Information Received in Response to RFIN 3150003927

Q #	Section #	Page #	Information
1	2	5	The requirements in this section seem outdated. Since 2018, the industry has shifted toward accomplishing this requirement by removing purchase limit restrictions to shift spend from check and/or ACH to virtual or purchasing cards. We recommend DFA evaluate this requirement and possibly amend it by removing the $5,000 limit while still adhering to the State of Mississippi tiered quote and bid requirement process.
2	2	6	The requirements in this section seem outdated. Since 2020, the industry has shifted toward accomplishing this requirement through the evolution of offering virtual declining balance cards issued electronically. We recommend DFA evaluate this requirement and possibly amend it by adding the option to issue cards virtually.
3	2.2	5	The State may consider the use of a "one card" for designated card holders combining the use of a purchasing and travel card to limit the number of plastic cards issued which could result in a financial benefit to the state.
4	2.2	6	The State may consider requesting alternative solutions, in lieu of issuing plastic declining balance cards annually, as technology has made the administration and controls over card and card users more effective in recent years. We recommend that DFA allows vendors to provide a variety of options to meet this need that may result in a financial benefit to the state and other participating entities.
5	2.7	8	The State should consider ensuring that all information received by the card provider from the merchant accepting the transaction is passed on to the state - including level III information.
6	2.12	11	Industry Standard, in support of large hierarchies as well as individual entities (based on complexity and scope), provides for administration at the ultimate hierarchy level and would allow to add/ include additional administrators for support functionality to affect a program in real-time. Additionally – at an individual participant level it is typically recommended that there be administration at the individual levels and may follow the same cast.
7	2.14	12	The State should consider having a qualifying question to confirm providers are able to pass along information regarding transactions because 1099 transaction reporting is provided by the merchant accepting the card and not a requirement of the issuer of the purchasing card to provide.

Q #	Section #	Page #	Information
8	2.16	12	The requirement to provide a master copy of all non-proprietary account data in hard copy could be considered an outdated and less secure process. DFA should consider updating this request to all for secured electronic copies to be sent to the State to protect all data.
9	2.19	13	The State may consider provide the number of years required by policy to retain information based on audit guidelines for the state as there is no industry standard for retention.
10	NA	NA	In order to provide the most accurate financial benefit/rebate incentive to the State and all participants in the Purchasing Card Program, DFA should consider releasing a vendor spend file. The state should also considering preparing spend information for each participating entity in the broader program. Vendor spend information should include vendor name, address, last 12 months or fiscal year of spend volume and # of payments made within the same timeframe, method of payment, i.e. check, ACH, wire, card, etc. and payment terms.
11	Account Types	5 of 13	When the State sent this program out for bid in 2017, ▇▇▇▇▇▇ submitted a proposal. There was one area that caused major concern with us and most likely other banks, due to the potential for extremely high costs to the bank. This requirement states that roughly 30,000 declining balance cards must be reissued each year in order to provide teachers with $300 a year for supplies. If the State requires cards that are contactless and chip enabled, these will become quite expensive to issue. In addition, there is also a worldwide chip shortage, causing many banks to balk at reissuing 30,000 cards a year. To help mitigate this risk and added expense, we have included an alternative to issuing physical cards—the ▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇. This product was developed and launched during the novel coronavirus pandemic in order to allow you to issue Single Use Account (SUA) cards directly into a mobile wallet. Cardholders can still access card numbers in order to make purchases online, but physical cards would not be required. For those without a smart phone, cards could still be issued. However, this approach offers a better solution to the State, as this volume could be accumulated as rebate-eligible, which would increase the State's incentives. Additional details regarding the Instant Card solution are provided for your reference and review. ▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇ You need a way for individuals that do not have a corporate credit card to make purchases for your organization without giving up control. The ▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇ is a fast, efficient and easy way

Q #	Section #	Page #	Information
			for your employees and contingent workers to make business purchases and keep your operations moving. ███████ uses a mobile app to push a virtual credit card to an individual to use in U.S. or Canadian dollars. With just a few simple steps, you can create and send an ███████ to anyone in your organization who needs it. ███████ features and benefits include: ▪ Allows for payment flexibility—Recipients can view full card details for online purchases or use their ███████ in their mobile wallet for in-store transactions. ▪ Provides security and control—Set card limits, restrict MCCs and set expiration dates to protect against misuse. ▪ Reports help manage transactions—███████ seamlessly integrates with Access Online so you can view transactions online. Access Online extract files contain ███████ transactions and integrate into existing financial systems, such as automatic daily feed to SAP Concur, Expense Pro, TravelBank and Chrome River. ▪ Eliminates the use of personal credit cards—No personal card use means greater spend visibility and easier reconciliation for your organization. Plus, employees and contingent workers will not have to worry about paying out-of-pocket for business expenses. ▪ Reduces fraud—███████ uses a uniquely generated card number, expiration date and security code as a proxy making it highly secure. Setting card limits for only what needs to be purchased and short expiration periods limits fraud. Mobile wallet use provides an additional layer of payment security.
12	Card Format	6 of 13	This requirement is acceptable, but we want to make the State is aware of an industry issue impacting all potential respondents. There is currently a worldwide chip shortage; custom cards such as those requested above could take as long as five months to receive. You may want to take this into consideration in terms of implementation time frames for the program.
13	Training	9 of 13	Like the State, we prefer to hold training sessions in person. However, due to the ongoing circumstances surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic, we recommend updating this requirement to allow respondents the ability to provide training sessions virtually, should issues arise in providing in-person training to various Mississippi locations.

Q #	Section #	Page #	Information
14	Contract Succession/ Transition	12 of 13	Although it is typical for banks to provide support to an existing client, including providing any information necessary to facilitate the transition, it is not typical for an incumbent provider to work directly with new provider. The first sentence of this requirement should be altered to reflect that the Contractor will support the State until your transition to the successor is completed.
15	Migration and Implementation Schedule	12-13 of 13	A typical card program implementation is 90-120 days (3-4 months). However, because of the global chip shortage, we recommend the State alter your requirements. We estimate that 5-6 months from contract signing would be a sufficient timeline to ensure a smooth transition.
16	Liability	13 of 13	We agree that the State will not be held liable or financially responsible for incorrect charges. All participating vendors will have a dispute process in place, and cardholders should be sure to adhere to those processes in the event that an incorrect charge occurs.
17	General Suggestion		We recommend including a comprehensive payables element to the RFP so that the State of Mississippi can maximize its benefit of electronic transactions. This is the ability to send one payment file containing card (virtual card), ACH, wire, international f/x, etc. and potentially utilizing artificial intelligence to route payments in the most efficient manner.
18	General Suggestion		We understand this was a RFI to solely review the questions/requirements, but for the RFP we suggest a thorough inclusion of spend data and require each bidder submit a summary benefit analysis in their response. There are a number of creative pricing/rebate options in the market. For example: Different bidders are calculating standard versus reduced interchange differently. It is not clear in many responses what type of transactions are included in each definition, or sometimes clients are not aware of their portfolio alignment to standard vs reduced interchange transactions, such as level III data. We have found this is causing challenges making an apples-to-apples comparison of each bidder's value proposition. In fact, it may overinflate their rebate versus reality.
19	Sect 2: Q2	5-6	All information for cardless accounts will be transferred to the appropriate parties via encrypted/protected email. Not clear. How does the DFA Program Admin designate the receiver to which the Contractor is to send this card information securely? Typically cardless account information is securely shared with the Program Admin for internal distribution and control.
20	Sect 2: Q5	7	Card generation, paper process/electronic online process. Antiquated. Paper application processes are antiquated as online applications accommodate all commercial card types. Do any of the State Card program participants require the use of Paper applicant and cannot use an online process, and if so how many? Additional service costs may apply if the state participants require the use of paper applications.

Q #	Section #	Page #	Information
21	Sect 2: Q7	8	Those systems include, but are not limited to: any SAP system (including the State's primary ERP system - MAGIC), or Banner, Oracle, or PeopleSoft systems. Not clear. Is the State's primary ERP system – MAGIC a customized platform on/in SAP? Or is MAGIC a separate ERP system on a proprietary platform?
22	Sect 2: Q7	8	Travel or Equipment Code. Not clear. Are these two codes fixed or static on each card account, or are they unique for each transaction on a card account?
23	Sect 2: Q7	8	An online reconciliation program should also be integrated with the program management system so that 100% audits can occur on a daily basis that can be managed on a hierarchal level. The reconciliation program should also be compatible with any state agency financial management system in order for a complete payment process to occur online. Not clear. This is the first time a reconciliation program is introduced in the State's requirements. A description of this "reconciliation program" and its uses/function would be helpful as bank card issuer often have an Accounting Reconciliation module in their program management platforms to assist with coding
24	Sect 2; Q14	12	The Contractor shall be able to report transaction volume and dollars by vendor, by type of vendor, by minority or woman owned businesses, 1099 reportable transactions, sales tax reporting for those transactions that are not tax exempt, etc Partial Antiquated. 1099 reporting is available through Mastercard or Visa not the Contractor card issuer. And Sales tax information is only available with Level 2 or Level 3 Suppliers through their merchant bank/acquiring bank not the Contract card issuer. For Pcard transactions that are Level 1 Suppliers, often the reconciliation module can provide tax estimates but does not provide actual sales tax collected which is only evidenced by the receipt for these merchants. Reporting on transaction volume and dollars by vendor is standard reporting by the Card issuer. Type of vendor is available in any merchant demographics as registered on the Mastercard or Visa network as this is not controlled by the Card issuer. However additional client specific Vendor type or ID number demographics can be added to the Card Issuer reporting tool by the State manually.