

QUESTIONS & RESPONSES #02**CONTRACT NUMBER: 052026-1030****RFP/RFQ TITLE: Project Management Information
System (PMIS) Selection
Implementation, and Support Services
(2026)****CONTACT: Axa Turney, Sr Contracts Administrator****EMAIL: procurement@portoftacoma.com****PHONE NUMBER: 253-888-4768****QUESTIONS DUE DATE: August 11, 2026 @ 2:00 PM (PDT)****Q&A ISSUE DATE: August 18, 2026**

#	Question	Answer	Question #	Responsible for Answer
1	Your RFP states "The successful respondent may be precluded from competing for, or participating in, subsequent contracts that are the direct result of or primarily generated by, the work performed under the contract resulting from this procurement." Would the selected firm be able to pursue for example, Design, PMCM, or technology type projects? Is a timeframe (i.e., 5-10 years) that such preclusions would be in place. Is the preclusion only for Primes or does it also apply to subcontractors?	Please see addendum 01	Q-003936	Axa
2	Is the Port seeking a true software-agnostic PMIS evaluation, or does it have a preferred shortlist of platforms under consideration?	No platforms have been excluded from consideration	Q-003937	Kevin
3	Does the Port anticipate selecting a PMIS platform and implementation partner as a single procurement, or could software and implementation services be awarded separately?	We will consider proposals structured such that software licensing is purchased from the software vendor and the services are provided by an integration partner. We will also consider proposals from software providers which are also the solution implementer of their solution. We will not select select a partner unless they are an authorized partner of the software vendor.	Q-003937	Kevin
4	Is there a target implementation completion date or desired go-live window?	Q1 or Q2 2027	Q-003937	Kevin

5	Beyond the systems identified in the RFP, are there additional enterprise applications requiring integration or consideration (GIS, document management, procurement, permitting systems, BI platforms, etc.)?	Depending upon the architecture of the selected platform there could be a need to integrate with SharePoint for Document Management. Potential vendors should disclose if their applications require or if functionality is increased with a document management system integration, in our environment that is SharePoint. Integrating with other platforms is not identified for this initial implementation but the ability to deliver additional capabilities, enhance functionality, and increase value of an enterprise application ecosystem can be considered for future enhancements. It will be necessary to integrate with or into Microsoft Fabric platform but that is not a requirement. Prior experience is a bonus. We do not require integration to GIS, but would like to know if the proposed system has that option. We do not have a permitting system. We do not require integration to Bluebeam, but would like to know if the proposed system has that option. We do not require integration to our spec writing system SpecLink, but would like to know if the proposed system has that option.	Q-003937	Kevin
6	Has the Port already completed business process mapping or requirements gathering activities?	Requirements are attached to the RFP in the Fit/Gap Matrix. The engagement should include a requirements validation effort. Business process mapping has not been conducted	Q-003937	Kevin
7	Which Dynamics 365 modules will require integration (Finance, Procurement, Contracts, Budgeting, Project Operations, etc.)?	Finance and Operations	Q-003937	Kevin
8	Are existing SharePoint structures and metadata standards already established?	No	Q-003937	Kevin

9	Will migration include active projects only or both active and closed projects?	Active projects will only be migrated if they have substantial life remaining. Substantial to be defined depending on the active projects at the time migration happens. Some closed and non-migrated active projects may need to be included in reports for historical authorization, budget and transaction information that would come from the integrated financial system.	Q-003937	Kevin
10	Is the Port expecting migration directly from Trimble Unity Construct?	<i>No expectations exist. Proposals will inform how data from all sources will be migrated</i>	Q-003937	Kevin
11	What are the primary reasons for replacing Trimble Unity Construct (e-Builder)?	Replacing our current solution is not a foregone conclusion. The Port is considering how to support current and future PMIS needs.	Q-003948	Kevin
12	How important is Capital Investment Planning versus project execution?	Project execution is the priority.	Q-003948	Norm
13	What are the ArcGIS integration requirements?	We do not require integration to GIS, but would like to know if the proposed system has that option.	Q-003948	Kevin
14	What is the expected integration architecture with Dynamics 365?	Messages delivered to an Azure Service Bus for processing based off of events. Two way integrations are not necessarily out of scope.	Q-003948	Kevin
15	What is the scope of data migration?	Active projects will only be migrated if they have substantial life remaining. Substantial to be defined depending on the active projects at the time migration happens. Some closed and non-migrated active projects may need to be included in reports for historical authorization, budget and transaction information that would come from the integrated financial system.	Q-003948	Kevin
16	What vendor portal capabilities are required at go-live?	All	Q-003948	
17	What is the expected breakdown of the 150 users (intern/external)?	50/100	Q-003948	
18	Which capabilities are mandatory for Phase 1 go-live?	All requirements in the Fit/Gap Matrix are required for Day 1. Respondants may propose a phased approach to be considered.	Q-003948	Kevin
19	What implementation timeline is expected?	Please see question 04	Q-003948	Axa
20	What criteria will distinguish vendors beyond Fit/Gap compliance?	Satisfying requirements by Out of the Box and Configured functionality is preferred. Elaboration describing development and 3rd party engagement (required in the Fit/Gap Matrix) will contribute to our evaluation.	Q-003948	Kevin
21	Section 26 Deliverables seems incomplete "All deliverables fully defined in this Agreement." Can you provide clarification to ensure that Client will not have any unwanted claims for ownership of the consultants information.	This indicates that all deliverables outlined in the Agreement are fully defined in Section D.	Q-003950	Axa

22	For the RFP submission on PMIS Fit Gap Matrix. Do we answer with an X or do we need to add the corresponding letter to each row/column? The instructions page makes it sound like if you are answering the question in column G, that you should mark that with a G, instead of an X. Just wanted clarification.	Indicate with 'X' in the appropriate column (<u>only 1 'X' per requirement row</u>): G - Out of the Box H - Config Needed I - Customization Needed (Elaboration Required) J - 3rd Party Needed (Elaboration Required) K - Gap (No Solution) Provide all remarks and elaboration in column M - Notes/Elaboration	Q-003952	Kevin
23	What is the Asset Management platform currently being used?	Maximo	Q-003961	Kevin
24	Section B – Background: need clarification that Port will be open to reviewing vendor's suggestions for additions or changes to the Standard Terms and Conditions provided (Attachment B).	Yes, will be open to review vendor's suggestions of T&C's during the question period. Please submit redline T&C's to email at top of procurement.	Q-003961	Axa
25	What specific goals does Port have for this new PMIS? Costs, features, vendor relations, etc. Should we assume "Fit Gap" requirements are indicative of the missing services in the current solution?	Refer to the Fit/Gap Matrix	Q-003961	Kevin
26	Which vendors have been previously interviewed or held demonstration with the Port in the last 2 years?	Trimble, Procure, Kahuna	Q-003961	Kevin
27	Was a consulting firm involved in developing the RFP? If so, which one?	No	Q-003961	Kevin
28	Is there a budget for this solution? If so, can you provide a breakdown between software and services?	Budget will be informed by proposals	Q-003961	Kevin
29	Is eBuilder a possible solution or will Port definitely replace eBuilder?	Please see question 11	Q-003961	Kevin
30	Are other Trimble solutions being used by the Port?	No	Q-003961	Matt
31	Fit Gap #24 – detail use cases for "native connections to Azure services". Versus simply requiring open access to project information. Does Port want to monitor availability and system statistics directly?	Messages delivered to an Azure Service Bus for processing based off of events. Two way integrations are not necessarily out of scope.	Q-003961	Dave
32	Fit Gap #29 – does Port expect the sync between PMIS and Sharepoint to be interactive in real-time or as a final archive at project close-out?	Both	Q-003961	Dave
33	Fit Gap #32 – define specific use cases for integration with D365 CRM	Port is interested in exploring opportunities with this integration	Q-003961	Kevin
34	Fit Gap #35 – define specific use cases for integration with MS Teams	Port is interested in exploring opportunities with this integration	Q-003961	Kevin
35	Fit Gap #32-35 – confirm expectation for any integration should be "turn-key" with specific data exchanges as needed by Port? Or should vendors align software capabilities for integration as standalone. Does Port have IT resources available to build middleware with these supplied tools?	Messages delivered to an Azure Service Bus for processing based off of events. Two way integrations are not necessarily out of scope. Port resources are available to lead the specification and development. Port resources can be allocated to build the services, but this does not exclude the vendor from providing this service.	Q-003961	Dave
36	Fit Gap #41 – detail expectations for resource management (in Schedules only)?	To be discussed and considered during design phase	Q-003961	PMs

37	Please describe the key pain points or challenges with the current systems that the Port is seeking to address through this procurement, so proposers can align their solution approach accordingly.	Refer to the Fit/Gap Matrix	Q-003959	PMs
38	The RFP identifies Trimble Unity Construct as the incumbent PMIS. Please confirm whether it is the primary data migration source for Phase 3, and provide a high-level inventory of data types, record volumes, and formats expected to be migrated so proposers can accurately scope and price Phase 3.	Will be defined during design phase If needed, ask Teri	Q-003959	Dave
39	The RFP states a maximum total term of five years. Please confirm whether this five-year term is an absolute ceiling, or whether the Port may extend beyond five years through additional option periods or a new contract award.	Port service contracts are capped at five years, after which service engagements must follow the Port competitive bid process.	Q-003959	Matt
40	Please clarify the following regarding NWSA's role: (a) Will NWSA participate in the evaluation process? (b) Will NWSA be a named party to the contract, or is the Port the sole contracting entity? (c) Are there any NWSA-specific configuration or reporting requirements beyond those captured in the Fit/Gap Matrix?	a) Yes b) No they would not - this is a POT contract c) None known at this time	Q-003959	PMs
41	Requirement 25 identifies semantic model integration as Critical but defers the scope to the engagement phase. Please clarify the intended semantic model platform (e.g., Microsoft Fabric, Azure Analysis Services, Power BI dataset) and the expected integration pattern so proposers can assess feasibility and price accordingly.	Microsoft Fabric is the platform for hosting the semantic model layer. Messages delivered to an Azure Service Bus for processing based off of events. Two way integrations are not necessarily out of scope.	Q-003959	Dave
42	The RFP references Attachment X in several sections covering functional and non-functional requirements; however, the only such document provided is the Fit/Gap Matrix (Attachment E). Please confirm whether Attachment E is the sole document covering functional and non-functional requirements, or whether a separate Excel-based requirements matrix exists that should be provided to proposers.	Yes the Fit Gap is the sole document covering functional and non functional requirements.	Q-003959	Axa
43	Separately (administrative/format question): Given the scope and complexity of the requirements, please confirm whether the page limit specified for proposal submissions may be increased.	Port is upping the page limit to 15 pages. Please see addendum 02.	Q-003959	Axa
44	Does the Port expect the vendor to provide middleware to support the required integrations?	No	Q-003963	Dave
45	Section A (Purpose); Section C (Scope of Services): The RFP solicits a "subscription-based" PMIS together with implementation and support. Will the Port accept a proposal in which the PMIS is a commercially available (COTS/SaaS) platform licensed under the software publisher's standard subscription agreement, with the Proposer serving as the implementation and support integrator (and, if applicable, authorized reseller)? If so, must the software publisher be named as a sub-consultant/team member?	Yes; the software publisher need not be named as a sub-consultant/team member	Q-003964	Axa
46	Section C (Scope of Services); Section B (Background — current tools): The Port currently uses Trimble Unity Construct (formerly e-Builder) for project management, plus Dynamics 365, RIB SpecLink Cloud, and Microsoft 365. Does the Port intend the new PMIS to fully replace Trimble Unity Construct, or to coexist with it? Please identify which legacy systems are to be retired versus retained and integrated.	Please see question 05 for response to integrations One PMIS will be chosen through this process Port plans to retire no other current applications	Q-003964	Kevin
47	Section C; Phase 3 (Integration & Data Migration): Please confirm the required integrations at go-live and their direction (one-way vs. bi-directional): Dynamics 365 (ERP), Microsoft SharePoint (document archiving), Trimble Unity Construct, and RIB SpecLink Cloud. Which are must-have at go-live versus future phases, and will the Port furnish the necessary API access, licenses, and environments for each connected system?	This will be determined during the design phase.	Q-003964	Dave

48	Phase 3 (Integration & Data Migration, “as applicable”); Section B: Is data migration in scope, and if so from which source systems? Please provide approximate data volumes (record/document counts) and the number of years of historical data to be migrated, and whether migration of active projects only or full history is expected.	Yes: from Trimble Unity Construct; possibly D365 F&O depending on design	Q-003964	Kevin
49	Section B (≈150 internal and external users): Please provide a breakdown of the estimated 150 users between internal (Port/NWSA staff) and external (consultants/contractors), and indicate whether licensing should be modeled on named users or concurrent users. Do external/guest users require full or limited/read-only licenses?	50 internal, 100 external users External Users will need more than read only and will need to be able to take some action.	Q-003964	PMs
50	Section A (Interlocal Cooperation Act); Section B (Port and NWSA): Are NWSA users included within the ≈150-user estimate and licensed under this single contract, or would NWSA and other public agencies procure separately under the Interlocal Cooperative Purchasing provision? Should Proposers price only Port usage, or Port + NWSA?	NWSA users are part of the ≈150 users as well as external users (consultants and contractors) and will be licensed under a single contract. Proposers should price as a lump sum.	Q-003964	Axa
51	Section E, Item 4 (Compensation); Attachment C (Cost Breakdown Offer): Attachment C provides only an hourly-rate (Project Role) table and a per-deliverable Cost table, which do not accommodate recurring annual subscription/license fees. How does the Port want Proposers to present (a) one-time implementation costs, (b) the Year-1 subscription, and (c) recurring annual subscription/support fees for Years 2–5? May Proposers append a supplemental pricing schedule to Attachment C?	In the cost breakdown. Proposers may append a supplemental pricing schedule if needed.	Q-003964	Axa
52	Section A (3-year base, renewals to 5 years); Attachment B, §25 (Rates/CPI): Should the compensation submittal price all five years (three-year base plus two renewal years)? Attachment B §25 ties rate adjustments to the Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton CPI, adjusted no more than annually. Do subscription/support fee escalations for Years 2–5 fall under the same CPI cap, or may they follow the software publisher's standard uplift?	Prices should inform year 1 total cost of ownership Service rate should be for the project; future years follow CPI guidelines Subscription rates, which may be established by a separate software provider, should be provided for year 1 and beyond, with options for multi-year licensing for years 2-5	Q-003964	Matt
53	Section C (single Task Order); Section E, Item 2(b) (multiple task orders)Section C states the work will be performed “within a single Task Order,” while Section E, Item 2(b) asks for the approach to “scheduling and sequencing individual task orders” and “simultaneous services on multiple task orders.” Please clarify whether this engagement is a single Task Order or an IDIQ-style vehicle issuing multiple task orders.	The intent is to issue separate task orders aligned with the major phases of the project. It is expected that an initial task order will cover planning and design activities, with a subsequent task orders issued for implementation and support	Q-003964	Axa
54	Section E, Item 1(d) (recent contracts by key personnel): Item 1(d) states that only projects “completed by key members of the project team” will be considered. Will past-performance references from the proposed software publisher or a sub-consultant (i.e., projects not performed by the prime's key personnel) be considered and scored — for example, the PMIS product's implementation record at comparable ports/agencies?	References and project examples submitted for the proposed software publisher, authorized implementation partner, or key sub-consultants will be considered, provided those firms and individuals are identified as part of the proposed project team and will have a substantive role in delivery of the services.	Q-003964	Axa
55	Section E (10-page limit; appendices/resumes excluded); Item 3 (Fit/Gap); Item 1(a) (org chart): Please confirm which items are excluded from the 10 numbered pages. The RFP excludes the cover letter, compensation, and appendices, and resumes (1 page each). Are the Fit/Gap Matrix (Appendix E), the organizational chart, and the required conflict/claim disclosures also excluded from the 10-page count?	Yes, the Fit/Gap Matrix, the organizational chart, and the required conflict/claim disclosures are also excluded from the 10-page count.	Q-003965	Axa

56	Submittal Process (separate PDFs; 9 MB limit): Please confirm the complete set of separate files expected at submission (e.g., cover letter, technical proposal, compensation PDF, Fit/Gap PDF and XLS). May supporting materials such as the software publisher's subscription/SaaS agreement, SLA, and security documentation be submitted as additional appendices without counting against the page limit, and does the 9 MB cap apply per file or to the total submission?	Total submission is 9MB	Q-003965	Axa
57	Final Evaluation Phase, Item 1 (Vendor Cybersecurity Self-Evaluation): For a SaaS/COTS PMIS, should the Cybersecurity Self-Assessment address the software publisher's hosting environment (e.g., SOC 2 Type II, FedRAMP/StateRAMP, data residency, encryption) in addition to the Proposer's corporate security posture? Will existing third-party audit reports (e.g., SOC 2) be accepted as supporting evidence in lieu of re-answering equivalent questionnaire items?	Yes. For a SaaS/COTS solution, the Cybersecurity Self-Assessment should address both the Proposer's cybersecurity posture and the environment where the solution and our data will actually be hosted and managed. This includes applicable areas such as SOC 2 Type II, FedRAMP/StateRAMP, data residency, encryption, access controls, incident response, and vulnerability management. We will accept existing third-party audit reports, such as a current SOC 2 Type II report, as supporting evidence where they address the applicable requirements. We do not want vendors duplicating information that has already been independently assessed; however, the Proposer should identify which questionnaire items the supporting documentation addresses. We may also request additional information or clarification where the documentation does not fully address a requirement.	Q-003965	Kevin
58	Attachment B (Standard T&Cs), §6 (Custom Code and/or Custom Reports): Per Section B, we are identifying an onerous term. §6 states that custom code/custom reports created by the Consultant "shall be owned by" the Port, with source code to be delivered. For a subscription COTS/SaaS PMIS, the platform and its underlying source code are the software publisher's intellectual property and cannot be transferred. Will the Port revise §6 so that Port ownership applies to Port-specific data, reports, and configurations, while the platform, pre-existing IP, and product source code remain the publisher's property?	Please redline T&C's and send to the email at the top of procurement so legal can review redlines.	Q-003965	Axa
59	Attachment B, §29 (Warranties); Section C/Deliverables (Ongoing support model and SLA): Also identifying an onerous/conflicting term: §29 disclaims warranties (including data restoration), yet the scope requires an "Ongoing production support model and Service Level Agreement(s)." Will the Port accept the software publisher's standard SaaS SLA, uptime commitments, and support terms as governing the subscription (layered onto Attachment B), and how will conflicts between the publisher's EULA/SaaS terms and Attachment B be resolved?	Please redline T&C's and send to the email at the top of procurement so legal can review redlines.	Q-003965	Axa
60	Attachment B, §13 (Assignability) The no-assignment clause could prevent continuity of the subscription if the software publisher undergoes a merger, acquisition, or corporate reorganization. Will the Port permit assignment or novation of the subscription to a successor publisher entity upon written notice, so that the Port's access to the PMIS is not interrupted?	Please redline T&C's and send to the email at the top of procurement so legal can review redlines.	Q-003965	Axa

61	Attachment B, §20 (General Insurance) and §23 (Insurance limits): §23 specifies Commercial General Liability (\$1M/\$3M), Automobile (\$2M), and Professional Liability (\$2M, plus a 3-year tail), while §20 references cyber/technology risk without a stated limit. Please confirm the required limit for Cyber/Technology E&O coverage, and whether the software publisher (as a sub-consultant) must independently carry these limits or whether the prime's coverage is sufficient for the team.	Please redline T&C's and send to the email at the top of procurement so legal can review redlines.	Q-003965	Axa
62	Section A (Purpose — potential preclusion from subsequent contracts): Section A states the successful respondent "may be precluded from competing for, or participating in, subsequent contracts that are the direct result of or primarily generated by" this work. Please clarify the scope of this organizational-conflict-of-interest restriction: does it preclude the awardee (and its teaming partners) from bidding future Port/NWSA capital-project delivery, PMO, or construction-management work that uses the PMIS, and for what duration?	Please see addendum 01	Q-003965	Axa
63	Section C, Phase 2 (Configure PMIS environment(s)); Section B (M365/Dynamics 365 ecosystem): How many environments are required (e.g., production, test/UAT, training)? Is the PMIS expected to be vendor-hosted SaaS, hosted in the Port's Azure/Microsoft 365 tenant, or Port-hosted on-premises, given the existing Dynamics 365 and Microsoft 365 ecosystem?	We require three environments, Dev/Test, UAT, Production, with strong ALM processes. For hosting we prefer in this order: SaaS, Vendor Hosted SaaS, Port Azure hosted.	Q-003965	Dave
64	Section F. Deliverables Phase 3: How much data in type, sources, quality and quantity is to be migrated? Is SharePoint the only document repository used by project teams?	To be determined during design phase	Q-003965	Kevin
65	Are trainings intended to be in person or virtual?	In person, if practical, is preferred but not required.	Q-003967	Kevin
66	Will there be one big go-live or a phased approach for end-user onboarding? If there is a phased approach with multiple user onboardings, how many phases are planned?"	Would expect one go-live but can be discussed and negotiated	Q-003967	Kevin
67	What are the expectations for training materials? Live trainings, QRGs/job aids, videos, additional reference documents, etc?	Yes, any and all	Q-003967	PMs
68	How many processes are expected to use custom applications vs standard Kahua apps?	None	Q-003967	Dave
69	Will Elevos be involved in any post-implementation support (Phase 5)	N/A not sure what this is.	Q-003967	PMs
70	Has the Port shortlisted any PMIS platforms, or is product selection fully open?	No. A Product has not been chosen	Q-003968	Axa
71	Should the Fit/Gap Matrix and pricing cover one recommended PMIS, or may we propose multiple options?	Multiple options should be submitted in separate proposals	Q-003968	Axa
72	Will "Out of the Box" score higher than "Configuration," and how do "Gap" responses on Critical items affect scoring?	Out of the Box and Configuration will be scored similarly. Requirements marked Gap indicate that the requirement cannot be satisfied by the proposed solution	Q-003968	Kevin
73	What is the annual capital program size and active project volume? Future state volume of projects.	approximately 150 projects in general About \$60M annually in capital	Q-003968	PMs
74	What is the volume of historical data and documents expected to be migrated?	See question #09 See also answer to question #85	Q-003968	PMs
75	What are the key drivers or limitations prompting the Port to replace its current Trimble Unity Construct (e-Builder) system?	Please see question 11	Q-003968	Kevin
76	Can you share the organizational structure, governance structure, and key stakeholders for this engagement?	Will be shared at a later point of the process	Q-003968	Axa
77	Will the client be okay with our team using AI tools during the project, or are there any client-side constraints regarding the use of AI tools?	Can be an option, pending discussion and prior approval from the Port	Q-003968	Matt

78	Does the Port have any preferred technology vendors, existing strategic partnerships, enterprise architecture standards, cloud preferences, or integration requirements that should influence platform selection and solution design?	We standardize on Microsoft technologies.	Q-003968	Dave
79	In order to more accurately quote the training, consulting and license needs, please provide a high-level breakout of the users' roles. For example, how many users work in each of the following areas: How many work with cost management? How many work in field management? How many are officials and require read-only and/or ability to approve business processes? Approximately how many 3rd parties (Architects, Contractors, Consultants)?	Cost Management = prox 50 between PMs, Finance, Contracts; Field Management = prox 100 between PMs, Inspectors, external contractors; not sure what you mean by officials - Executives prox 5; External users prox 100	Q-003969	PMs
80	Please provide a list of any PMIS systems the Port has reviewed within the last 12 months?	Trimble Unity Construct; Procore; Kahuna	Q-003969	Kevin
81	Will the Port please consider increasing the proposal page limit from 10 pages to at least 30?	Port is upping the page limit to 15 pages. Please see addendum 02.	Q-003969	Axa
82	ID #41 on the fit/gap matrix states a requirement "Manage resources across all projects". What resources does the Port intend to track across the projects (labor, materials, equipment)?	To be discussed and considered during design phase	Q-003970	PMs
83	Section b) in the Project Approach Narrative on page 6 requests an approach to scheduling and sequencing individual task orders, but Section F. Deliverables states that the scope of services will be included in a single task order. Please confirm that the intent is to issue one single task order and no sequencing of individual task orders is required.	Please see question 43	Q-003970	Axa
84	Can the Port confirm its estimated annual spend for each year of the potential 5-year contract?	To be informed by proposals	Q-003970	Kevin
85	What is the projected volume of projects to be migrated from e-Builder? Will the scope include migrating data, files (attachments), or both?	Depends on whether or not we want historical data. There are over 800 "projects" in eBuilder currently. In the past we made a determination of which projects to migrate based on where in the life cycle it was, relevance to other projects, historical significance, etc. Currently there are just under 100 projects the Engineering team is managing in eBuilder.	Q-003970	PMs
86	Is there an existing API interface, middleware platform, or integration layer available for D365 F&O that has already been implemented for other Port systems? If so, please describe it. Otherwise, should proposers assume a net-new (from-scratch) integration when developing their cost estimates and implementation approach?	Assume a net-new approach.	Q-003970	Dave
87	Is SharePoint expected to remain the system of record, with the PMIS synchronizing documents and data to it, or is the Port open to a PMIS-centric architecture where the PMIS serves as the primary repository and SharePoint functions as an archive, backup, or secondary document repository?	Sharepoint is the system of record. See question 32.	Q-003970	Dave