

July 17, 2019

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
Right of Way & Real Estate IT System Services for NYSDOT  
Contract #C037856  
Questions and Answers**

**Q1:** Can you confirm attachments 5, 8 and 9 are post award and not required as part of the proposal?

**Ans:** *That is correct. Attachments 5, 8 & 9 are not required to be submitted with the proposal.*

**Q2:** Please specify the state's expectations as it relates to onsite work vs. off-site work? How much of each is acceptable?

**Ans:** *NYSDOT is open to options to facilitate service delivery and reduce the cost of such service delivery with off-site work. However, it is still required for key personnel to be on site during delivery of more critical service items.*

**Q3:** Please clarify if NYS is also seeking a support and maintenance contract for this application or not and if so, should the pricing be included in this bid?

**Ans:** *NYSDOT is seeking maintenance and support with specific requirements in accordance with ATTACHMENT 23: SUPPORT & MAINTENANCE. The respondent's Technical proposal must specify the support and maintenance process with associated costs identified in ATTACHMENT 24: COST PROPOSAL.*

**Q4:** Please clarify if NYS is requiring a 90-day warranty and if they are requiring this is it in addition to a 1-year warranty?

**Ans:** *NYSDOT is requiring a 1-year warranty after go-live date.*

**Q5:** Will NYS DOT be willing to allow the vendor to move any data outside of NYS systems for conversion/migration efforts? If so, what constraints will be around this?

**Ans:** *Vendors are allowed to propose a data conversion and migration method which may involve systems outside the NYS systems that works best for their offered approach and is in the State's best interest to pursue. Section 4.9 Consultant Responsibilities specifies that the Respondent is responsible for complying with New York State Enterprise Information Security Office (EISO) which specifies Information Security Controls.*

**Q6:** Attachment 19, Req: PP1 – Needs to be updated to reflect new MWBE Goal of 19% (6%M/13%W).

**Ans:** *A corrected version of Attachment 19 will be provided for in Modification #3, dated July 17, 2019.*

**Q7:** C037856 Attachment 28 ITS Tech Svcs Overview Proj and App Lifecycle Standards (final).docx - This document outlines a standard NY project lifecycle approach with several deliverables that are more suited to custom development than a true COTS implementation.

- Is there flexibility for proposers to suggest a hybrid methodology, perhaps with a more Agile approach and deliverables that have been successful in previous COTS projects?

**Ans:** *Yes. Vendors are allowed to propose a development method (in their technical proposal) which works best for their offered approach and is in the State's best interest to pursue. For a proposed Agile method, NYSDOT expects to receive a proposed development plan defining the applied Agile method's schedule of deliverables.*

**Q8:** Attachment 23 Support and Maintenance.docx      A. Service Level Objectives -

- Can the State please clarify their definition of "Resolution" as it pertains to these service levels?
- If "Resolution" implies that the issue is fixed in the production environment, the State could be setting themselves up for a production code deployment no less than every 10 calendar days if Priority 3 issues are identified, which is not recommended.
- Alternatively, does "resolution" mean the issue has been logged, analyzed, and assigned to an upcoming scheduled release to either Test or Production?
- Note: We do understand Priority 1 and some Priority 2 issues may require an emergency patch release to Production as appropriate.

**Ans:** *Any code defect will remain open until fixed in the Production environment. NYSDOT may opt to bundle several fixes in a release package to manage the frequency of new code updates. Regarding Attachment 23 'Maximum Resolution Time', the definition of resolved is a fix is validated as resolving the defect in the NYS environment(s).*

**Q9:** Attachment 24 - Cost Proposal Workbook, Cost of Services Tab -

This worksheet contains a very rigid set of deliverables and payment milestones and precludes vendors from making any adjustments. Being confined to only 5 billable milestones over a 1-year implementation is highly unfavorable to vendor cashflow (especially 30% at very end), and does not allow recognition of other highly viable methodologies such as Agile, where iterative sprints of analysis, development and testing may improve project success and invite more frequent deliverables and payment points.

- If flexibility cannot be allowed for proposal submittal, will the State be open to optional deliverable and milestone approaches as part of negotiations with the successful vendor?

**Ans:** *No. The State has determined the payment schedule as it is written in the RFP and will not deviate from this schedule.*

**Q10:** Attachment 24 - Cost Proposal Workbook, Hardware Cost Tab - This tab indicates that hardware costs will be evaluated based on the NY State prices for the components proposed by the vendor.

- How will the State ensure that you are evaluating apples to apples environments, and avoid potential that vendors could deflate the specifications of the most optimal environment in order to reduce their evaluated costs?

***Ans: This is for information only and will not be evaluated or scored.***

**Q11: Attachment 27- ITS Design Experience**

Attachment 27 - ITS Design Approach requires that "The bidder shall prepare, as a component of the response to this request for proposal, a 2-3page high-level Experience Design Plan which illustrates how the experience design activities will integrate with and inform other phases within the context of the project timeline." The RFP format (Section 5) does not require this attachment with submission.

- Where should Bidders provide our response to this attachment or is it not required at this time?"

***Ans: Acknowledgement, not a response, is required for this Attachment as it provides standards that must be met for any Web based application.***

**Q12: Attachment 20- OITS Technology Standards Overview, IT1, Page 4**

Attachment 20, IT1 states "The Proposer shall describe how their proposed XXXXX solution will fit into the overall infrastructure and architecture requirements of NYS IT systems defined in this Attachment 3A," but there is no Attachment 3A.

- Please confirm that this is a typo and the referenced document is Attachment 20.

***Ans: That is correct. The referenced document is Attachment 20. A corrected version of Attachment 20 will be provided for in Modification #3, dated July 17, 2019.***

**Q13: ROW RE RFP and Attachment 19, etc, Section 5. Proposal Format and Contents, Page 27**  
Section 5 Proposal Format and Contents of the main RFP document outlines narrative requirements on page 27 such as "4. Approach, Scope, and Deliverables" and "5. Organization and Staffing". The requirements contained in these sections are, in many places, duplicated again in the later required Attachments. For example, 5. Organization and Staffing in the main RFP is almost exactly the same as Attachment 19 PP1, asking for an organizational chart, management plans, and estimated effort levels.

- So as not to confuse evaluators, should the response be supplied in the main RFP narrative and cross referenced in the individual attachments, or vice versa? Or should the information be duplicated and provided in both sections?

***Ans: NYSDOT prefers the use of the attachments, if applicable, for your response.***

**Q14: 03-C037856 Attachment 16 Functional Requirements (Final), Consultant Management, General -**

- Will the process of recording bid information include external users submitting data through a portal or will the DOT be entering the data?

**Ans:** *The functional requirements represent ‘what’ is needed in the solution, not ‘how’ that functionality shall be delivered. Proposed solutions should include ‘how’ the requirement to capture bid information will be met.*

**Q15:** Is NYSDOT interested in a subscription SaaS solution option where the vendor hosts the solution? We have provided SaaS subscriptions to other government agencies successfully which removes the burden of NYSDOT IT resources (both hardware and personnel)

**Ans:** *Any offered SaaS solution must conform with NYS Office of Information Technology Security policies. Any Cloud platforms offered must be FedRamp certified to be considered.*

**Q16:** Please confirm the correct estimated start date of the project. The pre-proposal slides, page 9 states “The Department estimates that the work for the successful consultant will commence on November 1, 2019.” - RFP states on page 1 – **Contract Award January 2020.**

**Ans:** *The Department is anticipating the start date for this contract will be November 1, 2019, however, Section 3.4 states that the contract will begin upon approval by the Office of the State Comptroller. The dates on Page 1 of the RFP are tentative dates after the Proposal due date of August 7, 2019; the date specified there is giving OSC the allotted 90 days to approve a contract.*

**Q17:** Licensing clarification request based on the information received during the pre-proposal meeting, slide # 19 “5. Please provide an expected user count break-down...”

**Ans:** *See Response to Question #18 below.*

**Q18:** What is the total number of read only users expected to cover the following statements. If the exact number is not known, please send an estimate of total users that are included in the following.

- "NYSDOT desires anyone in the department to have access to parts of its application data"
- "NYSDOT expects the OROW Specialists and read-only users will be able to use any of the Web, GIS and Mobile applications."
- "50 NYSDOT users with read only access"

**Ans:** *Web users: assume 200 DOT users and 80 DOT consultants annually entering data, up to 1,000 citizens annually accessing the system to submit and view application data and up to 50 DOT users with read only access;*

*GIS users: to be determined – for RFP purposes; assume 100;*

*Mobile users: assume 100 Right of Way Specialist entering data.*

*Please Note: NYSDOT expects that Office of Right of Way Specialists and Read-only users will use any of the Web, GIS and Mobile applications.*

**Q19:** Attachment 19: Project Plan Staffing, PP7. We have found that with today’s technical tools of phone conferences and screen sharing we can reduce total cost of the project by working together with NYSDOT to come up with a minimal onsite schedule. Please confirm we can

propose an alternative onsite schedule with our RFP response and still satisfy RFP responsiveness.

**Ans:** *See Response to Question #2 above.*

**Q20:** Attachment 23: Technical Proposal Response: Ongoing System Support, Maintenance and Enhancement Requirements. Please confirm reference to Attachment 17 should be a reference to Attachment 26.

**Ans:** *That is correct. The referenced document is Attachment 26, not Attachment 17. A corrected version of Attachment 23 - Technical Proposal Response: Ongoing System Support, Maintenance and Enhancement Requirements will be provided for in Modification #3, dated July 17, 2019.*

**Q21:** Attachment 27: ITS Experience Design Approach-CTO (Final). Section 'Experience Design Expertise', reference in this section "See Attachment: Proposed Experience Design Lead" not found in document or in other attachments. If required please supply.

**Ans:** *An updated version of Attachment 27: ITS Experience Design Approach, to address this question, has been provided for in Modification #3, dated July 17, 2019.*

**Q22:** Could the State please provide more information regarding the Data Conversion effort, such as:

- number of tables
- number of fields
- Size of data in legacy (in MBs and/or number of records)
- Number of documents to be migrated (or are they OK to stay where they are and we will migrate the indexes only)
- Size of document repository to be migrated (in MBs/GBs)

If at all possible a database schema for the Oracle staging database would be ideal.

**Ans:** *Specific details regarding the data and documents will be provided to the successful candidate after this contract is awarded as ongoing operations will continue to add to the current volumes. Interested parties are instructed to include, in their Technical proposal, a narrative description of their approach(es) to consuming legacy data held in a standard RDBMS and describe their approach(es) to integrating/linking legacy documents with their proposed solution.*

*Interested parties should also include expected level of effort labor estimates for consuming the data and linking the documents within the transition plan, data mapping, technical documentation, testing results, defect tracking, and corrective actions in the Cost of Services tab of their Cost proposal exhibit (Attachment 24)."*

**Q23:** This worksheet identifies a 12-month warranty:

- a. If vendors propose an implementation of less than or more than 1-year in duration should the warranty be prorated to maintain a total of 2-years of pre-maintenance implementation and support?

b. Warranties are typically offered to protect against "defects/bugs". Maintenance and support services include many additional benefits such as user support, proactive patches and/or upgrades, additional training options, support for analyzing and creating enhancement requests, etc.

Would the State be open to options to begin pro-rated Maintenance services concurrent with the Warranty?

c. In the RFP - Attachment 1 - Draft Contract - Section 15 sets an inconsistent warranty duration of 18 months. This section should be updated to the 12-month duration contemplated in this Cost Proposal Workbook.

**Ans:** *a. See response to Question #4 above.*

*b. Please refer to Attachment 23 – Support & maintenance which defines the difference between a defect and an enhancement.*

*c. See Response to Question #4 above.*

**Q24:** Is the new technology the state seeks created by the consultant (us), or are we purchasing existing technology and modifying it to fit the states' needs?

**Ans:** *The NYSDOT is seeking solutions that will support all the requirements included in this RFP. How that solution is designed/delivered shall be included in the respondent's Technical proposal. COTS solutions are preferred.*

**Q25:** Please confirm that 11x17 size pages are allowed where appropriate?

**Ans:** *Yes. 11" x 17" sized pages are allowed where appropriate.*

**Q26:** Please confirm that Attachments 1, 5, 8 and 9 are to be completed post award?

**Ans:** *That is correct. Attachments 1, 5, 8 & 9 are not required to be submitted with the proposal.*

**Q27:** The RFP requests responses by 8/7/19. Due to the change in the question and question response due dates, would the State consider adding a week to the due date in order to allow sufficient time to respond completely after receipt of all clarifications.

**Ans:** *No. The due date for Proposal responses shall remain the same.*

**Q28:** When formatting footers, should we utilize the titles on each of the attachment documents or the titles listed in the check list?

**Ans:** *It is at the Proposers discretion how to format the titles, footers, attachments, etc in their response.*

**Q29:** Amendment 2, Part II – Cost and Administrative Submittal, “One (1) original plus Three (3) Printed and Bound hard copies of Part II...” - Does NYSDOT have a preference for how to bind hard copies of Part II – Cost and Administrative Submittal?

**Ans:** *NYSDOT prefers to receive proposals bound in 3-ring binders.*

**Q30:** The table of contents has “Error! Bookmark not defined” for 4.10 Contingency Services and this section is indeed missing from the text. Did NYSDOT intend to include this section in the RFP?

**Ans:** *No. That section was removed.*

**Q31:** On page 4, in attachment 20 (Rqmt No. IT1 – Requirement Description System Technology Standards) – Would you clarify where it refers to attachment 3A, should it instead read attachment 20?

**Ans:** *See Response to Question #12 above.*

**Q32:** Page 26 of the RFP, Section 5 states that “...photographs, and illustrations (except for the organizational chart) are not to be included unless specifically required in this section.” Are screen shots of the COTS solution acceptable as illustrations assuming they are directly related to associated written text throughout the proposal?

**Ans:** *Yes. Screen shots and examples of existing solutions are welcome.*

**Q33:** Please confirm whether signing of sections II and III of Attachment #2 is only applicable to the prime consultant.

**Ans:** *Yes. That is correct.*

**Q34:** On page 27 of the RFP, you request Sections 4, 5, and 6. These sections significantly overlap with Attachments 18 through 23. Are you looking for a full narrative response for 4, 5, and 6 in addition to completing the Attachments, which would provide duplication of text and items such as the project schedule and Organizational Chart? Or would a brief narrative referencing the Attachments be sufficient?

**Ans:** *See response to Question #13 above.*

**Q35:** On Page 27 of the RFP, item 6 requests the respondent to provide a list of three (3) projects currently in progress and three (3) projects that have been completed in the last five (5) years. Then Attachment 18, Requirement Number ES3, Company Reference, asks for at least two (2) past relevant company projects.

a. Should ES3 actually correspond to item 6 and include each of the requested six (6) projects?

b. If not, then in item 6, does NYSDOT only require a list of the 6 (six) projects or is NYSDOT looking for more details about each of these projects?

c. For the 3 projects that are currently in progress, is it acceptable to include major enhancement (i.e. adding significant new modules / significant integration, etc.) projects for a completed system?

**Ans:** a. Yes.

b. *The information provided for in ES3 should correspond with the items listed in Item 5.1.6 of the RFP.*

c. Yes.

**A corrected version of Attachment 18 – Technical Proposal Response: Firm Experience Requirements has been provided for in Modification #3, dated July 17, 2019.**

**Q36:** Page 63 of the RFP, Item 15, refers to an 18-month warranty period. Attachment 24 refers to a 12-month warranty period. Please confirm that Attachment 24 is correct.

**Ans:** *See Response to Question 4 above.*

**Q37:** Are other industry (non-transportation agency) company references acceptable? If so, will a Company Reference for a transportation agency (State DOTs, Transit Agencies) carry more weight than a non-transportation related (oil & gas, pipeline) project?

**Ans:** *Other industry (non-transportation) company references are acceptable and will carry the same weight as a transportation agency reference as long as the project experience is of similar scale and scope of this project.*

**Q38:** Please confirm that ‘meaningful participation’ may include, but is not limited to any of the following categories:

- Project management services
- Requirements gathering services
- Business and technical design services
- Software configuration and development services
- Testing services
- Documentation services
- Technical installation services
- HR / staffing services
- Product VAR sales services
- Training services
- Help desk services

**Ans:** *Meaningful participation is defined as providing commercially useful functions (CUF) or services as stated in Section 2.2 of the RFP.*

*Meaningful participation is when the firm(s) being utilized toward the goal controls all components of a business and is directly responsible for the execution of the work they are contracted to perform. The firm also carries out its responsibilities by actually performing, managing, and supervising the work involved.*



**Q39:** Please enumerate/identify any service categories that are not considered ‘meaningful participation’.

**Ans:** *All services categories lend themselves to “meaningful participation”*

**Q40:** Attachment 17, Section B (FileNet) – Will there be a preferred file format for generated documents or other content types (forms, maps, photos, documentation)? Also, is there any requirement for combining files into a single bundled document?

**Ans:** *Native file format is preferred (e.g., .doc, .docx, .tif, .txt, and .pdf). 2) There is no requirement to combine files. 3) The Metadata file repository will be designed as a coordinated effort between the selected Consultant, and the NYS ITS/NYSDOT Project Technical team.*

**Q41:** Attachment 17, Section G (Mobile Access) – Is there a specification on what functionality of the system should be made mobile-accessible? Is the consultant expected to gather requirements and to create functional specs for the mobile apps during the design phase? What platforms/devices are to be supported? Who would be the primary users?

**Ans:** *1) There is no specification for mobile functionality. 2) Yes, the selected Consultant shall be responsible to confirm functional requirements (gap analysis) and create a functional spec during the design phase. 3) Mobile devices have not yet been selected, however, phones and tablets are expected. 4) Primary Users will be NYSDOT Right of Way Specialist entering and retrieving data.*

**Q42:** Attachment 17, Section H (Public Portal) – Does a public portal to integrate with already exist? If not, are there requirements and specs for this? Does the creation of the public portal fall under the Consultant’s responsibilities under this RFP?

**Ans:** *1) At this point, a Public Portal does not exist, however it is expected by the time of or after Contract Award that a Public Portal may be available for the Consultant to interface with. The selected Consultant will not responsible for development of a Public Portal. 2) Portal specifications are not available at this time. 3) The selected Consultant will not responsible for development of a Public Portal. Application web pages to support the Public Portal to fulfill the PRTL.01 and PRTL.02 requirements must comply with RFP Attachment 27 ‘ITS Experience Design Approach’.*

**Q43:** Attachment 19, Requirement No. PP7 (Key Project Staff Minimum Onsite Scheduling Requirements) – Can one person hold two key roles? For example, can the Technical Architect also be the Database Architect?

**Ans:** *One person can handle two key roles but it is preferred that there be one person for each role. The Proposer can propose one person for multiple roles, but will need to substantially justify how one resource can efficiently and effectively fulfill each assigned role without degrading scope, schedule, quality and budget.*

**Q44:** Attachment 21, Requirement No. DC1 – It states that the current OROW records will be made available in an Oracle Cloud repository. Is there a complete data model/documentation available for Summit? Vendor assumes that data conversion process will be done only for Summit data.

**Ans:** *Please see response to Question # 22 above.*

**Q45:** Attachment 21, Requirement No. DC2 – In what format(s) are the documents and map files referenced herein stored?

**Ans:** *Formats will be: .doc, .docx, .tif, .txt, and .pdf.*

**Q46:** Attachment 22, Requirement No. TA2 – Is the consultant expected to use OITS systems (ALM, Quality Center) etc. for all the Consultant's testing, or just for the areas where NYSDOT staff are to be involved in submitting issues?

**Ans:** *ITS systems for testing and scanning during the resulting implementation project shall be used as required per RFP Attachment 22. The Consultant is not responsible for providing these tools and should not offer these tools in any part of their proposal. It is expected that the selected Consultant will test any applications delivered prior to coming on site and may use tools of their choice to test the application prior to installation in the NYS Data Center. Once the application is installed in the NYS Data Center, NYSDOT and ITS will provide testing tools and work with the Consultant to conduct testing.*

**Q47:** Attachment 23, Section A (Service Level Objectives) –

- a. Who determines the level of defect prioritization/Severity, and what if the consultant has a different opinion? In case of a dispute as to the level of a System Defect, what procedure would be followed to resolve the assigned level of defect prioritization?
- b. Severity #1 defects may not be entirely due to the Consultant's own application, and may be due to deployment server changes/configurations by NYSDOT. Would the resolution time clock start when the defect is identified to be Consultant's responsibility alone?
- c. For Severity #1 defects, which may be an L1-support issue, same-day resolution time may be an overly aggressive goal for the Consultant to carry out. Would the existing processes for production environment access (for Consultants) permit such an aggressive resolution time? The same logic, scaled to Severity levels, applies to levels #2 and #3.
- d. What if contractor contends that a reported defect is actually an enhancement request? Is it acceptable to record a resolution as "Enhancement logged and pending funding authorization"?
- e. NYSDOT defined 4 environments (development, test, QA, and production), as well as a process for moving implementations and presumably changes through them. When resolving defects, is there an expedited deployment process to work through these 4 environments and the associated testing? Without this, it is difficult to envision proceeding through the specified process in 1, 2, or even 10 days depending on resources

available from the NYS hosting center, meaning it might not be possible to meet contractual resolution requirements for Severity levels #1 and #2, and possibly even #3.

**Ans:** *In general, NYSDOT notes that the RFP Attachment #23 SLO's do not apply during the development and implementation phases. The SLO's and defect remediation processes start after the system is live and deployed to users. More specific answers follow:*

- a. The SLAs provided in Attachment 23 are NYS ITS Standard definitions. If, after following defect triage, the Severity Level is under dispute, the defect can be reviewed with the NYSDOT Application Owners to determine if a change to the Severity is warranted.*
- b. The resolution time starts upon notification to the appropriate responsible party.*
- c. Severity 1 defects are managed by a 'Incident Manager' where all involved groups and parties are and work to resolve the defect in a timely manner.*
- d. If defect analysis determines that the resolution is an enhancement, the resolution will be managed as a Project Change Request.*
- e. The required Deploy and Release process is described in RFP Attachment 26 and shall be used to manage code deployments and promotion across tiers.*

**Q48:** Attachment 25, Use Cases – Within the flow diagrams, there are references to several documents, such as ROW 353. Please provide a list of these documents corresponding the “ROW XXX” to the name of the document. In one instance “ROW ...” is shown, which does not indicate the number of documents that may need to be generated as part of the process. Are there any documents to be generated that are not reflected in the Use Cases?

**Ans:** *The standard forms (“ROW XXX”) included in the Use Cases Attachment represent examples of process documents associated with the Use Case. Many other forms are currently in use that are not generated in association with the included Use Cases. It is expected that many existing forms may be eliminated due to automation of currently manual processes; such new efficiencies will be determined by the proposed solution. Thus, a complete list of required forms is not available at this time as this expected to be determined during the Requirements phase of the implementation project.*

**Q49:** Please provide a list of the Reports that NYSDOT wants included in the system.

**Ans:** *Please see response to Question #48 above. As with “ROW XXX” forms, many existing reports are expected to be eliminated or reconfigured with a new solution. Definitions will be determined during the Requirements phase of the implementation project.*