



Notice of Intent to Award

Solicitation Number	276254	Award Date	8/10/2023 4:14 PM CDT	
Solicitation Title	Merchant Services & Gateway			
Buyer Name	Sandra Walker	Buyer Email	sandra.walker@nashville.gov	
BAO Rep	Christopher Wood	BAO Email	christopher.wood@nashville.gov	

Awarded Supplier(s)

In reference to the above solicitation and contingent upon successful contract negotiation, it is the intent of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County to award to the following supplier(s):

Company Name	Link2Gov	Company Contact	Demetria Mallett		
Street Address	601 Riverside Ave				
City	Jacksonville	State	FL	Zipcode	32204

Company Name		Company Contact			
Street Address					
City		State		Zipcode	

Company Name		Company Contact			
Street Address					
City		State		Zipcode	

Certificate of Insurance

The awarded supplier(s) must submit a certificate of insurance (COI) indicating all applicable coverage required by the referenced solicitation. The COI should be emailed to the referenced buyer no more than 15 days after the referenced award date.

Equal Business Opportunity Program

Where applicable, the awarded supplier(s) must submit a signed copy of the letter of intent to perform for any and all minority-owned (MBE) or woman-owned (WBE) subcontractors included in the solicitation response. The letter(s) should be emailed to the referenced business assistance office (BAO) rep no more than two business days after the referenced award date.

Yes, the EBO Program is applicable. No, the EBO Program is not applicable.

Monthly Reporting

Where applicable, the awarded supplier(s) will be required monthly to submit evidence of participation and payment to all small (SBE), minority-owned (MBE), women-owned (WBE), LGBT-owned (LGBTBE), and service disabled veteran owned (SDV) subcontractors. Sufficient evidence may include, but is not necessarily limited to copies of subcontracts, purchase orders, applications for payment, invoices, and cancelled checks.

Questions related to contract compliance may be directed to the referenced BAO rep.

Yes, monthly reporting is applicable. No, monthly reporting is not applicable.

Public Information and Records Retention

Solicitation and award documentation are available upon request. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange.

A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

Right to Protest

Per MCL 4.36.010 – any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the purchasing agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.

MLL Supervisor (Initial)

Michelle A. Hernandez Lane
Michelle A. Hernandez Lane
Purchasing Agent & Chief Procurement Officer

**RFQ: 276254-Merchant Services & Gateway
(Round 1,2 and 3)**

Offeror	1-Business Information Systems	2-First Data Merchant Services LLC	3-Government Window LLC	4-Grant Street Group	5-JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A	6-Link2Gov	7-Value Payment Systems, LLC
Round 1							
Cost (10 Points)	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
Methodology and Approach (20 Points)	14.00	14.00	19.00	20.00	10.00	10.00	14.00
Qualifications and Experience (20 Points)	12.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	10.00	20.00	10.00
General Merchant Services/Gateway Capabilities & Data Security (30 Points)	20.00	24.00	24.00	28.00	21.00	18.00	20.00
Operations and Training (20 Points)	8.00	15.00	15.00	20.00	17.00	20.00	18.00
Total Round 1	64.00	83.00	88.00	98.00	68.00	78.00	72.00
Round 2							
System Demonstrations	56.00	95.00	49.00	100.00	74.00	86.00	66.00
Total Round 2	120.00	178.00	137.00	198.00	142.00	164.00	138.00
Round 3		9.09				30.00	
Final Cost		9.09				30.00	
All Rounds Total Evaluation		187.09				194.00	

****Grant Street opted not to submit an offer for Rd. 3.**

Evaluation Comments

1-Business Information Systems
Strengths: Good overall Methodology and Approach. Detailed approach to managing the project. Detailed incident response procedures for internal and external security breaches. Good implementation plan. Detailed timeline for the conversion. Adequate response on ability to have designated account representative and customer service team assigned to Metro. Adequate response on narrative description of Company's background information, length of time in business, principals and experience. Good overall response to General Merchant Services/Gateway Capabilities & Data Security. Detailed response to external attestations to the security programs in place

Weaknesses: Failed to provide timeline for on-boarding additional agencies or departments during the course of the contract. Failed to provide examples of company's experience in dealing with special events that require merchant services on a temporary basis. Response to total number of dedicated customer support representatives was unclear. Failed to provide no cost solutions to Metro for debit & credit card and e-check processing. Projects listed not of similar scope. Cannot supply all necessary hardware for processing credit cards that are certified PCI-listed payment applications. Timeframe for processing refunds to credit cards lacked specific detail. Will not provide backup devices for certain Metro identified departments so that revenue is not lost in the event of a system outage at the merchant services/gateway/processor level. Response for future capital investments was inadequate. Failed to provide a response if deposits into Metro's bank account(s) could be identified by MID. Response to ability to provide a full refund to a cardholder including the related service fee lacked specific detail. Failed to provide a response to ability to provide reporting details of fees by the gateway/processor broken down by MID and billed monthly to Metro for agencies that use Absorbed Fee Model. Cannot provide seven years of historical data. Failed to demonstrate Account creation, Assign / Remove permission levels and Account audit capabilities. Failed to demonstrate ad hoc reporting capabilities by employee/cashier. Failed to demonstrate reporting capabilities to show voided transactions for a given day or date range. Failed to demonstrate how to refund both a full and partial transaction including the service fees for all payment channels and how voids and refunds are displayed in reports. Display of online chargeback functionality from notification to resolution and detail of chargeback reporting capabilities was unclear. Failed to show what data fields are available to include in a transmission. Failed to show reports that are available to reconcile the transmission file totals to the batch settlements and what level of detail is available to identify settled transactions that were left out of the transmission file. Failed to demonstrate the number of customization options that are available in your company created websites. Failed to demonstrate post back capabilities for a site not created by your company. Network diagram for Credit Card Data flow ensuring PCI Compliance was unclear. Failed to show an example of cardholder receipt and the various methods for delivery. Failed to demonstrate how voids and/or refunds are processed on POS terminals. Failed to show the network diagram for Credit Card Data flow ensuring PCI Compliance for credit card terminals. Failed to demonstrate the payment process for taking In-Person payments with your proposed physical terminal. Show the receipts that are generated for virtual and physical terminals and indicate any customization that is available to the receipts lacked detail. Show the network diagram for Credit Card Data flow ensuring PCI Compliance for both Virtual Terminals and In-Person Payments was unclear.

2-First Data Merchant Services LLC

Strengths: Good overall Methodology and Approach. Good response on narrative description of Company's background information, length of time in business, principals and experience. Projects of similar scope. Good overall response to General Merchant Services/Gateway Capabilities & Data Security. Good examples provided on company's experience in developing payment websites for organizations similar to Metro with API capability for updating multiple systems. Great variety of solutions on plan and approach to supply all necessary hardware for processing credit cards that are certified PCI-listed payment applications and devices. Good overall system demonstration.

Weaknesses: Incident response procedures for internal and external security breaches lacked specific detail. Response to how new implementation would be completed without impacting the services provided by the current gateway and processor was vague. Failed to provide examples of company's experience dealing with special events that require merchant services on a temporary basis. Failed to provide no cost solutions to Metro for debit & credit card and e-check processing. Response to ability to process check (ACH) payments with real time validation of bank routing numbers lacked specific detail. Failed to provide a response for maximum per transaction limit that can be processed through gateway. Response to ability to provide an internet-based platform for authorized Metro staff to void or refund transactions was vague. Failed to provide a response if timeframe varied by card brand and refunds for eChecks. Response on certification of all cardholder information is kept confidential and is not used for marketing purposes or sold to a third party for its use was vague. Failed to demonstrate Account audit capabilities for failed attempts. Failed to demonstrate reporting capabilities to show settled transaction batches. Failed to show reports that are available to reconcile the transmission file totals to the batch settlements. Demonstration of typical website your company created that would be used to process online payments for Metro departments that do not already have this functionality lacked specific detail.

3-Government Window LLC

Strengths: Good overall Methodology and Approach. Good response on narrative description of Company's background information, length of time in business, principals and experience. Projects of similar scope. Good overall response to Operations and Training.

Weakness: Response to what hardware would be used in dealing with special events that require merchant services on a temporary basis was vague. Response on plan and approach to supply all necessary hardware for processing credit cards that are certified PCI-listed payment applications and devices was inconsistent. Failed to provide a response if timeframe varied by card brand and refunds for eChecks. Response to automated process for reversing authorizations on transactions declined due to CVV or AVS failure showed a lack of understanding the question. Failed to list complete list of proposer's offerings listed on the PCI Security Council's website under the Validated Products and Solutions and response showed a lack of understanding the question. Response to deadline details for responding to disputes and chargebacks lacked specific detail. Failed to demonstrate ability to provide reporting details of fees by the gateway/processor broken down by MID. Failed to demonstrate ability for chargebacks and returned items to be processed in separate daily ACH debit batches (by MID) so that they are not netted against daily receipt ACH credit batches. Failed to provide a response on how eCheck refunds are made. Response to demonstrating ability to provide Metro payment system administrators with account provisioning privileges for the following: create new user accounts, disable users, create new system administrators, disable system administrators, assign access levels by MID, process voids, process refunds, access all available reporting, and create ad-hoc reports if available was inadequate. Failed to demonstrate password reset procedures and account creation. Failed to demonstrate account audit capabilities. Failed to display online Chargeback functionality from notification to resolution and chargeback reporting capabilities. Failed to demonstrate post back capabilities. Failed to show network diagram for Credit Card Data flow ensuring PCI Compliance. Failed to demonstrate how your proposed terminal works with an existing POS system. Failed to demonstrate how voids and/or refunds are processed on POS terminals and how terminals are configured to use encryption. Failed to show the network diagram for Credit Card Data flow ensuring PCI Compliance. Failed to show the login process for Metro users taking payments by Virtual terminal. Failed to demonstrate the process for taking payments by Virtual terminal and payment process for taking In-Person payments with your proposed physical terminal. Failed to show the receipts that are generated for virtual and physical terminals and indicate any customization that is available to the receipts. Failed to show the network diagram for Credit Card Data flow ensuring PCI Compliance for both Virtual Terminals and In-Person Payments.

4-Grant Street Group

Strengths: Good overall Methodology and Approach. Good response on narrative description of Company's background information, length of time in business, principals and experience. Projects of similar scope. Good overall General Merchant Services/Gateway Capabilities & Data Security. Good overall Operations and Training. Excellent and very detailed system demonstration.

Weaknesses: Process for ACH refunds are issued by check.

5-JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A

Strengths: Adequate response on narrative description of Company's background information, length of time in business, principals and experience. Good overall response to General Merchant Services/Gateway Capabilities & Data Security. Good overall response to Operations and Training.

Weaknesses: Overall Methodology and Approach response lacked specific detail. Approach to managing this project including the identification of Proposer's clearly defined project management process, tasks and deliverables lacked specific detail. Incident response procedures for internal and external security breaches lacked specific detail. Failed to provide recommended timeline for the conversion. Failed to provide timeline and approach for on-boarding additional agencies or departments during the course of the contract. Failed to provide examples of company's experience in dealing with special events that require merchant services on a temporary basis. Failed to provide summary organizational chart showing proposed teams for (1) the conversion of services to your company and (2) for the ongoing support of these services throughout the length of the contract. Failed to provide annual transaction amount, type of project and dollar value. Response to system integration capabilities/limitations for Enterprise Applications, Point of Sale systems and Web Applications lacked specific detail. Vague response to ability to provide 24/7/365 ability to process Visa, Mastercard, American Express, Discover card transactions through the various payment channels. Failed to provide examples of company's experience in developing payment websites for organizations similar to Metro with API capability for updating multiple systems. Failed to describe process for notifications to Metro Appointed Contacts for service interruptions. Vague response to deadline to Metro Appointed Contacts for responding to chargeback requests and transaction disputes. Failed to provide a response for backup devices for certain Metro identified departments so that revenue is not lost in the event of a system outage at the merchant services/gateway/processor level. Failed to provide examples of detailed daily and monthly reports of all active and inactive MID's. Response to ability to provide customizable web-based reporting site with detailed and summary batch data, including the transaction amount and service fee that can be segregated by department/agency and/or MID lacked relevant detail. Failed to address system administrator capability to process requests for new MID's online with electronic signature functionality. Failed to demonstrate the service fees for all payment channels. Failed to display online chargeback functionality from notification to resolution. Demonstration on typical website your company created that would be used to process online payments for Metro departments that do not already have this functionality lacked specific detail. Post back capabilities for a site not created by your company lacked specific detail. Network diagram for Credit Card Data flow ensuring PCI Compliance lacked detail. Failed to demonstrate how your proposed terminal works with an existing POS system. Failed to demonstrate how voids and/or refunds are processed on POS terminals. Failed to demonstrate how terminals are configured to use encryption. The network diagram for Credit Card Data flow ensuring PCI Compliance for both Virtual Terminals and In-Person Payments lacked detail.

6-Link2Gov

Strengths: Good response on narrative description of Company's background information, length of time in business, principals and experience. Projects of similar scope. Good overall response to Operations and Training. Adequate system demonstration.

Weaknesses: Overall Methodology and Approach response lacked specific detail. Response to approach to managing project including the identification of Proposer's clearly defined project management process, tasks and deliverables lacked specific detail. Failed to provide a response on new implementation that would be completed without impacting the services provided by the current gateway and processor. Response lacked specific detail to timeline and approach for on-boarding additional agencies or departments during the course of the contract. Examples of company's experience in dealing with special events that require merchant services on a temporary basis lacked specific detail. Failed to provide a response to total number of dedicated customer support representatives and the number of clients services by each. Failed to provide no cost solutions to Metro for debit & credit card and e-check processing. Failed to provide cardholder statement examples from the payor side showing two separate line-item transactions, one for the tax or payment being made and one for the service fee charged by the merchant service provider. Failed to provide plan and approach to supply all necessary hardware for processing credit cards that are certified PCI-listed payment applications and devices. Failed to provide a response on certification of all cardholder information is kept confidential and is not used for marketing purposes or sold to a third party for its use. Failed to provide a response on external attestations to the security program currently in place. Response to backup devices for certain Metro identified departments so that revenue is not lost in the event of a system outage at the merchant services/gateway/processor level lacked specific detail. The number of customization options that are available in your company created websites lacked specific detail. Demonstration of post back capabilities for a site not created by your company lacked specific detail. The network diagram for Credit Card Data flow ensuring PCI Compliance and identifying the ports and protocols used in the transmission of credit card data both lacked specific detail. The network diagram for Credit Card Data flow ensuring PCI Compliance for both Virtual Terminals and In-Person Payments lacked detail.

7-Value Payment Systems, LLC

Strengths: Good overall Methodology and Approach. Adequate overall response to General Merchant Services/Gateway Capabilities & Data Security. Good overall response to Operations and Training.

Weaknesses: Response on how new implementation would be completed without impacting the services provided by the current gateway and processor lacked specific detail. Failed to provide examples of company's experience in dealing with special events that require merchant services on a temporary basis. Failed to provide a narrative description of the Company's principals. Failed to provide transaction amounts and dollar value. Type of projects lacked specific detail. Response for automated process for reversing authorizations on transactions declined due to CVV or AVS failure lack specific detail. Process for notifications to Metro Appointed Contacts for service interruptions and planned downtime lacked specific detail. Backup devices plan for certain Metro identified departments so that revenue is not lost in the event of a system outage at the merchant services/gateway/processor level is not feasible for Metro. Failed to provide a response to external attestations to the security programs in place. Failed to provide a response to ability to provide a full refund to a cardholder including the related service fee. Failed to provide a response to account provisioning privileges. Account audit capabilities. (user search, account status, last login, failed attempts) only available upon request. Failed to demonstrate all transaction search capabilities for the current day including Department, locations within Department (MID), Payment type. Failed to demonstrate reporting capabilities to show voided transactions for a given day or date range. Failed to show preview of all standard reports available and the output options available for each. Failed to demonstrate how to void a transaction for all payment channels. Failed to demonstrate how to refund a partial transaction including the service fees for all payment channels. Failed to display online Chargeback functionality from notification to resolution. Failed to show what data fields are available to include in a transmission. Showing reports that are available to reconcile the transmission file totals to the batch settlements and what level of detail is available to identify settled transactions that were left out of the transmission file both lacked detail. Failed to demonstrate post back capabilities. Failed to demonstrate how your proposed terminal works with an existing POS system and how voids are processed on POS terminals. Failed to show the login process for Metro users taking payments by Virtual terminal. Failed to complete the process for taking payments by Virtual terminal. Failed to demonstrate the payment process for taking In-Person payments with your proposed physical terminal. Failed to show the receipts that are generated for physical terminals and indicate any customization that is available to the receipts.

RFQ: 276254-Merchant Services & Gateway (Round 3) Final Cost		Max. RFP Cost Points
		30
Offeror's Name	Total Cost	RFP Cost Point Distribution
First Data Merchant Services LLC	\$3,193.29	9.09
Link2Gov	\$967.90	30.00