Addendum #5

Date 10/26/2018

The following is additional information regarding **RFP-83640** titled **Business Intelligence Solution** released on 10/10/2018. **The due date and time for responses is updated to <mark>11/7/2018 @ 2:00PM PDT</mark>.** This addendum includes both questions from prospective bidders and the Port's answers, and revisions to the RFP. This addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and therefore, the information contained herein shall be taken into consideration when preparing and submitting a bid.

Item #	Date Received	Date Answered	Vendor's Question	Port's Answer	RFP Revisions
1	10/11/18	10/15/18	Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)	Firms outside the United States may propose if they can meet the requirements of the RFP.	
2	10/11/18	10/15/18	Whether we need to come over there for meetings?	Meetings and training can be done remotely via phone/web.	
3	10/11/18	10/15/18	Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)	Assuming the submitter can meet the requirements of the work, home office location is negotiable.	
4	10/11/18	10/15/18	Can we submit the proposals via email?	See instructions in RFP 83640, Attachment A on page 7-8, Submittal Process	
5	10/16/18	10/17/18	Can the Buyer please explain 'Budgeting capabilities' requirements surrounding Attachment D, #18 in more detail? If the Buyer expects true 'Budgeting capabilities' such as those provided by vendors such as Anaplan (www.anaplan.com) or Hyperion Financial Budgeting and Planning (https://www.oracle.com/applications/performance-management/), we would normally expect scores of budget-specific requirements that are not articulated in this solicitation.	We do not intend for this tool to replace our current financial budgeting solution. This is not a mandatory requirement for the BI solution, but having core functionality that can be leveraged for forecasting and budgeting analytics is highly desired. ***The Seller should indicate in the Comments column of Attachment D #18 what capabilities the proposed solution provides, if any.***	

6	10/16/18	10/17/18	The Buyer requests "10 data analysts that would be creating reports, dashboards, visualizations". The Seller offers two licenses that would fit this description, and we would like to propose the correct options. Our Explorer role can create content such as dashboards, reports and visualizations from scratch, using a web browser, using metadata that has previously been connected, published and curated to some extent. Our Creator role can *additionally* connect, cleanse, curate and publish that metadata for Explorer or Viewer consumption, for approximately double the cost. More detail can be found here: https://www.tableau.com/pricing/teams-orgs. Given those details, how many of the 10 would the Buyer prefer in each role?	Based on your description, we would prefer six (6) Explorer licenses, and four (4) Creator licenses.	
7	10/16/18	10/17/18	Of the 280 users, how many concurrent users will access the system?	We anticipate up to 30 concurrent viewers. ***Seller should indicate in their proposal, considerations relating to concurrent system usage.***	
8	10/16/18	10/17/18	Is there any additional value/weight given for companies who are Minority (MBE) or Woman Owned Businesses (WBE)?	There is no additional weight given for companies who are minority (MBE) or Woman Owed Businesses (WBE).	

9	10/17/18	10/19/18	Can the provided solution be a combination of a data warehouse for historical and interactive reporting as well as a data repository for developers to access and create their own reporting?	The primary objective, and notable outcome of this RFP is the successful selection and implementation of a front-end BI tool for data visualization and BI-related tasks. A data warehouse is not a requested component of the solution, but we will accept it as an element of the submitted solution with the understanding that the proposed data warehouse is a required element of the front-end BI tool, necessary in order to provide the functionality that meets the objectives outlined in the RFP. ***Competing solicitations are not required to submit a data warehouse element if their BI tool fulfills the goals outlined in the RFP without it.***	
10	10/17/18	10/19/18	Do you want users to access the various source systems directly via one application or would an ETL from the sources to one location for access suffice?	Users should be able to access the various source systems directly via one application.	

11	10/17/18	10/19/18	Real time access to raw sources may not be possible when there are disparate data sources with various connectivity and granularity and users need to have limited knowledge of SQL or other programming languages to transform. Could we provide real-time access to certain data points but others ETL into a central repository? There are other alternatives but would require further discussion on needs for reporting.	Acknowledged. However, the selected tool is expected to allow users to access various and disparate data sources as desired/required. (See #10.) Proposals may be submitted that consolidate data sources, if this element is necessary to provide the functionality that meets the objectives outlined in the RFP. ***However, preference will be given to solutions that allow access to data sources as described.***	
12	10/17/18	10/19/18	Are you looking for .net development or a front end application for data access outside of a reporting tool such as Power BI?	No.	
13	10/17/18	10/19/18	Can you elaborate on users transforming fields or data analysis? Are you referring to developers accessing the data repository, warehouse, data mart or data lake we architect to build reporting from or a capability for the end users to manipulate data with no programming knowledge? Data types are not changeable without programming knowledge once a destination data type is defined.	Tools exists which allow the user the ability to manipulate and transform data as necessary for analysis and visualization. (As an example, an integer field of 20181015 can be transformed into a date field of 10/15/2018 if necessary.)	
14	10/17/18	10/19/18	Summary and aggregated data levels computed in real time can lead to performance degradation? Would this need to happen at runtime of reporting or can we build a aggregated model for report users to hit?	The tool should be able to aggregate detail data as specified/selected by the user at runtime.	
15	10/17/18	10/19/18	In displaying data specified by groups/organizations, does that mean only those organizations/groups should be able to see that data (incorporating row level security)?	The tool should recognize the security model of the underlying data source(s).	

16	10/17/18	10/19/18	You mention multiple data science/predictive analysis programming languages (SQL, R, Python), do you have a preference on any of these? Does versioning play a role in what language you want to use?	No preference. Version does not play a role.	
17	10/17/18	10/19/18	Are you looking to report off of this solution and then export it back into a SQL database or flat files? (Ex. Export a Power BI to flat files or back into a database).	Solution should provide the ability to export data to flat files, (for example, Excel). However, there will be no need for export of data back into a database.	
18	10/17/18	10/19/18	Does executing data extracts and queries at predefined times and by business events mean scheduled jobs for alerting? We need more specifics around this. (what would be some examples of conditions or events)	Yes – that is one anticipated use case. Tool should provide alerts to defined users when KPI exceeds a threshold.	
19	10/17/18	10/19/18	Free view-only licensing will not work in an Azure model for Power BI reporting unless you are doing a publish to web which will not adhere to the requirements of row level security and will have no security for viewing the data. Anyone who can hit the website publicly will be able to see it.	Acknowledged. ***Seller should indicate in their proposal, how this will be addressed in the proposed solution.***	
20	10/17/18	10/19/18	What kind of task automation are you looking for in using macros or small applications?	Management of repetitive tasks is desirable. For example, automated generation and distribution of reports.	
21	10/22/18	10/24/18	Thank you for providing the answers to our questions. As of right now we only have one additional. In the consideration of timing, could you please extend the due date an additional two weeks in order for us to ensure the most comprehensive response?	No.	
22	10/22/18	10/24/18	Is it the intent of the Port to continue to store the various data sources (i.e. SQL Server databases, flat files, etc.) "on premise" on their own internal servers regardless of the SaaS service?	Both.	

23	10/22/18	10/24/18	Related to above, is the Port's data center a cloud based service provider (i.e. Amazon Web Services, Microsoft Azure, etc.) or is it a locally hosted/administered data system?	We have both.	
24	10/22/18	10/24/18	Does the Port envision the dashboards being viewed/hosted within the Port's internal web domain (i.e. dashboards.tacomapower.com), via 3rd party SaaS Provider (i.e. dashboard.SaaSProvider.com, or via a custom domain (i.e. callitwhatyouwant.com)?	We have not made a determination. Preference will be given for flexibility.	
25	10/22/18	10/24/18	Is the port able to speak generally about the volume of data in the 25 data sources? (i.e. rows of data, approx. # of tables, size of databases, etc.)? Trying to get a general sense of scale…	We have several enterprise level systems of varying sizes, as well as smaller sub-systems.	
26	10/23/18	10/24/18	Is the Port of Tacoma looking for subscription licensing that is paid annually or perpetual licensing with annual maintenance?	Preference will be given for a SaaS solution.	
27	10/23/18	10/24/18	Of the 25 SQL data sources, can you provide an estimate on data source sizing (rows, columns, etc.)?	See response to Question #25 above.	
28	10/23/18	10/24/18	Does the purchase of licenses or services need to go through a GSA certified vendor?	No.	

29	10/24/18	10/26/18	The RFP states that you have multiple data sources. Can you disclose more information around this?
			What are the various sources?
			   o Can you list the database platforms?
			   o If flat files, what are the formats (excel, csv, text, etc.) and can the columns change?
			   o Are there any API calls (JSON, XML, and HTML)?
				Please see requirement #1 in Requirements Matrix beginning on page 19 of the RFP.	

30	10/24/18	10/26/18	What is the current or projected size of your data sources?	Please see Question #25.	
31	10/24/18	10/26/18	Will the reporting sources be read only or will users need to update or insert new data from the BI tool?	We anticipate that usage will be Read-Only.	

32	10/24/18	10/26/18	Do you have in-house business analyst that already know the backend data?	Yes.	
33	10/24/18	10/26/18	The RFP states that you are looking for reports, dashboards, and visualizations. • Do you have a defined number of reports? • Do you have a defined number of dashboards? ○ Can you disclose the granularity of the dashboards? ○ Will you need to drill down or drill through from the summary data? • Are you looking for any custom visualizations outside of typical graphs and charting?	We are looking for a tool that has these capabilities, which will be used by in-house resources to generate reports, dashboards, and visualizations. Please see Requirements Matrix which begins on Page 19 of the RFP. We are not looking to have any custom visualizations created for us.	
34	10/24/18	10/26/18	For visualizations, do you have any markups of what you are looking for as final product? If so, can you provide this information?	Not relevant. Please see Question #33.	
35	10/24/18	10/26/18	There are many avenues when defining predictive analytics. Can you better define what type of forecasting your looking to achieve? • Sales • Inventory	Please see the Data Exploration and Analysis sections of the Requirements Matrix that begins on Page 19. Seller should state the capabilities of its solution in the proposal.	
36	10/24/18	10/26/18	Can the solution backend span across multiple tools such as PowerBI, PowerApps, MS Flow, etc. as long everything is accessible from one front-end tool?	Preference will be given to the simplest solution that best meets the requirements.	

37	10/24/18	10/26/18	Do you have a defined timeline for a finish product or go live? Can we work in phases/implementations around an agile approach?	*No.* *We are looking for an existing solution or service that best meets the capabilities listed in the Requirements Matrix which begins on Page 19 of the RFP.* *The only services we are looking for initially are installation and configuration (if necessary) and then training for our technical staff.* *We anticipate that integration to data sources will be performed by Port resources after they have received the training services.* *We will evaluate the need for additional professional services after the initial implementation.* *A rate sheet for optional professional services should be included with your proposal as indicated in section D-2 of the RFP on page 5.*	
38	10/24/18	10/26/18	Does the BI Tool need to be mobile friendly?	Please see the Requirements Matrix that begins on Page 19 of the RFP.	
39	10/24/18	10/26/18	Do you have a current tool or software you use? If so, are you able to share it? This will help us identify some key pieces to include or they we may be able to expand on.	We do not currently have an enterprise BI Tool.	

40	10/24/18	10/26/18	Do we need to provide a help/reference section or data dictionary as part of the BI tool?	No. Please see Question #37.	
41	10/24/18	10/26/18	What is the anticipated budget/budget range for this project (both initially and for each of the subsequent years)?	We anticipate a range of $75K to $100K annually, for licensing and services, but it could potentially go higher depending on the licensing model or the capabilities of the solution proposed.	
42	10/24/18	10/26/18	Were solutions evaluated by NWSA/Port prior to the release of this RFP?	Some Port users have experience with some of the more common BI solutions, but we have not undertaken a formal solutions evaluation as an organization.	
43	10/24/18	10/26/18	Does NWSA/Port have an anticipated timeline for decision, award, installation/configuration, and go-live?	Decision and award are anticipated to occur in 2018. Installation/Configuration and Go Live are anticipated to occur no later than end of Q1 of 2019.	

44	10/24/18	10/26/18	Would NWSA/Port please provide details pertaining to potential use cases for the solution?
			    a. What types of reports would be created?
			    b. Please provide additional details on what functions would be needed for the types of users you identified (view-only vs. data analysts).
			    c. Requirement #43 asks about support for a free view-only licensing option. Are these "view-only" users the same as identified in Section D.2 Compensation? Are these considered "public" users or would their access need to be secured with a login?
				Please see Requirements Matrix beginning on Page 19 of the RFP.
				
				For part C of this question:
				
				• Yes, the "view-only" users are the same users as in Section D.2 Compensation.
				
				• We have both public and login-secured users.	

45	10/24/18	10/26/18	The RFP appears to be for a tools-only acquisition. Does NWSA/Port anticipate any assistance with development of applications, reports, etc.? If so, would this be sought after contract award?	This is correct. As indicated in part D.2, please include a rates sheet for optional consulting hours.	
46	10/24/18	10/26/18	It is our general practice that terms and conditions only be reviewed and negotiated upon being selected as the vendor of choice. We are open to reviewing terms and conditions at the time of contract award and our team will be available to have an open dialogue with your legal team so that we can best meet the requirements of NWSA/Port. Is this acceptable to NWSA/Port?	No, we want all proposers to propose using the same terms & conditions. Please follow the directions on pages 2-3 of RFP 83640. To do otherwise will not be responsive to the RFP requirements.	

47	10/24/18	10/26/18	As instructed in Section D.1 (p. 5) of the RFP, we will be providing our software license agreement with our proposal. We understand that certain terms and conditions included as part of the RFP may not be covered under the license agreement. While we do not agree to a blanket incorporation of the RFP or our proposal into the negotiated agreements, we will agree to incorporate particular portions of the RFP and proposal into the agreements on a case-by-case basis as discussed and agreed to by the parties and we agree to incorporate any applicable terms upon reasonable mutual agreement of the parties. Is this acceptable to NWSA/Port?	By submitting a proposal, you are agreeing to the incorporation of the RFP unless you have submitted alternate language which the Port has agreed to via published addendum. To do otherwise will not be responsive to the RFP requirements.	
48	10/24/18	10/26/18	NWSA/Port has put a "highly desirable" rating on vendors offering a SaaS solution. Would NWSA/Port please share some of the primary reasons a SaaS solution is preferred? What features/functionality of a SaaS solution are most desirable? Or is the requirement more around resources to support the software?	We prefer a SaaS solution for any new solutions that we acquire.	
49	10/24/18	10/26/18	If an on-premise solution is proposed, would the 2 system admins identified be the ones who could administer the software environment?	Yes.	
50	10/24/18	10/26/18	Please confirm that references are only to be provided if requested by NWSA/Port in subsequent stages?	Yes.	
51	10/24/18	10/26/18	For Attachment D, the instructions seem to indicate that comments are only to be included if the Proposer responds with codes other than "F;" would NWSA/Port please verify this or should comments be provided wherever proposers want to provide additional information?	For any item on the Requirements Matrix, you may provide additional comments for clarification, even if you responded with a code of "F".	
52	10/24/18	10/26/18	Who is the owner of this system? Port of Tacoma? Port of Seattle? Or is it legally the NORTHWEST SEAPORT ALLIANCE? 1.1. Who owns the data in the system? 1.2. Are you required to maintain security with DHS? DoD? Others?	Ownership is not relevant. Please see attachment F of the RFP. For a SaaS solution, we require that no data may reside outside of the continental United States.	

53	10/24/18	10/26/18	Which versions of Microsoft SQL Server are currently holding data to be migrated? If other operating and database systems are dependencies, please list them all.	No migration is necessary. Tool will connect with existing data resources.	
54	10/24/18	10/26/18	Which versions of Windows Server are hosting these databases?	Not relevant. Seller should state what versions its solution supports, as part of the proposal.	

55	10/24/18	10/26/18	Are both Tacoma and Seattle already using internet access from Level 3 CenturyLink?
			    1.1. Is the BYOD usage all via WiFi or public data networks?
			    1.2. Are all users already using endpoint security?
			        1.2.1. Who maintains the security?
			        1.2.2. Are any users outside the continental US?
			        1.2.3. Are any users non-US citizens?
				We do not experience this question as relevant.
				
				Please see question #37.	

56	10/24/18	10/26/18	The SSAE 18 audit standard superseded the SSAE 16 report, effective May 1, 2017. Are you sure you want SSAE 16? Given the cloud implications in this contract, we would suggest you reconsider this requirement. And since this has international implications and dependencies don't you want ISAE 3402 instead?	The Port of Tacoma will accept the new SSAE 18 reports.	
57	10/24/18	10/26/18	Regarding the NIST requirements in https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-53r4.pdf, is the defined security control baseline high, medium, or low? There are huge variations in cost and resources based on this answer.	**Response pending**	

58	10/24/18	10/26/18	Are all data sources considered public information?
			    1.1. If not, which ones are considered homeland security-rated, FedRAMP-, or DoD SRG-rated?
			    1.2. What are the levels of security for each data source?
			    1.3. Are any of these considered data sources that have secondary implied security requirements not spelled out in the RFP?
			        1.3.1. Coast Guard Maritime Information Exchange (CGMIX)
			        1.3.2. Coast Guard's Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) information system
			        1.3.3. USCG-Approved Equipment
			        1.3.4. USCG-Accepted Laboratories
			        1.3.5. Port State Information Exchange
			        1.3.6. Incident Investigation Reports
			        1.3.7. USCG Life Raft Servicing Facilities
			        1.3.8. MARPOL Certificates of Adequacy
			        1.3.9. Vessel Identification System
				All data and records are available to the public via a written public records request, except where prohibited by law.
				
				Items 1.1 thru 1.3.9 are not relevant.
				
				Please see Question #37.	

59	10/24/18	10/26/18	Can you please tell us for each of the 25 databases, who owns the copyright (Seattle or Tacoma), what are the security requirements for the data today as is, and what are the security requirements in the new system?	Copyright ownership is not relevant to this RFP. Please see Question #37. Please see the bullet titled, "Software License / SaaS Agreement" on page 5 of the RFP.	
60	10/24/18	10/26/18	What GIS is currently installed?	ArcGIS Version 10.4.1	
61	10/24/18	10/26/18	What data storage systems are being used?	Please see Requirements Matrix which begins on Page 19 of the RFP.	
62	10/24/18	10/26/18	Can you provide example datasets or example data formats for the necessary data in the application?	Not relevant. Please see Question #37.	

63	10/24/18	10/26/18	On Req# 39, can you define or provide an example of what a "frequently used task" is?	An example would be the routine generation and launch of cyclically used reports, dashboards, or visualizations that are available in the solution tool or service.	
64	10/26/18	10/26/18	Due Date revision.		**The due date of RFP 83640 Business Intelligence is updated to 11/7/18 @ 2:00PM PST**