



MARTIN O'MALLEY
Governor

ANTHONY BROWN
Lieutenant Governor

T. ELOISE FOSTER
Secretary

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES # 3
PROJECT NO. F10B5400006
Department of Budget & Management
Central Collection Unit
Debt Collection Services
November 5, 2014

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This List of Questions and Responses #3, questions #61 through #65, is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above named RFP.

In most instances the submitted questions and the Department's responses merely serve to clarify the existing requirements of the RFP. Sometimes, however, in submitting questions potential Offerors may make statements or express interpretations of contract requirements that may be inconsistent with the Department's intent. To the extent that the Department recognizes such an incorrect interpretation, the provided answer will note that the interpretation is erroneous and either state that the question is moot once the correct interpretation is explained or provide the answer based upon the correct interpretation.

No provided answer to a question may in and of itself change any requirement of the RFP. If it is determined that any portion of the RFP should be changed based upon a submitted question, the actual change may only be implemented via a formal amendment to the RFP. In this situation, the answer provided will reference the amendment containing the RFP change.

61. If a MBE/VSBE collection agency is used as a subcontractor, can that subcontractor provide services in its own name or does the State require the subcontractor and prime contractor to operate as the same?

RESPONSE: For the contract resulting from the Debt Collection RFP F10B5400006, it is CCU's preference that MBE/VSBE collection agency subcontractors use the prime Contractor's name to provide services in order to limit possible confusion of debtors contacted for collection purposes on behalf of the State. Experience gained by an MBE/VSBE subcontractor working for the prime Contractor would accrue to that subcontractor in its own right, however.

62. Does the State have any specific 'Identified Items of Work' for VBE subcontracting (we want to make sure the service we propose would be acceptable)? Would purchased supplies be acceptable that would be used such as paper or office supplies?

~Effective Resource Management~

RESPONSE: The State does not have specifically “Identified Items of Work.” So long as an Offeror can demonstrate that the functions to be provided by the VSBE subcontractor fall within the solicitation’s Scope of Work, then the proposed VSBE subcontracting activity will be acceptable.

63. Page 28, 3.2.1.2.B – for an account with a good address that is non-responsive to collection efforts, we interpret this as 6 mandatory letters for that account over the 6 month collection period. Considering this is a significant fixed cost based on 76,000 annual new accounts, would the State consider a minimum of 2 letters or make letter strategy a decision for the collection vendor?

RESPONSE: CCU will allow Offerors to determine how many letters to issue as part of their proposed debt collection strategies; however, the Contractor will be required to send an initial notice/dunning letter to debtors owing \$100 or more upon referral of Accounts. See Amendment 4, Item 1.

As a reminder, Technical Proposals must describe Offerors’ debt collection plans to include the proposed use of letters, phone calls, and/or other proposed debt collection means and justify expected recovery rates based on those proposed collection strategies. See RFP Section 3.2.1.1. In doing so, Offerors must refrain from including their proposed commission rates anywhere in their Technical Proposals. An Offeror’s proposed commission rates are financial information and will be considered after and apart from an Offeror’s Technical Proposal. See “Note” to RFP Section 4.4.

64. Our firm is PCI-DSS Compliant and performs an annual SSAE16 SOC 1 Type II audit, would this be acceptable in lieu of performing a separate SSAE16 SOC 2 Type II audit??

RESPONSE: No. Payment Card Industry – Data Security Standards is intended to address the risks and vulnerabilities associated with personal consumer financial information from credit card and payment card transactions occurring through point-of-sale devices, merchant computers, wireless transmissions, and web-based shopping sites. The PCI-DSS assessment (whether in conjunction with a SOC 1 Type 2 Report or not) would not be sufficient in place of a SOC 2 Report. This is because the PCI-DSS audit criteria may not cover those other records or databases which are unrelated to PCI merchant transactions but may contain the debtor’s Social Security number.

65. Would the state consider revising the monthly dunning letter requirement (in section 3.2.1.2) requirement so that the awarded Contractor would only send a monthly letter to verified addresses (right party contact)?

RESPONSE: CCU has revised the monthly dunning letter requirement in RFP Section 3.2.1.2. See response to Question 63 and Amendment 4, Item 1.

Remember proposals are due on November 20, 2014, no later than 2:00 p.m. If there are questions concerning this solicitation, please contact me via e-mail at rachel.hershey@maryland.gov or call me at (410) 260-7681 as soon as possible.

Date Issued: 11/5/2014

By:
Rachel Hershey
Procurement Officer