH</td>
<td>Office of State Administrative Hearings</td>
<td>Georgia agency legally mandated to conduct hearings for drivers protesting administrative license suspensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC’s</td>
<td>General Purpose PC</td>
<td>Page description language based on using control sequences that are processed and are interpreted in the order they are received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCL 5</td>
<td>Printer Command Language - Level 5</td>
<td>A file format used to represent documents in a manner independent of application software, hardware, and operating systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Portable Document Format</td>
<td>A file format used to represent documents in a manner independent of application software, hardware, and operating systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDPS</td>
<td>Problem Driver Pointer System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PII</td>
<td>Personally Identifiable Information</td>
<td>Information that can be used on its own or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>Project Management Institute</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO</td>
<td>Project Management Office</td>
<td>A group or department within a business, agency or enterprise that defines and maintains standards for project management within the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>Project Management Professional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACF</td>
<td>Resource Access Control Facility</td>
<td>IBM security software that provides access control and auditing functionality for z/OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eRFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposal</td>
<td>A solicitation made often through a bidding process, by an agency or company interested in procurement of a commodity, service or valuable asset, to potential Offerors to submit business proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVE</td>
<td>Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFTP</td>
<td>Secure File Transfer Protocol</td>
<td>Network protocol that provides file access, file transfer, and file management functionalities over any reliable data stream.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOA</td>
<td>Service-Oriented Architecture</td>
<td>An architectural pattern in computer software design in which application components provide services to other components via a communications protocol, typically over a network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQL</td>
<td>Structured Query Language</td>
<td>A special-purpose programming language designed for managing data in relational database management systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSL</td>
<td>Secure Sockets Layer</td>
<td>A protocol for encrypting information over the Internet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSOLV</td>
<td>Social Security Online Verification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP</td>
<td>System Security Plan</td>
<td>Documentation which outlines the technologies and measures used to maintain the security of a system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;State&quot; or &quot;State Entity&quot; or &quot;The State&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The State of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Contractors used by the Prime Contractor to facilitate activities and duties of the Prime Contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offeror(s)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Companies desiring to do business with the State of Georgia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1 LINE</td>
<td>Transmission System 1</td>
<td>Hardware specification for telecommunications “trunking”. A trunk is a single transmission channel between two points on the network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAVT</td>
<td>Title Ad Valorem Tax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCO</td>
<td>Total Cost of Ownership</td>
<td>Financial estimate intended to help buyers and owners determine the direct and indirect costs of a product or system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 datacenter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rating Classification of Telecommunications infrastructure for Data Centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;TOP&quot; or &quot;TOPS&quot;</td>
<td>Temporary Operator Permit</td>
<td>A temporary license plate issued by automobile dealers to customers to be used until permanent license plates are received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAT</td>
<td>User Acceptance Testing</td>
<td>Process of verifying that a solution works for the user.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIN</td>
<td>Vehicle Identification Number</td>
<td>A unique serial number used by the automotive industry and government to identify individual motor vehicles, towed vehicles, motorcycles and mopeds as defined in ISO 3833.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPN</td>
<td>Virtual Private Network</td>
<td>Enables a computer or network-enables device to send and receive data across shared or public networks as if it were directly connected to the private network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAN</td>
<td>Wide Area Network</td>
<td>Network that covers a broad area (i.e. any telecommunications network that links across metropolitan, regional, national or international boundaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z/OS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64-bit Operating System for mainframe computers, produced by IBM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 eRFP ATTACHMENTS

The following documents make up the referenced Attachments to this eRFP.
14.1 OFFEROR PROFILE FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offeror's Legal Name:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Number:</th>
<th>Fax Number:</th>
<th>E-mail Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Office Location:</th>
<th>Date Established:</th>
<th>Ownership:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Leadership:</th>
<th>Number of Employees:</th>
<th>Number of Employees Directly involved in Tasks Directly Related to the Work:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Manager(s). Please denote years of experience and if PMP certified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Offeror shall provide information on their background as well as evidence that it currently has in place the personnel, internal procedures, and any other resources required under the terms of this eRFP to ensure successful performance and contract compliance. Offerors must describe current operational capacity of the organization and the Offeror’s ability to absorb the additional workload resulting from this Project.
# 14.2 Offeror Experience Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Company Name:</th>
<th>Contact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Phone Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Beginning Date of Project (Month/Year):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending Date of Project (Month/Year):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAMVA Jurisdiction:</th>
<th>Meets Mandatory Experience Requirement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes _____ No ____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Offeror must document previous experience and expertise in providing a minimum of two (2) Vehicle Titling and Registration and/or Driver Licensing and Driver Record Management solutions in an AAMVA jurisdiction within the past eight years. Additionally, the Offeror must document previous experience in an additional solution of similar size, functionality and scope within the past eight years. Details of the similarities must be included. The Offeror must complete this form for each reference of experience and fill them out completely to provide the Offeror experience information. Failure to recreate the form accurately to include all fields, may lead to the rejection of the Offeror’s Proposal.
14.3 OFFEROR REFERENCES FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name:</th>
<th>Contact Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>Beginning Date of Project: (Month/Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ending Date of Project: (Month/Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of project size, complexity and the Offeror’s role in this project.
14.4 **OFFEROR KEY PERSONNEL PROFILE SUMMARY FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate’s Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Position:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Company Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Company Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Contact Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Contact Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Begin Date of Employment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End Date of Employment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a description of services provided that are in line with those to be provided as part of the eRFP.

Describe how the client work size and complexity are similar to the eRFP.
14.5 **SUBCONTRACTOR PROFILE FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcontractor’s Legal Name:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td>Fax Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office Location:</td>
<td>Date Established:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Leadership:</td>
<td>Number of Employees:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Background Information:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Subcontractor's Legal Name:**

**Address:**

**Phone Number:**

**Fax Number:**

**E-mail Address:**

**Home Office Location:**

**Date Established:**

**Ownership:**

**Firm Leadership:**

**Number of Employees:**

**Number of Employees Directly involved in Tasks Directly Related to the Work:**

**Additional Background Information:**
# 14.6 Contractor / Subcontractor Disclosure Form

## Prime Contractor

| Contact Name: |  |
| Company Name: |  |
| Address: |  |
| Phone Number: |  |
| Email: |  |
| Scope of services to be provided: |  |

## Subcontractor

| Contact Name: |  |
| Company Name: |  |
| Address: |  |
| Phone Number: |  |
| Email: |  |
| Percentage of overall workload performed: |  |
| Scope of services to be provided: |  |
14.7 **MANDATORY OFFEROR REQUIREMENTS**

As specified with each requirement listed in the **Mandatory Scored Offeror Requirements**, the Offeror must indicate whether its proposal meets the individual requirements by marking either a "YES" or "NO" in the response block provided. A Pass/Fail evaluation will be utilized for all mandatory requirements. Ordinarily, to be considered responsive, responsible and eligible for award, all questions identified as mandatory must be marked “YES” to pass. There may be rare instances in which a response of “NO” is the correct and logical response in order to meet the mandatory requirement (e.g. responding “NO” that the Offeror does not possess any conflicts of interest). Otherwise, any mandatory questions marked "NO" will fail the technical requirements and will result in disqualification of the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response by Offeror. Only Yes or No Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Developed and implemented two driver licensing and driver record management solutions of similar size and scope within the past eight years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>Has the Offeror implemented an additional solution of similar size, functionality and scope within the past eight years?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
<td>Referenced solutions must be in production and currently in operation for two U.S. jurisdictions or entities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4</td>
<td>Meets bond requirements as detailed in Section 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5</td>
<td>Submission includes attachment 14.2 for each of the solutions referenced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6</td>
<td>Offeror’s assigned project manager(s) shall have maintained a PMP certification for the last three years with concurrent experience on a project of similar scope and complexity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7</td>
<td>Submission includes attachment 14.1 to provide all Offeror profile information described in Section 4.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8</td>
<td>Submission includes attachment 14.3 for each of three professional references from organizations referenced in 4.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O9</td>
<td>Submission includes attachment 14.4 Personal Profile Summary, résumé, and three professional references each for of the Offeror’s key personnel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O10</td>
<td>Submission includes audited financial statements for the past three years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O11</td>
<td>Submission identifies all subcontractors; includes attachments 14.5 Subcontractor Profile and 14.6 Contractor/Subcontractor Disclosure for each subcontractor utilized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O12</td>
<td>Does Offeror agree to accept full Prime Contractor responsibility for coordinating and controlling all aspects of performance of the contract and any Subcontractors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O13</td>
<td>Submission includes staffing plan as described in section 4.7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O14</td>
<td>Submission includes high-level project plan as described in section 4.8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O15</td>
<td>Submission includes work plan as described in section 4.9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O16</td>
<td>Staffing Plan, Project Plan, and Work Plan are compatible; assumptions used are identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O17</td>
<td>Submission identifies participation by DDS/DOR, as described in Section 4.10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O18</td>
<td>Submission includes $3,000,000 letter of bondability as per Section 10.3.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.8 MANDATORY FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

As specified with each requirement listed in the Mandatory Scored Functional Requirements, the Offeror must indicate whether its proposal meets the individual requirements by marking either a "YES" or "NO" in the response block provided. A Pass/Fail evaluation will be utilized for all mandatory requirements. Ordinarily, to be considered responsive, responsible and eligible for award, all questions identified as mandatory must be marked “YES” to pass. There may be rare instances in which a response of “NO” is the correct and logical response in order to meet the mandatory requirement (e.g. responding “NO” that the Offeror does not possess any conflicts of interest). Otherwise, any mandatory questions marked "NO" will fail the technical requirements and will result in disqualification of the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response by Offeror. Only Yes or No Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution incorporate a state of the art, customer-centric solution that will utilize a fully integrated and consistent interface throughout all components of the solution as defined in the eRFP Section 7.1.1?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include cash management and financial services functions as defined in the eRFP Section 7.1.2?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include customer management functionality as defined in the eRFP Section 7.1.3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include user management functionality as defined in the eRFP Section 7.1.4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include reporting and audit functions as defined in the eRFP Section 7.1.5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include training programs as defined in the eRFP Section 7.1.6?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include customer relationship management functions as defined in the eRFP Section 7.1.7?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution provide support services as defined in eRFP Section 7.1.8?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include title and lien processing functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.2.1?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include ELT and ETR processing functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.2.2?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include vehicle registration processing functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.2.3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include ETR and Temporary Operating Permit functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.2.4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include functionality to account for and calculate fees and taxes as defined in eRFP Section 7.2.5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include functionality to enforce vehicle insurance compliance as defined in eRFP Section 7.2.6?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include Business Registration functionality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution incorporate IRP functionality as described in Section 7.2.8?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include inventory management functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.2.89?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include document management functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.2.910?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F19</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include issuance and management of driver licenses and identification cards functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.3.1?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F20</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include citation processing functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.3.2?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F21</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include withdrawals functionality as defined in eRFP Sections 7.3.2.1 through 7.3.2.3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F22</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include driver record maintenance functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.3.3 through 7.3.3.3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F23</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include motor vehicle reports functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.3.4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F24</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include online services functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.3.5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F25</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include CDLIS and PDPS process functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.3.6?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F26</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include document management functionality as defined in eRFP Section 7.3.7 through 7.3.7.3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.9 MANDATORY TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

As specified with each requirement listed in the Mandatory Scored Technical Requirements, the Offeror must indicate whether its proposal meets the individual requirements by marking either a "YES" or "NO" in the response block provided. A Pass/Fail evaluation will be utilized for all mandatory requirements. Ordinarily, to be considered responsive, responsible and eligible for award, all questions identified as mandatory must be marked “YES” to pass. There may be rare instances in which a response of “NO” is the correct and logical response in order to meet the mandatory requirement (e.g. responding “NO” that the Offeror does not possess any conflicts of interest). Otherwise, any mandatory questions marked "NO" will fail the technical requirements and will result in disqualification of the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory Technical Requirements</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response by Offeror. Only Yes or No Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution provide the key technical objectives as described in Section 8.1?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution provide a detailed description of the infrastructure and environments needed for DRIVES as described in Section 8.2?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution provide database management components and features as described in Section 8.3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution detail the database cleansing process as described in Section 8.4?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution detail the database conversion process as described in Section 8.5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Does the Offeror provide a homogenous solution for the processing and operations components of DRIVES as described in Section 8.6?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Does the Offeror describe its approach to providing interconnections as described in Section 8.7?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution provide a simple integrated and intuitive interface as described in Section 8.8?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Does the Offeror clearly explain their approach to system security and does the Offeror include a sample System Security Plan and Incident Response Plan as described in Section 8.9?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Does the Offeror employ business intelligence and audit functions as described in Section 8.10?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Does the Offeror response detail its approach to Disaster Recovery as described in Section 8.11?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution support mobile integration as described in Section 8.12?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Does the Offeror response thoroughly explain its approach to system documentation as described in Section 8.13?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>Does the Offeror accept the software rights provisions as described in Section 8.14?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>Does the Offeror solution include Software Configuration Management principles as described in Section 8.15?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>Does the Offeror explain the software environments that will be employed with the DRIVES system as described in Section 8.16?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 14.10 System Interconnections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>IC Type</th>
<th>IC Location</th>
<th>IC Source</th>
<th>IC Notes</th>
<th>Used by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3M License Plate</td>
<td>License Plate Fulfillment</td>
<td>SFTP</td>
<td>VPN</td>
<td>3M</td>
<td>3M connects internally and via VPN</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABNote</td>
<td>Title Print Vendor</td>
<td>SFTP</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>ABNote</td>
<td>ABNote is picking up file from State site</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA)</td>
<td>Social Security verification, search of driver records in other states (PDPS), search and reconciliation of commercial motor vehicle drivers and records (CDLIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Address Verification</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mainframe</td>
<td>Mainframe</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Batch process that validates the GRATIS address with the ITS address</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Extracts</td>
<td>Data extract from POLK, Experian, Tag Reader, Counties, and Cross sell</td>
<td>SFTP &amp; FTP</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>Picking up FTP or SFTP files bi-monthly</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>Department of Driver Services online Inquiry</td>
<td>Mainframe</td>
<td>Mainframe</td>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>Separate mainframe partitions</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer Inquiry</td>
<td>Dealer VIN Inquiry</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>CICS backend with GTA front end using web methods</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPD Group</td>
<td>Renewal postcards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI and Defensive Driving schools</td>
<td>Reporting of course completion (matched with customer records)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELT</td>
<td>Electronic Liens</td>
<td>SFTP</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Vendors</td>
<td>Vendors drop</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>IC Type</td>
<td>IC Location</td>
<td>IC Source</td>
<td>IC Notes</td>
<td>Used by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions</td>
<td>Emissions interfaces for all metro counties</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>A-Plus</td>
<td>A-Plus hosting externally connecting via CICS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETR</td>
<td>Electronic Titles</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Vendors</td>
<td>CICS web services to title companies and vendors. Vendors drop and pickup files via SFTP. ETR Vendors ACH money to DOR and all 159 counties.</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCIC</td>
<td>Georgia Law Enforcement Inquiry</td>
<td>Mainframe</td>
<td>Mainframe</td>
<td>NLETS</td>
<td>Actual interconnect is with NLETS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEICS</td>
<td>Georgia Electronic Insurance Compliance System Batch and Online System</td>
<td>CICS/SFTP</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Via SFTP accounts; CICS interface DOR web site</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Bureau of Investigations</td>
<td>Driver record information provided to Georgia Crime Information Center (GCIC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Courts</td>
<td>Citation and suspension processing for municipal, county, and State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Department of Education</td>
<td>School suspension data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Department of Human Services</td>
<td>Child support non-compliance data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Department of Natural</td>
<td>Driver data for hunting and fishing licenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>IC Type</td>
<td>IC Location</td>
<td>IC Source</td>
<td>IC Notes</td>
<td>Used by DOR/DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Department of Revenue</td>
<td>Driver data for title and tag processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Data for annual Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) 562 Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Secretary of State</td>
<td>Voter registration applications and identity verification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Superior Court Clerks Authority</td>
<td>Jury Lists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Technology Authority</td>
<td>Network and mainframe services, agent for access to driver records for other agencies and third parties, billing for MVRs obtained by third parties, printing services for bulk mailing of suspension notices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPIS/GETIS</td>
<td>Georgia Electronic Parking Ticket Information</td>
<td>SFTP</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Vendors</td>
<td>15-20 vendors sending info via SFTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Check</td>
<td>ITS web service hosted at DOR server which can be consumed by ITS</td>
<td>IIS/mainframe</td>
<td>SSL</td>
<td>ITS</td>
<td></td>
<td>To get the status of an IRP carrier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>IC Type</td>
<td>IC Location</td>
<td>IC Source</td>
<td>IC Notes</td>
<td>Used by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP</td>
<td>International Registration Plan</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>NADC/Azure</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Prod version to NADC; test regions in Azure</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITI SST</td>
<td>Self Service Terminal Program</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>VPN</td>
<td>ITI</td>
<td>ITI uses VPN Tunnels for data transfer</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Integrated Tax System</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>DOR/NADC</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Web services both MF and NADC servers</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVR</td>
<td>Automated number for check of license data</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVR Inquiry</td>
<td>Gratis IVR VIN Dealer Inquiry</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>Hosted by ATT, will be moving to InContact via CICS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVR Tag renewals</td>
<td>Gratis IVR Tag renewals</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>Hosted by OPC connected to CICS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeline</td>
<td>Organ donor data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVR Business Partners</td>
<td>Providing bulk MVRs directly to insurance companies, car rental companies, etc.</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIC</td>
<td>NCIC Stolen Check</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>GBI</td>
<td>GBI is hosting</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMVTIS</td>
<td>National Motor Vehicle Title Information System</td>
<td>SFTP</td>
<td>VPN</td>
<td>NMVTIS</td>
<td>Batch processing via SFTP using VPN Tunnels</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPC insurance payments</td>
<td>OPC insurance reinstatements</td>
<td>SFTP</td>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>OPC</td>
<td>DOR receives files on SFTP</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agency Access</td>
<td>DFACS, DNR, DHR/DHS using RACF access</td>
<td>Mainframe</td>
<td>Mainframe</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Direct access to GRATIS for CICS app</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>IRP PRISM</td>
<td>SFTP</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>Batch processing via SFTP</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>Out-of-state Sales Tax</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Data from ITS is transferred to GRATIS through openDOR. Data from GRATIS to</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>IC Type</td>
<td>IC Location</td>
<td>IC Source</td>
<td>IC Notes</td>
<td>Used by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVI</td>
<td>Salvage vehicle information</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NADC</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Website-freestanding application at NADC</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag Reader</td>
<td>Registration Data to Tag Readers</td>
<td>FTP</td>
<td>GCIC</td>
<td>Vendors</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag Renewals</td>
<td>Online tag renewals</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>NADC</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>CICS via website at NADC</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>Title Advalorem tax online calculator</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>NADC</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>CICS via website at NADC</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Department of</td>
<td>SAVE verification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Postal Service</td>
<td>Electronic verification of delivery for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Service</td>
<td>certified mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Selective</td>
<td>Selective Service registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Service/United</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States Department of Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIN Status inquiry</td>
<td>VIN Status inquiry for public</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>NADC</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>CICS via website at NADC</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Services</td>
<td>Multiple web services for Title Max,</td>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>CICS web services</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junk yards Title cancellation, Vin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inquiry, Insurance reports, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>Lockbox, printing and mailing, renewal</td>
<td>SFTP</td>
<td>DOR</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>Receives files into WF system from DOR</td>
<td>DOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>notices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fargo</td>
<td>SFTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.11 GEORGIA ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY SERVICES (GETS)

14.11.1 Overview
The Georgia Enterprise Technology Services (GETS) program is an ongoing venture between the Georgia Technology Authority (GTA) and key state agencies to stabilize, consolidate, and improve information technology (IT). These goals are being achieved by contracting with private-sector leaders in technology service delivery to provide agencies in the GETS program with infrastructure and managed network services, including a state-of-the-art data center hosting environment.

Infrastructure services includes mainframe, server, service desk, end user computing, disaster recovery and security. Managed network services include the state’s wide area network, local area networks, and voice services.

The GETS model of IT-as-a-service is consumption-based. State agencies no longer buy and maintain costly hardware that quickly becomes obsolete. Instead, GETS agencies pay only for the IT services that they use, and they have the ability to add or delete services at will based on business needs.

14.11.2 IT Projects in the GETS Environment
Each state agency owns its IT projects and associated applications to ensure that the projects align with overall agency mission and business strategy. The agency requests IT services to develop, test, and operate its applications from GETS service tower providers (STPs). Based on the agency’s requirements, the STPs respond with service solutions that meet GTA architectural and governance standards. In its role as the project owner and integrator, the agency coordinates project activities across its staff, STPs, third-party vendors, and other stakeholders from inception through implementation in the production environment.

With several partners in every deployment including the agency, the application vendor, the STPs, and GTA, the GETS environment is highly complex. It requires adherence to a mature project management methodology and framework to define and delineate roles and responsibilities, an effective system of accountability for all parties, and highly skilled project managers.

To that end, the state contracts with a multi-sourcing integrator (MSI) to manage and coordinate the work of the incumbent STPs using the Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) framework. The MSI ensures the delivery of quality and competitive services, guides innovation and evolution of service offerings, and standardizes processes and tools across the environment. This includes processes and tools for IT project management. In addition to following prescribed processes, projects in the GETS environment comply with GTA policies, standards and guidelines (PSGs) available at: http://gta.georgia.gov/psg/book-page/enterprise-policies-standards-and-guidelines.

Additional information on the GETS program is available at http://gta.georgia.gov.

14.11.3 GETS Service Tower Providers (STPs)

In September 2015, GETS STPs include:
AT&T, who provides managed network services including local area network, wide area network, voice, and security.

Capgemini, who acts as the multi-sourcing integrator, provides the GETS service desk, and the cross-functional services of asset, incident, problem, change, service request, and project management.

IBM, who provides data center management (mainframe and midrange), print shop, desktop management, security, incident management, and disaster recovery.

Microsoft, who provides email services.

14.11.4 State of Georgia Data Center Hosting Environment

The North Atlanta Data Center (NADC) is a Tier IV data center designed specifically for data center operations. There are multiple layers of physical security, including biometric access. Access to the center meets and exceeds state and federal safety and security standards. Agency staff and their system/application/software/middleware providers have limited access to the NADC and must be approved in advance.

The facility has fully redundant mechanical and electrical systems and a round-the-clock electrical and mechanical technical support staff. The center’s modern fire detection and suppression uses dry chemicals. Computers are fully protected against water damage, lightning, and severe weather, including winds up to 175 mph.

Currently, there are hundreds of computer applications running in the data center that support the business functions of more than 50 state agencies. There are four main computing platforms: IBM Z series mainframe, UNIX, Linux, and Windows.

Governance of the data center and its operations are routinely performed by several auditing authorities, building superintendents, fire and safety inspectors, agency and GETS personnel, service providers and quality control analysts.

14.11.5 North Atlanta Data Center Roles and Responsibilities

| Production Hardware Support | GETS service tower providers (STPs) perform maintenance and upkeep of underlying computing hardware. Agencies and their system/application/software/middleware providers (providers) must provide specific requirements for hardware and operating system (OS) prior to GETS STPs provisioning the underlying hardware and associated OS. |
| Data Backups and Restores | GETS STPs perform systematic backups of configuration information for underlying hardware and main OS as part of routine operational maintenance. This is also true in the event that a restoration is necessary (terms and conditions of that activity are available upon request). Agencies and their providers must specify what must be captured as part of backup activity, the required intervals, |
and restoration procedures particular to the provider’s system/application/software/middleware.

| Disaster Recovery | GETS STPs lead and perform periodic Disaster Recovery (DR) exercises. If a disaster is declared, GETS is the controlling entity throughout the event.  

*Agencies rate the criticality of the system/application/software/middleware.*  

*Agencies and their providers must participate in this program and must specify restoration procedures for their system/application/software/middleware once the underlying operational infrastructure is declared operational. This includes order of restoration, verification specifics and participation in post DR activities.* |
| --- | --- |
| Business Continuity | GETS STPs lead and perform periodic Business Continuity (BC) exercises. If a disaster is declared, GETS is the controlling entity throughout the event.  

*Agencies rate the criticality of the system/application/software/middleware business processes.*  

*Agencies and their providers must participate in this program and must specify restoration procedures for their business processes once the underlying operational infrastructure is declared operational. This includes order of restoration, verification specifics and participation in post BC activities.* |
| Change Management | GETS STPs provide formal Change Management (CM). Access is extended to authorized agency personnel only.  

*Agencies and their providers must coordinate changes initiated by either party and input those into GETS CM system.* |
| Incident Management | GETS STPs provide formal Incident Management. Access is extended to authorized agency personnel only.  

*Agencies and their providers must coordinate the details of the incident prior to reporting the incident to the GETS Help Desk or GETS IN system.* |
<p>| Infrastructure (servers, firewalls) | GETS STPs provide fully functional and secure underlying computing infrastructure. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Network (LAN, WAN, load balancers)** | GETS STPs provide fully functional and secure underlying network infrastructure.  
   Agencies and their providers must specify all requirements that support optimum performance of their system/application/software/middleware prior to GETS provisioning for underlying network. |
| **End User Computing (desktop PCs, laptops)** | GETS STPs provide fully functional and secure end user computing (EUC) hardware.  
   Agencies and their providers must specify all requirements that support optimum performance of their system/application/software/middleware through the use of EUC prior to GETS provisioning for EUC. |
| **Database**                      | GETS STPs provide fully functional and secure underlying network infrastructure and network connectivity to support the use of databases.  
   Agencies and their providers must specify all requirements for type, sizing, and support needed (logical and physical) for their system/application/software/middleware to operate at optimum performance. |
| **SAN Storage**                   | GETS STPs provide Storage Area Network (SAN) functionality if requested.  
   Agencies and their providers must specify all requirements for sizing, retention timeframe, access frequency, and support needed for their system/application/software/middleware to operate at optimum performance. |
| **Security**                      | GETS STPs provide a secure data center and its underlying computing infrastructure and network.  
   Agencies and their providers must specify all security requirements for the successful operation of their system/application/software/middleware prior to provisioning services. The agency and their providers are also responsible for protecting the data that is at rest and in transit inside and between components that comprise the system/application/software/middleware. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Solutions</th>
<th>GETS STPs develop formal service solutions. Access is extended to authorized Agency personnel only. Agencies initiate IT service requests using the GETS Service Request Management (SRM) portal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remote Access</td>
<td>Remote access for developers is available in development and test environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Access to GETS Services</td>
<td>Access to GETS services is extended to authorized agency employees. Services can be accessed via the Web or by calling the GETS Help Desk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sharing Services</td>
<td>Georgia Technology Authority is the business owners for the Enterprise Service Bus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.georgia.gov">www.georgia.gov</a></td>
<td>Georgia Technology Authority is the business owners for the georgia.gov and ga.gov domains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.12 DOR AND DDS INFORMATION SECURITY POLICY

14.12.1 General Principles
The DOR and DDS Information Security program’s guiding principle is the principle of least privilege. The principle of least privilege is the practice of limiting access to the minimal level that will allow normal functioning. Applied to employees, the principle of least privilege translates to giving people the lowest level of user rights that they can have and still do their jobs. The principle is also applied to things other than people, including programs and processes.

The DOR and DDS also use privilege bracketing, which ensures that when permission levels must be raised temporarily that the higher level is in effect for the briefest possible time. So, for example, an end-user might log on to an administrative account when necessary for some task and immediately revert to a lower-level account as soon as that task is complete.

14.12.2 Security Classification
The DOR and DDS use FIPS Publication 199, Standards for Security Categorization of Federal Information and Information Systems to classify all of its data types. The DOR and DDS have classified the systems and data with which the fraud management solution will interact as follows:

- **SC FTI** = \{(confidentiality, moderate), (integrity, moderate), (availability, moderate)\}
- **SC STI** = \{(confidentiality, moderate), (integrity, moderate), (availability, moderate)\}
- **SC GRATIS (system)** = \{(confidentiality, moderate), (integrity, moderate), (availability, moderate)\}

Where SC is the security categorization, FTI is Federal Tax Information, and STI is State Tax Information.

With a categorization of moderate for the system and data types, the DOR uses NIST Special Publication 800-53, Security and Privacy Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations, Appendix D, Security Control Baselines – Summary for its security controls baseline.

In addition to the controls in Special Publication 800-53, when dealing with FTI, the Internal Revenue Service has its own standards and controls, which would also be applicable. IRS Publication 1075, Tax Information Security Guidelines for Federal State and Local Agencies, contains the IRS requirements. The IRS has published specific Safeguard Computer System Control Matrices (SCSEMs), which are published on the IRS’ website.

The DOR and DDS Information Security Policy DOR-PS-RA-01.01, Risk Assessment Policy requires that an information system’s risk be assessed prior to placing that system into production. The DOR and DDS expect the Offeror to participate in the risk assessment process.

14.12.3 Authentication
The DOR and DDS Information Security Policy DOR-PS-IA-01.01, Identification and Authentication Policy requires that Identification and Authentication modules of systems perform as follows:

- Ensure that the information systems uniquely identify and authenticate organizational users (or processes acting on behalf of organizational users);
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- Ensure that the information systems identify and authenticate specific devices before establishing a connection;
- Manage information system identifiers and authenticators for users and devices;
- Ensure the information systems obscure feedback of authentication information during the authentication process to protect the information from possible exploitation/use by unauthorized individuals;
- Ensure that the information systems employ authentication methods that meet the requirements of applicable laws, Executive Orders, directives, policies, regulations, standards, and guidance for authentication to a cryptographic module;
- Ensure that the information systems uniquely identify and authenticate non-organizational users (or processes acting on behalf of non-organizational users).

Additional information on Identification and Authentication requirements may be found in the DOR and DDS Information Security Standard DOR-SS-IA-01.02, Identification and Authentication.

14.12.4 Cryptographic Controls
The DOR and DDS Information Security Policy DOR-PS-SC-02.01, Cryptography Policy requires that all tax information be encrypted.

All data communication between the Offeror’s system and existing DOR and DDS systems shall be encrypted. Data at rest in the Offeror’s system must also be encrypted.

Cryptographic modules used in the Offeror’s system shall be tested against requirements found in FIPS Publication 140-2, Security Requirements for Cryptographic Modules. Offeror’s cryptographic implementation shall meet a minimum of Security Level 2 assurance.

Security Level 2 requires, at a minimum, role-based authentication in which a cryptographic module authenticates the authorization of an operator to assume a specific role and perform a corresponding set of services.

Security Level 2 allows the software and firmware components of a cryptographic module to be executed on a general purpose computing system using an operating system that:

- Meets the functional requirements specified in the Common Criteria (CC) Protection Profiles (PPs) listed in Annex B and
- Is evaluated at the CC evaluation assurance level EAL2 (or higher).

An equivalent evaluated trusted operating system may be used. A trusted operating system provides a level of trust so that cryptographic modules executing on general purpose computing platforms are comparable to cryptographic modules implemented using dedicated hardware systems.

Offeror’s using cryptographic modules embedded within a trusted operating system must ensure that such modules have the approval of the National Institute of Standards and Technology’s (NIST) Cryptographic Module Validation Program.
14.12.5 General Practices

14.12.5.1. Performance

In performance of services under this eRFP, the Offeror agrees to comply with and assume responsibility for compliance by his or her employees with the following requirements:

All work will be done under the supervision of the Offeror or the Offeror's employees.

Any return or return information made available in any format shall be used only for the purpose of carrying out the work under this eRFP. Information contained in such material will be treated as confidential and will not be divulged or made known in any manner to any person except as may be necessary in the performance work under this eRFP. Disclosure to anyone other than an officer or employee of the Offeror will be prohibited.

All returns and return information will be accounted for upon receipt and properly stored before, during, and after processing. In addition, all related output will be given the same level of protection as required for the source material.

The Offeror certifies that the data processed during the performance of this eRFP will be completely purged from all data storage components of his or her computer facility, and no output will be retained by the Offeror at the time the work is completed. If immediate purging of all data storage components is not possible, the Offeror certifies that any data remaining in any storage component will be safeguarded to prevent unauthorized disclosures.

Any spoilage or any intermediate hard copy printout that may result during the processing of data will be given to the agency or his or her designee. When this is not possible, the Offeror will be responsible for the destruction of the spoilage or any intermediate hard copy printouts, and will provide the agency or his or her designee with a statement containing the date of destruction, description of material destroyed, and the method used.

All computer systems receiving, processing, storing or transmitting FTI must meet the requirements defined in IRS Publication 1075. To meet functional and assurance requirements, the security features of the environment must provide for managerial, operational, and technical controls. All security features must be available and activated to protect against unauthorized use of and access to confidential data.

No work furnished under this eRFP will be subcontracted without prior written approval of the DOR and DDS.

The agency will have the right to void any contract entered into if the Offeror fails to provide the safeguards described above.

14.12.5.2II. INSPECTION

The Agency shall have the right to send its officers and employees into the offices and plants of the Offeror for inspection of the facilities and operations provided for the performance of any work under this eRFP. On the basis of such inspection, specific measures may be required in cases where the Offeror is found to be noncompliant with agency safeguards.
### Georgia MVD 2014 Taxes and Fees Collected

- **TAXES - TAVT**: 64%
- **TAXES - ADVALOREM**: 22%
- **REGISTRATION FEE**: 10%
- **TITLE FEE**: 2%
- **PENALTY**: 1%
- **INSURANCE FEE**: 1%
- **TAXES - SALES TAX**: 0%
- **DEALER REG FEE**: 0%
- **MISC FEE**: 0%
- **PENALTY FEE**: 0%
- **INTEREST**: 0%
- **Other**: 0%
GA MVD 2014 REGISTRATION RENEWAL HANDLING

- Over Counter: 74%
- Web: 10%
- Mail In: 16%
- Kiosk: 0%

GA MVD TRANSACTION TYPES 2014

- REGISTRATION: 59%
- MISC: 22%
- TITLING: 19%
GA MVD 2014 TITLE WORK HANDLING

- Processed by County: 69%
- Processed by ETR: 31%

GA MVD 2014 TITLE WORK TYPE

- GA Title Transfer: 60%
- New Vehicles: 15%
- Out of State: 25%
14.14 DDS TRANSACTION AND REVENUE INFORMATION

ANNUAL REVENUE

- Regulated Program Application Fees, 0%
- CDL Application & Road Test Fees, 1%
- OSAH Hearing Fees, 3%
- Reinstatement Fees, 29%
- DL/ID Issuance Fees, 51%
- Super-Speeder Fines, 16%

TRANSACTION BREAKDOWN

- Non-Commercial DL Issuance, 43%
- Commercial DL Issuance, 7%
- ID Issuance, 14%
- Citations Processed, 19%
- Withdrawals Processed, 11%
- Withdrawals Reinstated, 6%
- Withdrawals Reinstated, 6%
**DRIVER ABSTRACT BREAKDOWN**

- Requested by Business Partners, 99%
- Requested at CSCs
- Requested at Headquarters
- Requested via Internet Services