



ADDENDUM #5

December 15, 2023

TO: ALL POTENTIAL SUBMITTERS

FROM: Nina Alexander, Buncombe County Procurement Agent

SUBJECT: ADDENDUM #5 Payment Card Processing

The following changes, revisions, additions, and/or clarifications to the plans and/or specifications are hereby made a part of the original documents.

Addendum # 5

Notes on previous addendums:

Addendum # 2 is Supplementary Document 1 – Merchant Statement.
Addendum # 3 is Supplementary Document 2 – NCPTS Interface.
Addendum # 4 is Supplementary Document 3 – example of NCPTS text file.

The following questions were asked by potential bidders prior to the deadline:

Section 2.4 Proposal Questions

1. What is the latest date by which the County will issue any addendum related to this RFP? By what communication means (i.e., email, portal)?

[Addenda may be posted as necessary to the Buncombe County Procurement Webpage for the duration of the solicitation event.](#)

Section 2.6 Proposal Contents

2. What is the make and model of your existing Terminals?

[Verifone V400C Plus](#)

3. What does the County pay for each Terminal?

[\\$299/terminal](#)

Section 3.2 Evaluation Criteria

4. From how it reads, it looks like the County is looking for two different rates for Onsite (POS) vs Online. Why is that?

We aren't necessarily looking for two different rates. We are interested in direct responses to both POS and Online due to different use cases at the County.

Section 5.0

- On pages 7-12 of the RFP for the three Scenarios listed, we assume the County wants to keep the same pricing for each payment channel for Taxes via Web, POS, IVR. However, to be sure, is the county also wanting different pricing for each payment channel (Web, POS, IVR). We are assuming no as to reduce confusion for your community members, but we just wanted to confirm that answer with the county.

We are asking potential vendors to submit pricing how they see fit. We agree to keep it as simple as possible.

Scenario 2

- POS, 88K Trx/\$11.4M See paid bills up to 3-year period visible. No zero balances: Is the County also receiving a batch file with NCPTS/Farragut today?

We send the following data in a CSV file to the current vendor for NCPTS data:

Bill, Merchant ID, Total Due, -1 as Minimum Amount, USD as currency, Past Due Date, 0 as Late Fee, Current Year + 1 as Expiration, First Name and Last name as contact, Street address, city, state, zip, USA as country, bill number (but it uses the same field as Bill), Pin, bill description, tax year from bill, acreage

There are several other fields in the CSV file that the current vendor requires but we don't pull data for them but set as empty string: phone, email, customer id, invoice type, pay types allowed, terms, memo, grouping Id

See attached Supplementary Documents #2 and #3

- Can the County confirm number 32 and 33 within Scenario 2 of the Scope of Work are required by the Vendor? Is this a simple numbering mistake or are these supposed to be included in this Scenario?

This is a formatting error.

Scenario 3

- Provide Services for all payments not covered by 1 and 2 (non-property tax web-based payments, API's, Phones, etc.,) 28K Trx/ \$36.3M. Is this for IVR?

Scenario 3 Transaction Type:

Transaction type	Transaction Amount	Number of Transactions
IVR	\$3,090,304	4,241
WEB	\$33,114,682	23,812

Grand Total

\$36,204,986

28,053