

## Question & Answer #5 and Amendment #4

### #00719 / #00819 – Commercial Card Services

This document is posted to capture questions received during the Question & Answer Period to solicitation #00719 / #00819 for Commercial Card Services.

#	Question	Response	Did this change the solicitation?
1	(Question #49 from Amd #3) Does ITP indicate which categories?	<p>ITPs do not currently indicate category participation.</p> <p>Enterprise Services has reached out to the states that have completed the ITP process to obtain that detail. As of the release of this amendment the following states have provided this additional detail.</p> <p>Arizona – Both Categories</p> <p>If additional data is received, the data will be posted to WEBS.</p> <p>ITPs are not required for states to participate. States may choose to participate in categories at any point during the solicitation or term of the Master Agreement.</p>	No.
2	This provider is confident that most (probably all) providers will not be able to meet the 13.8 (M) mandatory requirement. Will the State be willing to move this to a Non Mandatory status?	This requirement has been updated.	Yes.

#	Question	Response	Did this change the solicitation?
3	Regarding Exhibit B1, Question 2.6, due to OFAC requirements for clearing cardholder names from potential watch lists, a phone call is required to change a name on cardholder information. We believe other providers would have similar requirements and request that this question be removed from the Mandatory Requirements section.	This requirement has been updated.	Yes
4	Regarding Exhibit B1, Question 2.14, due to the significant impact of a change to billing cycle close date to the card program's financial billing and reporting data and processes, ( <i>Provider</i> ) needs to understand why a cycle billing change would need to be done in the system versus a coordinated effort between the ( <i>Provider</i> ) relationship management and servicing teams and the NASPO customer, where the teams could ensure there was no disruption to the NASPO customer's operations and cardholders?	Billing cycle end date will be established during a Purchasing Entities' implementation. Purchasing Entities must be able to establish the billing cycle close date. This date is set for the Purchasing Entities' agreement period.	Yes

#	Question	Response	Did this change the solicitation?
5	<p>Regarding Exhibit B1, Question 5.1, it is our understanding merchants do not send in the timestamp when they batch their transactions for posting, and only authorizations reflect the time stamp, while transactions do not. Due to the fact authorizations on all TSYS North American platforms show a static time zone, any issuer having TSYS process their transactions would not be able to adhere to the requirement in Question 5.1. Therefore, we request that this question be removed from the Mandatory Requirements section.</p>	<p>This requirement has been updated.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
6	<p>In Question #60 in the Q&amp;A document you adjusted the amount of days in the pricing schedule C1. I think your intent based on the change of the definitions in the most recent Q&amp;A is to have the Rebate/Incentive Share #3 calculation done on client held days instead of file turn days. Are you able to amend this section to remove “average speed of pay” and “file turn” and replace with client held days? Without this change any State with a file turn day greater than 45 days would not receive rebate under the proposed pricing.</p>	<p>Prompt payment is based on the Quarterly Total Volume and average Client Held Days.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

#	Question	Response	Did this change the solicitation?
7	<p>Regarding 13.8 (M) mandatory requirement. This question appears to be requesting a manual payment posting process, where an accounts receivable administrator will need to open the mail, confirm the issue date is within 3 days of the postmark date, and manually post the payment. In contrast, corporate check payments are usually electronically processed using the payment coupon and the check's MICR line. How many checks are being sent from all the NASPO State and Purchasing Entities in a month?</p>	<p>See response to <a href="#">Question #2</a>.</p>	<p>No</p>
8	<p>Can the State of Washington and the NVP committee confirm that the only exceptions if any, that need to go into the RFP response as part of the submission is for the master contract in section E?</p> <p>As for all of the other participation addendums and terms &amp; conditions documents, those will be addressed after the intent to award and during the negotiation period outlined in the contract and do not need any exception listed now?</p>	<p>Issues, concerns, exceptions, or objections to any of the terms or conditions contained in Exhibit E Master Agreement must be documented by bidders in the Master Agreement Issues List (Exhibit E1).</p> <p>The Lead State (WA) will not address questions or concerns or negotiated other States' terms and conditions. Such states shall negotiated the terms and conditions for their participating directly with the awarded Contractor(s).</p>	<p>No</p>
9	<p>Can the State of Washington and NVP committee please provide a breakdown of the total number of gallons fueled by each state as part of Category 2, the fuel card portion of the RFP? If possible, a breakdown that includes the number of gallons for unleaded vs diesel fuel type would be helpful as well.</p>	<p>See attached spreadsheet.</p>  <p>2018_FuelType.xlsx</p>	<p>No</p>

#	Question	Response	Did this change the solicitation?
10	Can value-added paid services that are optional be added as part of the RFP Response?	Assuming you are referring to Exhibits J1 & J2 added in Amendment #3.  Providing "Supplemental Services" in either category is optional. See Description (pg 43 of Solicitation Document) and Instructions of Exhibits J1 & J2.	No
11	B2 3.3 ( <i>corrected by Enterprise Services</i> ) Almost all transactions post with 24-48 hours. However, there are instances where merchants can take longer to batch or process a transaction. Will the State of Washington & NVP Committee consider removing the word must from this requirement, as this is typically dependent on each merchant to accomplish?	This requirement has been updated.	Yes
12	B2 5.8 Can the State of Washington and NVP committee confirm the change of the 30-day requirement for rebate reporting was change 60-days for both categories?	This due date was corrected for Category 1 in Amd 3 but mistakenly missed in Category 2. Corrected.	Yes
13	B2 10.1 (M) is there a checkbox to confirm this requirement or is there something the State of Washington and the NVP committee wants respondents to add or acknowledge?	Thank you for catching our mistake. A 'checkbox' has been added to this requirement.	Yes

#	Question	Response	Did this change the solicitation?
14	B2 14.1 (M) Will the State of Washington and NVP committee please consider changing the verbiage to include no liability for lost or stolen cards ONCE they have been reported to the card provider either by the online system or calling in to customer service?	This requirement has been updated.	Yes
15	B2 17.1 (MS) How is the State of Washington & NVP committee validating acceptance numbers as there are ONLY a set number of fuel station provider across The US? Can the State of Washington and the NVP committee point to a documented number of fuel locations to base the acceptance numbers off of?	<p>Since the number of fuel locations/fuel station providers can fluctuate from day to day, we will not be comparing acceptance locations to a set number of fuel locations/fuel station providers.</p> <p>Bidders <u>may</u> be required to provide verification of accepting locations at the request of the Procurement Coordinator.</p>	No
16	C2 How is the State of Washington and the NVP Committee evaluating the rebate calculation for the spend? Is the spend the Gross or Net amount (i.e. exempted tax is included in the spend number or exempted tax is excluded from the spend number)?	<p>Rebate is based on Standard and Non-Standard Volume.</p> <p>Doing additional research to determine how exempted tax is currently being handled. Additional detail will be posted, once gathered.</p>	No
17	C2 Can the State of Washington and the NVP committee confirm if the evaluation for the early payment calculation based on the number of days from the date of invoice, date of the transaction or some other measure like DSO?	Prompt payment is based on the Quarterly Total Volume and average Client Held Days.	No

#	Question	Response	Did this change the solicitation?
18	Can you please update the large ticket transaction definition to state: "Large Ticket Transaction: Generally, high dollar transaction that, per the Association's guidelines, constitutes the purchase is completed with a lower than standard interchange rate."	We will not be changing the definition of Large Ticket Transaction. Large Ticket Transactions are defined by the Association's guidelines.	No
19	Can you please update the definition of Reduced Interchange Rate to say "The combination of those transactions qualifying as Large Ticket Transactions and Merchant Negotiated Transactions"? It appears that the current definition only refers to Merchant Negotiated Transactions since Large Ticket Transactions do not require a lower negotiated rate between the merchant and the Network.	This definition has been updated.	Yes
20	As of the issuance of the RFP, can the State validate that all Mandatory Requirements are currently available to the State and its participating entities?  Can the State generally state that all of the Mandatory Requirements have been available to the State and its participating entities for at least 12 months?	Requirements (Mandatory or otherwise) for this solicitation are not based on the requirements of the current Master Agreement but captured what the states need in their current environment.  If bidders have issues/concerns with any requirements (Mandatory or otherwise) raise those concerns as early as possible (see Section 3.3 of the Solicitation).	No.

#	Question	Response	Did this change the solicitation?
21	<p>Selecting billing cycle end date is established during implementation. Is this item related to changing the billing cycle end date? The change of a billing cycle end date can impact multiple issuer program support operations along with client program execution, requiring client and issuer coordination to complete this process. Please elaborate on how this functionality operates today?</p>	<p>See response to <a href="#">Question #4</a>.</p>	<p>No</p>
22	<p>Can the State provide a color copy sample of each Participating State's Purchase Cards including a sample preferably with customization options as described in the RFP section Card Design/Embossing, Delivery &amp; Activation.</p>	<p>Sample cards are included in the attached word document.</p>  <p>SampleCards.pdf</p>	<p>No.</p>
23	<p>11.3 Physical Cards to be delivered within 2 business days of account setup. A standard industry practice is to give the client the option to select the Card delivery method based on the level of urgency. For full clarification, every card for this contract is expected to be delivered within 2 days of account setup?</p> <p>This means cards would be sent via a delivery service, not through the US Postal Service. This can result in the requirement for recipients to sign for their card delivery. Can the State elaborate on how this process operates today?</p>	<p>This requirement has been updated.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

#	Question	Response	Did this change the solicitation?
24	<p>13.8 Payment posting based on date of check or electronic issue if the postmark is within 3 days of the date on the check/electronic issuance.</p> <p>This requirement expects the issuer to verify the postmark on envelopes is within 3 days of issue date on the check. Are these business days or calendar days?</p> <p>What is the justification for expecting a payment post-date to occur before the issuer has received the payment?</p>	See Response to <a href="#">Question #2</a> .	No.
25	<p>13.9 10-day grace period for payment pulled from ACH. Is this an ACH Debit transaction?</p> <p>Please describe the impact of a 10-day grace period, is this a back date of the posting date similar to 13.8 above?</p> <p>Are these business days or calendar days?</p>	<p>Working with the party that submitted this question for clarification.</p> <p>Days would be business days.</p>	No
26	C1, #3- It has been established payments are expected by 45 days at the latest. If payments are received after 45 days, will that associated volume be excluded from rebate calculation from all incentive categories?	No. Prompt payment is based on the Quarterly Total Volume and average Client Held Days.	No

#	Question	Response	Did this change the solicitation?
27	<p>From the list of states that have requested to participate, please detail which ones intend to participate in Category 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alaska</li> <li>• Arizona</li> <li>• California</li> <li>• Colorado</li> <li>• Connecticut</li> <li>• Illinois</li> <li>• Maryland</li> <li>• Montana</li> <li>• Minnesota</li> <li>• Oregon</li> <li>• South Dakota</li> <li>• Utah</li> <li>• Wisconsin</li> </ul>	<p>From Amd #3, Question #49:</p> <p><i>Alaska – Cat 1 only</i>  <i>California – Cat 1 only</i>  <i>Colorado – Both Categories</i>  <i>Connecticut – Cat 2 only</i>  <i>Minnesota – Both Categories</i>  <i>Montana – Cat 1 only</i>  <i>Oregon – Both Categories</i>  <i>South Dakota – Cat 1 only</i>  <i>Utah – Both Categories</i>  <i>Wisconsin – Both Categories</i></p> <p><i>If additional data is received, the data will be posted to WEBS.</i></p> <p>Arizona provided their anticipated categories, see response to <a href="#">Question #1</a>.</p> <p>Illinois, and Maryland have not provided their anticipated categories.</p>	No
28	<p>As detailed in Exhibit I, please provide Annual Fleet Card Fraud amounts for these states.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alaska</li> <li>• Illinois</li> <li>• Maryland</li> <li>• Montana</li> <li>• Utah</li> </ul>	<p>As part of the ITP process, states were asked to provide their 2018 card volume. If that data was provided, it was included in Exhibit I.</p> <p>Alaska and Montana have both indicated they only anticipate leveraging Category 1 (see response to <a href="#">Question #32</a>).</p> <p>Illinois, and Maryland have not provided their anticipated categories (see response to <a href="#">Question #32</a>).</p> <p>Utah did not provide their 2018 card volume for fleet.</p>	No.

#	Question	Response	Did this change the solicitation?
29	<p>Regarding Exhibit B1, Question 5.13, can you provide more information on the type of requested report you're referring to?</p> <p>If this is transaction based, no system would offer reports in real-time at the time of purchase. What are you defining as a report in real time?</p>	This requirement has been updated.	Yes

Questions or responses included in this document require changes to the solicitation document. The solicitation document has been updated and all changes are highlighted in yellow.

Due to file size limitations when posting to WEBS, some Exhibits have been removed. The Exhibits that were removed were not impacted by this amendment.



00719\_00819b\_a6.d  
ocx

Any additional questions regarding this solicitation must be directed to the Procurement Coordinator listed below.

Roni Field  
360.407.7949  
veronica.field@des.wa.gov