

QUESTIONS & RESPONSES #02
PROCUREMENT NUMBER: 072026-1047
RFP/RFQ TITLE: DATA CONSOLIDATION AND REPORTING SERVICES
CONTACT: Michelle Walker, Procurement Analyst
EMAIL: procurement@portoftacoma.com
PHONE NUMBER: 253-888-4744
QUESTIONS DUE DATE: Friday, September 11, 2026, @ 2:00 PM (PDT)
Q&A ISSUE DATE: 09/08/26

#	Question	Answer	Question #
1	Given that Attachment E (technical requirements) carries 25 of ~100 initial evaluation points, please provide the point allocation for the remaining ~75 points across price, past performance, staffing, and management approach so we can calibrate proposal emphasis.	RFP Section D Initial Evaluation Phase items (pages 6 and 7) indicates how the points are allocated for each evaluation category.	Email
2	Is award of the future implementation Task Order (the ~\$900K phase) contingent solely on satisfactory performance of the Assessment Task Order, or will it be independently competed/re-solicited among qualified vendors regardless of who performs the Assessment?	We intend to issue a single MSA to the firm/consultant selected in this procurement for the Assessment phase project and future phases/projects (Initial Implementation, Service/Support, Enhancement/Expansion) for the Data Consolidation and Reporting solution unless findings during the Assessment or subsequent phases do not support moving forward with the selected consultant.	Email
3	What Task Order contract type will govern the Assessment phase (firm-fixed-price, T&M, or cost-reimbursable), and is the same type anticipated for the implementation phase?	We prefer fixed-priced, milestone-based pricing for the Assessment and Initial Implementation phase projects. Future Task Orders may be T&M or fixed priced depending on the type of work: support or small enhancement work is more likely to be T&M where larger enhancement/expansion projects would likely be fixed price milestone-based or deliverables-based.	Email
4	Please identify the specific terminal operating systems (TOS) and EDI message standards (e.g., ANSI X12, UN/EDIFACT, specific transaction sets) currently in use across the Alliance's terminals that the solution must ingest.	Terminal Operating Systems (TOSs) currently used by terminal operators at NWSA terminals include Kaleris/Navis-N4, Tideworks-Mainsail, Cyberlogitec-Opus, as well as in-house TOSs that also utilize common EDI message standards. The transaction sets required would be those needed to meet the reporting requirements in Attachment E, Cell B11 and we would rely on the expertise of the selected consultant to determine what message types would be required.	Email
5	How many distinct terminal operating systems and data sources are in scope for the initial Assessment, and is that count expected to grow during the implementation phase or option years?	The NWSA currently has 5 international marine terminals. We do not anticipate the number of terminals to increase to more than 6 during the Initial Implementation.	Email
6	Please clarify the practical definition of 'near real-time' for cargo and vessel scheduling updates (e.g., target latency in minutes/seconds) so we can size the ingestion architecture appropriately.	Hourly update frequency is sufficient for the initial implementation.	Email

7	Is there an incumbent vendor currently providing data consolidation, reporting, or EDI translation services to the Port of Tacoma / NWSA, and if so, will that vendor be eligible to bid on this solicitation?	There is no incumbent for this solution/service. Since 2024, we have completed two limited scope proof-of-concept projects with two different vendors (CargoSprint/Advent eModal and Wabtec) to help us understand more about how to approach this solution. Both of those vendors are eligible to bid on this solicitation.	Email
8	The RFP states performance will be offsite, yet a TWIC credentialing clause is referenced — please clarify which project activities, if any, require physical access to secured terminal facilities, and who bears the cost/timeline burden of obtaining TWIC credentials for assigned personnel.	We anticipate that the majority of the services for this RFP can be delivered remotely. There may be occasions when in-person discussions would be beneficial. However, we do not anticipate that unescorted TWIC access will be required for the services being rendered for this procurement. Section 27c of the Terms and Conditions shall be removed.	Email
9	For the 15-page proposal limit, please confirm whether resumes, staffing charts, past performance references, and appendices are excluded from the page count, or must fit within the 15 pages alongside the technical narrative.	Attachments that we ask you to include with your proposal (Attachment D-Cost Breakdown Offer Template and Attachment E-Data Consolidation and Reporting Requirements) do not count toward the 15-page limit. Your project team resumes (up to 1 page per person) may also be Attachments to your proposal and will not count toward the 15-page limit.	Email
10	Is attendance at the September 4, 2026 Bidders Conference mandatory for proposal eligibility, and if so, is remote/virtual attendance an acceptable substitute for in-person presence?	The Bidder's Conference will be held virtually by Teams meeting, not in person. Attendance is not mandatory. Questions and answers discussed during the Bidder's Conference will be documented and posted to the Procurement page on the Port's website.	Email
11	Please specify the minimum cyber liability and professional liability insurance coverage amounts required, and confirm whether proof of coverage is required at proposal submission or only upon contract award.	In Terms & Conditions to the Master Service Agreement. 23.b.vi. vi. Cybersecurity Liability Insurance of not less than \$5,000,000 per claim and in the aggregate. Coverage shall include cyber-related risks, including theft, loss or misuse of data, release of private information as a result of a network breach, penetration, compromise, or loss of IT systems control, and shall include costs associated with incident response, forensic investigation, breach notification, and recovery, where applicable. Coverage shall remain in effect for the term of this Agreement plus three years. 23.b.ii. iii. Professional Liability of not less than \$4,000,000 per claim and in the aggregate. Coverage shall remain in effect for the term of this Agreement plus three years. Certificates of Insurance citing the contract and project number shall be provided to the Port Entities on an annual basis for each of the three years. Proof of coverage is required at contract execution prior to work.	Email

12	Given the strict prohibition on modifying the Port's Terms & Conditions, is there a formal mechanism during the Q&A period to request clarification or flag concerns about specific clauses without being deemed non-responsive?	Page 4-The Port Entities Standard Terms and Conditions are included in Attachment B to this RFP. By submitting a proposal, the Consultant represents that it has carefully read and agrees to be bound by the Port Entities Standard Terms and Conditions. Identify during the question submittal and response period, any sections you consider onerous, clarify why you consider these sections onerous, propose alternative language and describe why it is in the Port Entities' best interests to adopt the alternative language. If you have suggested revisions please submit a question requesting the change with why you consider the current wording onerous, propose alternative language, and describe why it is in the Port Entities' best interest.	Email
13	Will subcontractors or teaming partners providing specialized maritime/EDI domain expertise need to be identified by name and role in the initial proposal, or may they be added/substituted after Assessment award pending Alliance approval?	Subconsultants can be added by Consultant later but must be approved by the Port/NWSA prior to the Subconsultant performing services. See Attachment B-Section 2 of the Terms and Conditions (Subconsultant and Supplier Relations) for more details.	Email
14	Please clarify data and work-product ownership: will the Alliance retain full IP rights to custom-developed integration code and dashboards, or will the awarded vendor retain any rights to reusable components/frameworks?	See Attachment B-Section 6 of the Terms and Conditions (Custom Code and/or Custom Reports): Any custom code or custom reports requested by the Port Entities and written or otherwise created by the Consultant shall be owned by the Port Entities, but the Consultant shall retain the right to use and sell the custom code or custom reports in whole or in part. Note: The data ingested and aggregated as part of this solution cannot be re-used, sold, or monetized by the Consultant without written consent from the owner(s) of the data.	Email
15	What are the decision criteria and notice period the Alliance will use to exercise each of the five 1-year contract extension options, and is vendor performance re-evaluated at each option year or only at the initial 5-year mark?	The Port/NWSA may choose to extend the MSA beyond the initial 5 year term (up to 10 years total) if it is in the Port/NWSA's best interest. There is no pre-defined decision criteria but vendor performance will be a key factor.	Email
16	Can the experience requirements related to container terminal and maritime operations be satisfied through the experience and qualifications of a subcontractor or teaming partner?	Yes. Proposers may partner with subcontractors to augment their team and satisfy the experience requirements. Any subcontractors must be approved by the Port before performing work.	Bidder's Conference #1
17	Can the experience requirements related to container terminal and maritime operations be satisfied through the experience and qualifications of the proposed key personnel or consultants assigned to the project?	Yes. Experience of proposed key personnel, consultants, or subconsultants may be used. The Port's agreement will be with the prime consultant.	Bidder's Conference #2
18	Is it allowed to suggest offshore/nearshore resources for the services related to data ingestion and reporting.	Yes. The services are expected to be primarily capable of being performed remotely, although some in-person meetings may be helpful. Port data must be stored in U.S.-based data centers and may not be stored outside the United States.	Bidder's Conference #3

19	About Port entities - what type of operation they conduct and what are their current systems they run.	The project involves five international container terminals located in Tacoma and Seattle. Operations include loading and unloading container vessels and transferring containers to and from rail and trucks. The five terminals currently operate four different terminal operating systems. Although the systems differ, they generally use industry-standard EDI messaging.	Bidder's Conference #4
20	Are you expecting a commercial port community system that is "off the shelf"? Or are you looking to leverage your existing investments with companies like Microsoft + some custom development to finetune exactly to your needs without purchasing additional software?	The Port is primarily seeking a Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) solution rather than a solution developed and hosted internally. An existing commercial solution may be proposed. The focus of this procurement is specifically on data consolidation and reporting and not implementation of a full Port Community System.	Bidder's Conference #5
21	Will the Assessment Task Order be awarded to a single vendor, or more than one vendor?	The Port anticipates awarding one Master Services Agreement to a single vendor. The selected vendor is expected to perform the Assessment and, assuming successful completion of that phase, continue with the Initial Implementation and future enhancement and expansion work. The Port does not anticipate conducting a separate procurement for each phase.	Bidder's Conference #6
22	Since there are multiple TOS are you looking/expecting aggregation of such data based only at EDI alone or thinking about more comprehensive connections with the databases.	For the Initial Implementation, the primary focus is EDI and event-based data. The Port is looking to track events such as vessel discharge, gate-in, gate-out, rail-in, and rail-out. Additional message types or data sources may be considered as future requirements.	Bidder's Conference #7
23	Can you confirm if the Port has any existing or preferred technology platforms for the data consolidation solution, or is the vendor expected to recommend the technology stack as part of the Assessment.	The Port is not prescribing a specific technology stack. The proposed SaaS solution should provide appropriate access to summarized transactional data through APIs, such as REST or Graph-based APIs. Proposers should define their proposed API and technology approach.	Bidder's Conference #8
24	How soon after the MSA is awarded would the assessment start? this calendar year or after new year?	The Port would like the Assessment to begin as soon as possible following MSA award. If possible, the Assessment would begin during the current calendar year, with the goal of completing it early next year and beginning implementation thereafter.	Bidder's Conference #9
25	Can we use our team's (proposed staff) past experience from their previous projects to meet the required container terminal and maritime experience?	Yes. Relevant past maritime experience of the proposed staff may be considered and would be beneficial.	Bidder's Conference #10
26	Is there a baseline of data that the Port already aggregates today that terminal operators, rail, customs and the trucking community contribute for analytics and environmental assessment?	Yes. The Port currently receives operational metrics directly from the terminals through a largely manual process. Rail, customs, and trucking data are also received from various sources and may be incorporated into future phases. Terminal data has been collected for many years but is not currently received through an automated electronic process.	Bidder's Conference #11
27	Has any prior assessment or discovery work been done on this, and is there an incumbent doing any of it today?	Yes. The Port has conducted proof-of-concept efforts beginning in approximately 2023–2024 to better understand the data and reporting requirements and determine the appropriate technical approach. Those efforts helped demonstrate that EDI is a viable approach. There is currently no production solution and no incumbent vendor.	Bidder's Conference #12

28	"Attachment E lists EDI types 301, 309, 310, 315, 322, 350, 404, 417, and 418 as examples for the initial implementation. Will the Assessment phase be expected to produce a definitive, prioritized list of required EDI message types per terminal, or should proposers assume all listed types must be supported at go-live for all five terminals?"	The Port has not finalized the specific EDI message types required to produce the reporting identified in the requirements. The selected consultant will be expected to use its expertise during the Assessment to determine and finalize the EDI message types required for the Initial Implementation. The Port does not currently anticipate that every EDI type listed will necessarily be required at go-live.	Bidder's Conference #13
29	A follow up to my previous question about off the shelf software to add clarity, are you seeking a commercially available SaaS product that already contains the majority of the required functionality out-of-the-box? or are you open to a configurable SaaS data and analytics platform that would be tailored to your operational requirements? Follow up, would the Port consider a solution built on Microsoft-managed SaaS services for data integration, storage, governance, reporting, and analytics?	The Port is open to either approach. Proposers may offer an existing solution that already provides the required functionality or a configurable SaaS solution tailored to the Port's requirements. Microsoft-based solutions are acceptable. However, the Port is specifically seeking an externally hosted SaaS solution and does not intend to host the solution within its own Azure environment or internal technology infrastructure.	Bidder's Conference #14
30	"Requirement row 47 states all data must remain in US datacenters. Does this apply equally to raw/transactional EDI data received from terminal operators and to aggregated reporting data, or does the Port anticipate the third-party vendor handling the raw EDI data outside of Port-owned infrastructure with only the aggregated outputs subject to this requirement?"	All Port data must be stored in data centers located within the United States. Some incoming raw data may belong to terminal operators rather than the Port, so there may be flexibility regarding where certain raw data is processed. At a minimum, aggregated data and reporting provided to the Port must reside in U.S.-based data centers. Additional details may need to be evaluated during the Assessment project.	Bidder's Conference #15
31	You mentioned that hourly updates are sufficient for the initial implementation. Are there any specific use cases or operational requirements that would require real-time or near-real-time data?	Hourly updates are considered sufficient for the Initial Implementation. Future functionality, such as a shipper portal or customer track-and-trace capability, may benefit from or require real-time or near-real-time updates.	Bidder's Conference #16
32	"The RFP references the NWSA Port Community System (PCS), which already includes truck tracking, turn times, and queue times for the trucking community. Is it a requirement or expectation that the new Data Consolidation and Reporting solution integrate with or extend the existing PCS infrastructure, or should proposals treat this as a fully standalone platform?"	The proposed solution should be treated as a standalone platform. There is no current expectation that it integrate with the Port's existing in-house Port Community System. However, the solution should be flexible enough to ingest additional data sources, including data currently used within the PCS, as part of future phases.	Bidder's Conference #17
33	Please clarify whether prior maritime logistics or port experience is considered a mandatory qualification, or whether comparable experience delivering complex multi-stakeholder data integration and reporting solutions within transportation, logistics, supply chain, or other public-sector environments will also be considered relevant.	Maritime experience is desired and would be beneficial because it may help the consultant understand the Port's operational and reporting requirements, but it is not mandatory. Strong comparable experience in other relevant areas may also be considered.	Bidder's Conference #18
34	Attachment D states that the Initial Implementation estimate may increase by up to 20% following completion of the Assessment. Please confirm how newly identified requirements, additional interfaces/data sources, third-party licensing, or other conditions not reasonably identifiable at proposal submission will be handled if they result in an increase greater than 20%.	Proposers should provide the best estimate possible based on the high-level requirements currently available. If the Assessment identifies requirements or conditions that could not reasonably have been known at the time of proposal, the Port may address them through a change request, scope adjustment, or other mutually agreed approach. The Port's anticipated budget for the Initial Implementation is approximately \$900,000, and the project will need to remain within available funding.	Bidder's Conference #19

35	Please confirm whether the Port Entities will coordinate with the Marine Terminal Operators to provide timely access to technical SMEs, interface documentation, data samples, connectivity information, and required authorizations for the Assessment and Initial Implementation, or whether the selected Consultant will be responsible for independently obtaining these from each MTO.	The Port Entities will be responsible for initiating and coordinating the relationships with the Marine Terminal Operators. The selected Consultant will not be expected to independently obtain agreements or authorizations from each MTO or be solely responsible for the terminals' response timelines. Coordination will require partnership among the Port Entities, Consultant, and terminal operators.	Bidder's Conference #20
36	Assuming you have the dashboard and reporting tool delivered, are you looking to customize your own reporting formats and views over time? Is this understanding, correct?	Yes. Following establishment of baseline reporting, the Port expects some level of configurability and customization, including the ability for users to create their own views. Some of this functionality may be associated with future-state requirements.	Bidder's Conference #21
37	22.The Port/NWSA Notes for this requirement include "maps/geospatial visualizations" among the listed visualization examples. Could the Port Entities clarify the expected scope of geospatial capability for the Initial Implementation? Specifically: a. Is a map-based visualization expected as part of the initial set of reports/dashboards, or is it listed as an illustrative example of the visualization library the platform should support? b. If maps are in scope, what location data are anticipated as inputs (e.g., terminal/berth locations, inland rail ramps, vessel positions, gate or yard geometry), and would the Port Entities provide that spatial reference data, or is the Consultant expected to source it? c. Do the Port Entities maintain existing GIS data or an enterprise GIS platform that the solution would be expected to consume from or publish to, either in the Initial Implementation or as a future enhancement?	a. Geospatial visualizations are not a requirement for the initial implementation. b. Not in scope for initial implementation. But are something we would want to consider for a future enhancement or expansion. c. We do have an existing GIS platform (Esri)	Bidder's Conference #22
38	Based on your previous statement that the Port previously completed a proof of concept with Advent and Wabtec. Could you share the key findings, lessons learned, and any gaps that were identified during those efforts that should be considered by respondents?	The initial proof of concept evaluated whether existing terminal appointment-system data could provide the information needed for Port reporting. That approach did not provide the required data or data quality. A subsequent proof of concept evaluated EDI data from a terminal operating system using a limited number of EDI feeds and reports. That effort demonstrated that EDI feeds could provide the data required for the reports evaluated. The Port also learned that EDI feeds may vary by terminal and stakeholder, and not every feed will necessarily contain all required information. Coordination with terminal operators will therefore be important to determine what data is currently available and what changes or enhancements may be required.	Bidder's Conference #23
39	What specific capabilities or business outcomes remain unresolved today that the previous PoC efforts did not adequately address?	The most recent proof of concept was intentionally limited in scope. It included two EDI feeds, one terminal, and a small number of reports. The new solution will require a substantially broader implementation involving additional EDI message types, additional reporting requirements, and participation from all five international terminals.	Bidder's Conference #24

40	NWSA and the Port have stated estimated dollar amount budgeted for this effort - there is no "lowest bidder wins" concept but who scores highest on the evaluation.	The procurement will be evaluated on best value rather than lowest price. Approximately 80 points are allocated to capabilities and 20 points to cost. A team of business and IT representatives will evaluate capabilities, while Procurement will separately evaluate compensation. The Port may shortlist vendors for interviews unless there is a clear leading proposal based on the written submissions. The anticipated Assessment cost is approximately \$50,000 to \$100,000. The anticipated budget for the Initial Implementation is up to approximately \$900,000. Cost is a factor in the evaluation, but the lowest-priced proposal will not necessarily be selected.	Bidder's Conference #25
41	Looking to scalability - what are the total volumes you expect aggregating by the solution (throughput)?	In 2025, the five international terminals handled approximately 1.5 million container vessel lifts/moves. Each container movement may generate multiple associated events or EDI transactions, including movements into, out of, and within the terminal. Therefore, the total number of events or messages processed will be multiple times the annual number of container moves.	Bidder's Conference #26
42	When the shortlist comes out will the presentations be in person or virtual?	Virtual.	Bidder's Conference #27
43	Did either of the previous POCs result in technology, integrations, data models, interfaces, reports, or other components that the selected Consultant will be expected to reuse, integrate with, replace, or consider during the Assessment and Initial Implementation?	No. The Port is not retaining deliverables from the previous proof-of-concept efforts, and the selected Consultant will not be expected to reuse or integrate any components from those efforts.	Bidder's Conference #28
44	Page 4 of the RFP states that "Subscription Agreements (SaaS) shall be reviewed and approved in writing by Port Entities' Contracts, Risk Management, and General Counsel prior to execution." Could you please clarify whether the referenced SaaS Agreement is separate form?	No, the SaaS agreement will be the Vendor's form just reviewed and negotiated with Port Entities' prior to execution. (Page 4, Subscription Agreements (SaaS) shall be reviewed and approved in writing by Port Entities' Contracts, Risk Management, and General Counsel prior to execution)	Q-004093
45	Attachment B - Master Services Agreement (MSA) Template and Terms & Conditions, or if it is intended to be incorporated within the MSA framework?	The MSA Terms & Conditions are to be incorporated in the MSA. The time to ask for changes is during the question period of the procurement.	Q-004094
46	Additionally, should proposers anticipate any other agreements, terms, or contractual documents governing the assessment phase, implementation projects, or ongoing SaaS services beyond the SaaS Agreement and Attachment B MSA?	No, documents to be released from this Procurement are: 1) MSA w/Terms & Conditions in Attach B (Page 4, Submitted proposals must incorporate all agreed upon terms and conditions without any exceptions or changes. Response submittal is agreement to the Contract without any exceptions). 2) SaaS Agreement as needed (Page 4, Subscription Agreements (SaaS) shall be reviewed and approved in writing by Port Entities' Contracts, Risk Management, and General Counsel prior to execution). 3) Task Orders from MSA for each project (First TO is included in Proposal, and each additional TO will require a proposal from Vendor) 4) Purchase Agreement (Each TO will be released on a PO for invoicing purposes only)	Q-004095

47	Clarification on the complete set of contractual documents associated with this procurement would be greatly appreciated.	1) Cover Letter (Page 5) 2) Proposal with evaluation criteria (Page 6-7) 3) Cost Breakdown with evaluation criteria (Page 7) (Attach C-template) 4) Data Consolidation & Reporting Requirements (Attach E) 5) Cybersecurity Self-Assessment (online form - only those Shortlisted) 6) References (only if selected)	Q-004095
----	---	--	----------