



QUESTIONS & RESPONSES #01

RFP or RFQ / TITLE 2019-01 | Port Community System

CONTACT Sharon Rothwell, PROCUREMENT

EMAIL procurement@portoftacoma.com

PHONE NUMBER 253-383-5841

SUBMITTAL DUE DATE July 19, 2019 @12:00 PM (PST)

Q&A ISSUE DATE July 3, 2019

PROPOSER QUESTIONS	PORT RESPONSES	RFP/ RFQ Section
[Can] companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)	Yes. We'll use the information obtained from this RFI to make an informed decision on how to best proceed with the design, procurement and implementation of PCS technology, and do not have any restrictions on vendor geography.	
[Do] we need to come over there for meetings?	No. There are currently no meetings under consideration as part of this RFI.	
Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)	Yes. We'll use the information obtained from this RFI to make an informed decision on how to best proceed with the design, procurement and implementation of PCS technology, and do not have any restrictions on vendor geography. We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that the RFI will be followed by an RFP, and, ultimately, the selection of a vendor.	
Can we submit the proposals via email?	Yes.	

<p>Initial planning seems to have been maintained, however delay occurred and below timing is already outdated, please confirm new applicable Project Milestones.</p> <p>These 12 elements will adhere to the following PCTS Project Milestones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems Engineering – 2018 Q3 and Q4 • System Procurement – Begin 2019 Q1 • System Development – Begin 2019 Q3 • System Deployment – Begin 2019 Q4 • Estimated date the project will be fully implemented: December 1st, 2022 	<p>The Systems Engineering milestone was completed in Q1 2019 as part of a design planning phase. We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that the RFI will be followed by an RFP, and, ultimately, the selection of a vendor.</p>	
<p>Could you let us know the list of the TOS (Terminal operating System) currently deployed in NWSA ?</p>	<p>North Harbor (T18-SSA, T30-SSA) / South Harbor (East Sitcum Terminal/Ports America-M21, Husky Terminal/ITS-ITS MTS, Pierce County Terminal/Everport-TOSPRO, Washington United Terminal-OPUS)</p>	
<p>UN16 kindly explain what do you mean with “per diem / Demurrage “, are all shipping companies having the exact same free time conditions and tariffs, regardless of the Terminal Operator ?</p>	<p>The ability to track an accurate Freight Delivery Status would facilitate calculation of Per Diem and Demurrage charges. Each port terminal is managed by a Marine Terminal Operator (MTO), who controls their own free time and tariffs.</p>	
<p>UN24 when you mention the need of “uploading” documents and reports, what are the formats/types of documents you have in mind?</p>	<p>The NWSA anticipates uploading documents and reports in pdf or csv formats.</p>	
<p>UN25 are you referring to Geofencing technology or do you have something else in mind? Do you require mobile app to automatically starts when user enter terminal perimeter?</p>	<p>Yes. The NWSA anticipates a mobile application would be coupled with geofencing to activate a defined process when entering/exiting a terminal.</p>	
<p>UN26 when you mention redundancy are you talking about system redundancy or equipment/maintenance redundancy?</p>	<p>Redundancy refers to System Redundancy, within the functional area of Systems Operations.</p>	
<p>FRATIS is the name of the future system community is going to log on to, which is the front end of the PCS system, is it?</p>	<p>The NWSA anticipates the FRATIS subsystem, also referred to as the PCS Core Platform graphical user interface (GUI), would be made up of two information dissemination channels: the NWSA website and a mobile application. These would be the interfaces in which PCS users access information provided by a future PCS system.</p>	

<p>8. FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>a.4.4.2 : “automatic procedures for startup of subsystems” do you mean that we should be able to start subsystems directly from our PCS?</p> <p>b.4.4.3 : when you mention “subsystem” are you referring to the external systems linked to the PCS such as GIS/Maximo/Bellerophon... or internal modules of the PCS?</p> <p>c.4.4.15 what do you mean with “per-subsystem level”?</p> <p>d.4.5.15 when you say “not to be under the control of NWSA” what is the role of NWSA in this situation and do you intend to create a neutral entity to handle PCS/FRATIS?</p>	<p>a.) The NWSA anticipates that a PCS would have automated procedures for startup of Subsystems or Internal Modules. b.) These Subsystems may be referred to as Internal Modules. c.) "per-subsystem level" may also be referred to as an Internal Module. d.) From a security standpoint, the NWSA does not anticipate being under control of data provided to the PCS by stakeholders. We would remain a neutral party to facilitate shared data in the supply chain, but would not control input or output of the data.</p>	
How will the PCS entity look like? Neutral party or NWSA itself?	The NWSA anticipates being a neutral party for a future PCS.	
License to do business in the state of Washington, please elaborate on this requirement?	In order to participate in a future RFP, a vendor would need to be licensed to do business in the state of Washington.	
What port call optimization efforts are done at NWSA?	The NWSA currently executes manual business processes to accomplish efficient port calls. The NWSA is a port authority landlord, and doesn't manage or control operations between the ocean carriers, terminals and BCOs.	
Is data correctness provided by stakeholders currently? Does NWSA see a role for the PCS besides the format to check data accuracy? Could you elaborate on this topic more extensively and provide an example?	Data is voluntarily provided to the NWSA by stakeholder groups that are responsible for providing data correctness. We anticipate a future PCS would also support data accuracy. The existence of data in the supply chain would allow data validity checks to ensure data correctness. For example, an ocean carrier may provide a vessel arrival ETA for today, but if the current location of the ocean vessel is 500 miles from the port, then we can interpret the data as incorrect.	
The company policy of Interested Party does not allow to share pricing information without a Non Disclose Agreement between both parties. Does NWSA have a standard NDA or would NWSA be open to receive ours?	The NWSA would be open to signing a vendor NDA.	
Preferred approach of Interested Party is to enter a long-term strategic business partnership in which the specific needs and situation of NWSA are tailored into a digital strategy vision and implementation roadmap. Interested party has expert knowledge of port operations combined with a suite of proven solutions and port an digital consultancy services. Is NWSA open for a response/interaction based on this approach?	Yes.	

Will all questions and answers be shared with interested parties?	Yes.	
How many parties will participate in the RFI?	This RFI is open to all vendor(s) who wish to participate by submitting a response.	
Please share a breakdown of the NWSA budget for PCS project?	The responses to this RFI will be used to identify vendor costs to assist in the budget process for a future PCS. We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that the RFI will be followed by an RFP, and, ultimately, the selection of a vendor.	
Based on which criteria will the responses of Interested Parties be evaluated? Please share the weight and formulas?	The responses to this RFI will be used to identify vendors in the marketplace, as well as costs and benefits of a future PCS solution. We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that the RFI will be followed by an RFP, and, ultimately, the selection of a vendor.	
Which roles / functions are represented in the NWSA team for this RFI?	This RFI has been produced with a NWSA core team representing the Operations, Planning and Information Technology groups, in addition to a team of experienced consultants.	
Is there a preference between Cloud/SaaS or on-premise solution? Please elaborate on the why?	The NWSA anticipates a Cloud/SaaS solution would be hosted and supported on a vendor platform, and would require fewer NWSA resources for system maintenance and support. We do not have a preference of one solution over the other for this RFI.	
What function would the mapping have in user need 1?	This refers to mapping of information, data and performance indicators, which would be used by the Port Community and Data Management functions to assist in a visual reference of the data.	
Could you elaborate on the development and functionalities of a custom dashboard, could you provide examples?	The ability to create custom dashboards in User Need 7 would allow users to disseminate subsets of information and data in a visual reference. The NWSA anticipates a dashboard would have the capabilities to work with PCS data for key monitoring and metrics.	
What is the current appointment system? Should this be a new module of the PCS system?	The NWSA is a port authority landlord and doesn't manage or control a terminal's appointment system. Some terminals do utilize individual appointment systems, but this would not be considered a module of a future PCS.	
Could you elaborate on accommodating NDA considerations, could you provide an example? What should the PCS support?	The selected vendor(s) of a potential RPF would have access to sensitive NWSA network or port information and possibly sensitive 3rd-party information.	
Regarding Truck Traffic Congestion, is PCS expected to exchanging information or provide a service? Could you provide examples of possible solutions?	The NWSA anticipates a future PCS would integrate data from truck traffic, in the form of an information exchange or as a service. An example of the information exchange would be consumption of current RFID data, whereas an example of a service would be interfacing with the current RFID vendor to collect RFID data.	
Is there a system of gate planning in place at the moment , providing times slots for truckers?	The NWSA is a port authority landlord and doesn't manage or control a terminal's gate planning system. Some terminals utilize individual gate planning systems to provide time slots for truckers.	

How is the current collection of data for warehouses, dispatchers, trucking companies arranged by NWSA? Is this done voluntarily or obligated to do? Data sharing is about thrust, how does NWSA foresee in this?	The NWSA collects data via email and excel spreadsheet from stakeholder groups on a voluntary basis. We acknowledge that trust would be foundation of a future PCS, and would work with stakeholder groups to ensure data is shared along the supply chain.	
Who is responsible for the stacking and yard of the containers? Empty and full?	The NWSA is a port authority landlord, and doesn't manage or control terminal activity. Each Marine Terminal Operator (MTO) is responsible for all container activity within the terminal.	
Regarding the current emission reduction goals: are they also applicable for the entire shipping-port part? Also, are there current projects done by NWSA which are relevant to this RFI?	The NWSA has previously implemented a Clean Truck Program for drayage trucks for international container terminals as part of the long-range emission reduction goals.	
Would NWSA be open for offering based point solution(s) for e.g. Port Call Optimization? Just-In-Time Arrival concept?	The NWSA is a port authority landlord, and doesn't manage or control operations between ocean carriers, terminals and BCOs. The NWSA anticipates a future PCS would enable data sharing between all stakeholders in the supply chain.	
Will a separate RFP/RFQ be released after the RFI is reviewed?	We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that it will be followed by an RFP/RFQ, and ultimately the selection of a vendor.	
Can NWSA provide a more detailed anticipated Project Schedule?	There is no timeline on a future PCS. We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that it will be followed by an RFP/RFQ, and ultimately the selection of a vendor.	
Who makes go/no go decision on this project? Port authority, board of directors, both?	The NWSA has completed a design phase for a future PCS, with no current timeline. The responses to this RFI will assist the NWSA in determining cost and benefits of a future PCS. We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that the RFI will be followed by an RFP, and, ultimately, the selection of a vendor.	
What is the expected timeline of any post RFI activities?	There is not a current timeline for a future PCS. We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that it will be followed by an RFP/RFQ, and ultimately the selection of a vendor.	
When will the RFP be issued?	We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that it will be followed by an RFP/RFQ, and ultimately the selection of a vendor.	
When will the RFP contract be awarded?	We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that it will be followed by an RFP/RFQ, and ultimately the selection of a vendor.	

When does NWSA expect work to begin?	There is no current timeline for a future PCS. We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that it will be followed by an RFP/RFQ, and ultimately the selection of a vendor.	
When does NWSA require key milestones to be met to align to grant funding?	There is no longer grant funding aligned to a future PCS. We intend to inform those who respond to this RFI of our intentions no later than six (6) months following the response due date of July 19, 2019. This RFI does not provide a guarantee that it will be followed by an RFP/RFQ, and ultimately the selection of a vendor.	
In regards to “3.3 Interface Requirements” and response time; would NWSA prefer analysis, demonstration, inspection, and testing to validate a 15 second response time for a user defined report, or can vendors provide evidence that our application(s) perform within 15 seconds or less as a general standard?	Identification of an interface general standard would be sufficient for this RFI. The responses to this RFI will assist the NWSA in determining cost and benefits of a future PCS.	
In section 3.3, is it preferred that vendors demonstrate the existence of an interface with local Seattle/Tacoma systems such as “piertrucker” or “Bellerophon” as part of the RFI response? Or would showing a proven interface capability be sufficient to demonstrate that a connection is available and easy to set up with third-party applications?	Section 3.2 of the PCS Concept of Operations document is a Description of Current Situation, identifying NWSA Systems-of-Record that need integration with a future PCS. For this RFI, we are interested in vendor information on general integration capabilities.	
Real-time” data is often defined differently across the industry; could NWSA please offer a definition of “real-time” to better clarify this for each of the related sections?	The NWSA anticipates "real-time" data updates would occur at a maximum of 15-second intervals.	
What is the level of involvement the port authority plans on having in the data acquisition efforts across the stakeholder groups and users? - Is the port authority going to help, incentivize, or mandate real time data from the data providers for the PCS? - Will NWSA grant access to the selected vendor to gather data on the port’s behalf from all relevant data providers, existing and future, to ensure that the necessary data elements are available?	The NWSA anticipates working with stakeholder groups to collect and share data, as required. We also anticipate assisting stakeholders, but don't anticipate providing any incentives for providing real-time data. The NWSA anticipates working with selected vendor(s) of a future PCS to collect and share data, as required.	

The RFI assumes that "data currently consumed or owned by the NWSA will be made available to the PCS." Some of the companies in the provided list (Figure 5) would be potential bidders on this project, therefore if the winning bidder not be from that list, will the NWSA work with the successful bidder to ensure access to the existing data feeds currently being used by NWSA?	Yes. The NWSA anticipates we would work with a selected vendor(s) to integrate identified systems-of-record.	
Which teams from the port will be overseeing solution build/design?	The NWSA anticipates the Operations and IT teams would be key internal groups to oversee implementation of a future PCS.	
How will the port help the vendor obtain access to the stakeholders necessary for solution design and verification?	The NWSA is engaged with key stakeholder groups, and anticipates we would work with stakeholder groups to drive a future PCS.	
22 of the 30 listed User Needs (Table 1) are listed as High priority. The RFI says "high-priority projects will be selected based on the highly desired needs of the wide variety of user groups interviewed" while further acknowledging that it will not be possible to address all user needs with the enhanced system design. Can you provide additional information on how that selection process will work?	The NWSA anticipates implementation of all user needs in a future PCS. However, we acknowledge that a future PCS may need to be implemented in phases, and we would seek to implement our user needs based upon a prioritized hierarchy. We anticipate this approach would be flexible based upon our needs and vendor input.	
Is it acceptable to have a "PCS" that is a cohesive set of modular applications that communicate & work together? i.e. A suite of application that work together (think Microsoft office).	Yes. A modular approach to a future PCS is acceptable. Vendor teaming is also strongly encouraged in your responses to a future PCS. We'll use the information obtained from this RFI to make an informed decision on how to best proceed with the design, procurement and implementation of PCS technology.	
What languages will be required for both the application and technical support?	The NWSA anticipates a future PCS would support multiple languages, similar to our NWSA web site which utilizes Google Translator.	
PCS Core Platform Graphical User Platform Interface (GUI), which will be referred to as the FRATIS subsystem moving forward - Does that mean the proposed PCS system will be part of the FRATIS system or will it be a separate system that can relay information in and out of other FRATIS subsystems? [Page 77, 1.6.1.e-]	The NWSA anticipates expanding the current web site as one FRATIS dissemination channel, also referred to as the PCS Core Platform graphical user interface (GUI). The NWSA web site expansion would be out-of-scope for suppliers, but would be a point-of-entry to access data from a future PCS.	
Will the PCS have a consistent look and feel with other NWSA apps and website? If so, what are these other NWSA apps? [Page 91, 4.1.1] - Are there any guiding design principles laid down by NWSA around the look and feel of their existing apps? - Do we have flexibility to repurpose the look and feel if needed for an improved user experience?	The NWSA anticipates a future PCS would not mimic the look and feel of the web site, which has a unique UX. The NWSA anticipates we would expand the current web site as one FRATIS dissemination channel of a future PCS, but would be out-of-scope for suppliers.	

In regards to “3.3 Interface Requirements” and response time; would NWSA prefer analysis, demonstration, inspection, and testing to validate a 15 second response time for a user defined report or can vendors provide evidence that our application(s) perform within 15 seconds or less as a general standard?	Evidence of application response time to meet system requirements would be sufficient for this RFI. The responses to this RFI will assist the NWSA in determining cost and benefits of a future PCS.	
In section 3.3, is it preferred that vendors demonstrate the existence of an interface with local Seattle/Tacoma systems such as “piertrucker” or “Bellerophon” as part of the RFI response? Or would showing a proven interface capability be sufficient to demonstrate that a connection is available and easy to set up with third-party applications?	Identification of a proven interface capability to third-party applications would be sufficient for this RFI. The responses to this RFI will assist the NWSA in determining cost and benefits of a future PCS.	
It is understood that all relevant legal requirements and statutes are to be met and/or exceeded for data security/ privacy but are there any specific compliance or security certifications/audits that NWSA will require?	The NWSA doesn't anticipate any specific certification/audits in addition to the security needs listed in this RFI.	
How does NWSA envision their role in this partnership model? [Page 58, 7.2.3- Public Private Partnerships] - Are there any current PPP initiatives that NWSA is involved in that are similar as a reference or example?	The NWSA anticipates partnerships with public agencies for sharing of data to gain improved visibility to truck data outside the gateway. We are currently implementing CCTV hardware in a partnership with the Seattle Department of Transportation for enhanced visibility of truck congestion and security concerns.	
Does NWSA prefer a vendor that has a proven solution in the marketplace that can be expanded and configured to meet their needs or an IT services company that will build a custom application for single use?	The NWSA would be open to a proven solution in the marketplace that can be expanded, or an IT service company with a custom application. We'll use the information obtained from this RFI to make an informed decision on how to best proceed with the design, procurement and implementation of PCS technology.	
Is there a preference for software systems that have been deployed and tested in the North American market?	No. The NWSA anticipates a future PCS would meet our system requirements, which were developed for a North American market.	
Please clearly define “supply chain neutrality” as it relates to the vendors in this RFI?	The NWSA anticipates a future PCS would allow data sharing along the supply chain for all stakeholder groups, and each stakeholder would assume data responsibility to ensure an end-to-end solution.	
NWSA refers to a desired Port Community System (PCS) “open electronic platform” in RFI 2019-01 Port Community System. With this platform, are you seeking an application for visualizing and interacting with data in the PCS or an API, web service architecture, or other programmatic-only connection?	The NWSA anticipates a future PCS would be an open electronic platform for sharing data between stakeholders, and not constrained by the architecture. We'll use the information obtained from this RFI to make an informed decision on how to best proceed with the design, procurement and implementation of PCS technology.	

Is NWSA's intent for a single PCS solution to be used by both the Port of Seattle and the Port of Tacoma?	Yes. The NWSA is comprised of both the Port of Seattle and Port of Tacoma, and would need to operate transparently.	
Recognizing that the scope of the PCS will grow over time and that key User Needs have been ranked and prioritized per the ConOps in Attachment A, NWSA has assumed that FAST/CMAQ elements will be implemented first. Integration within a broad community of stakeholder systems, as illustrated in Figure 2 of Attachment B, will require 3rd party data hosting and sharing agreements due to the desire for this PCS to be "outside" of the NWSA. How will the NWSA governance/ownership of PCS ensure its neutrality for these data/content agreements as stated in the RFI purpose? Will there be a separate entity legally bound to the agreements, and, if so, who will own this responsibility?	The NWSA doesn't anticipate operating a future PCS with control of the data provided by stakeholders. We would remain a neutral party to facilitate shared data in the supply chain, but would not control the input or output of data by stakeholders. The NWSA doesn't anticipate having a separate legal entity to be bound to data/content agreements, but would work with a selected vendor(s) to ensure stakeholder participation.	
Will the creation of a vehicle tracking and communication system that extends outside of the NWSA port areas create a Private Information (PII) security or information management problem (perceived or real) for NWSA staff with access to this information (per Attachment B, Section 3.3.1) or to stakeholders who must access it for business decisions (as described in Attachment B, Section 3.3.4, Scenario 6.7 and others)?	The NWSA doesn't anticipate that sharing of data from outside the gateway would create a problem for staff or stakeholders, other than be considered data available for public record requests. We anticipate this data and information would benefit staff and stakeholders with improved truck visibility, and corresponding insights.	
Is a net reduction in Demurrage a long-term goal of the PCS (as mentioned in Attachment B, Section 4.1.1 and in Attachment A, Scenario 6.3/UN16)? If so, how would this be ranked in terms of prioritization and in relation to the other priorities listed?	The NWSA doesn't anticipate that a net reduction of demurrage is directly a long-term goal of a future PCS. We are a port authority landlord and don't manage or control terminal operations. The NWSA views a future PCS would assist in identifying accurate loading and unloading times for a Marine Terminal Operators to better manage demurrage.	
Could you provide 1 some options in regards to Page 5/7 on the RFI document; Performance Expectations: The ideal vendor(s) response would: Is licensed to do business in the state of Washington and bonded.	Performance expectations will assist the NWSA in understanding vendors in the marketplace, and may be used in a future RFQ/RFP process. One expectation for this process would be a license to do business in the state of Washington and be bonded.	
The term FRATIS seems to refer to: a. Existing freight(truck/vehicle/rail) location/tracking information and b. New street/crossing/incident information as well as, c. The future state of the NWSA website (and a means to disseminate all PCS data to all stakeholders, whether via web or mobile app), d. Can you better clarify your vision for Fratis and whether which definitions are more accurate?	A FRATIS subsystem would be most accurately reflected in item c. The NWSA anticipates a future PCS with a FRATIS subsystem, also referred to as the PCS Core Platform graphical user interface (GUI). The FRATIS subsystem would be made up of two information dissemination channels: the NWSA website and a mobile application. These will be the interfaces in which PCS users access information provided by a future PCS solution.	

<p>Does the FRATIS architecture as depicted include an expansion of the current NWSA website or is this entirely new build/platform? a. If so, is this in the PCS suppliers scope of supply? b. Could the PCS serve as the means to disseminate the information to NWSA stakeholders directly?</p>	<p>The NWSA anticipates expanding the current web site as one FRATIS dissemination channel, also referred to as the PCS Core Platform graphical user interface (GUI). The NWSA web site expansion would be out-of-scope for suppliers, but the mobile application would be in-scope.</p>	
<p>Sect. 4.3.1: should we assume all integration contracts or data sharing agreements w/ 3rd party system suppliers, MTOs and SSLs will have to be secured by the winning PCS vendor or are some currently in place(or in the NWSA tariff)?</p>	<p>The NWSA does not have existing integration contracts or data sharing agreements, but we would anticipate working with selected vendor(s) to facilitate integration and data sharing.</p>	