

QUESTIONS & RESPONSES #04
CONTRACT NUMBER: 092026-1056
RFP/RFQ TITLE: Maximo Hosting and Support Services
CONTACT: Michelle Walker, Procurement Analyst
EMAIL: procurement@portoftacoma.com
PHONE NUMBER: 253-888-4744
QUESTIONS DUE DATE: Friday, October 16, 2026 @ 2:00 PM (PDT)
Q&A ISSUE DATE: 10/22/26

#	Question	Answer	Question #
001	How many instances are there?	We have two instances, Test and Production. We will want a Test environment readily available when we need to troubleshoot issues or test changes before promoting them to Production. The Test environment can be offline when not in use.	Q-004204
002	Are you migrating SQL to OpenShift or leaving it as is?	Port staff are not that knowledgeable with OpenShift. We use SQL today. We need to continue to access the database using Azure Data Factory for existing integrations and reporting. We assume that means we will need a SQL database for Maximo after migrating to MAS. We would look to the selected consultant to advise us in this area.	Q-004204
003	Where are doc links currently stored?	Most document attachments are stored on the Maximo server. We are open to migrating those to our SharePoint environment and replacing the attachment links in Maximo with URLs pointing to the documents in our SharePoint environment.	Q-004204
004	What modules are planned for use? Just manage or other? e.g. Health/Monitor/Predict	In the short-term we want to continue using what we are using today (Manage) and migrate to MAS. If our long-term direction is to stay with Maximo then we will implement other modules and capabilities. If our long-term direction is to migrate to D365 Supply Chain Management then we would not add additional capabilities to Maximo. Our long-term direction has not been finalized.	Q-004204
005	Are there plans to use Maximo Mobile?	See question 4. If our long-term direction is to stay with Maximo then we will implement Mobile as one of the first modules after migrating to MAS. But Mobile will not be rolled out to users until we have determined our long-term direction..	Q-004204
006	Are there any JAVA customizations or business objects in the /SMP folder?	No	Q-004204
007	What is the platform for OpenShift? Azure/AWS/On prem?	This will depend on the environment used by the selected hosting partner. As stated in the RFP, the Port does not intend to continue hosting our Maximo environment in our own Azure tenant. The Port will consider hosting providers that utilize major cloud environments.	Q-004204
008	What are the exact current Maximo 7.6.1.x version, database platform/version, add-ons, and customizations to migrate to Maximo Manage on MAS?	This information can be found in RFP Attachment D.	Q-004225
009	Will the bidder perform a full source assessment, including Integrity Checker remediation, and what are the data-quality acceptance criteria?	The Port will look to the selected consultant to advise on the steps required to perform a high-quality migration of our existing functionality, data, integrations, and reports to the MAS hosted environment while minimizing impact to our users. Your proposal should indicate how you would accomplish this.	Q-004225
010	Will all customizations, Java classes, XML, scripts, reports, and extensions be packaged, validated, remediated, and deployed?	Required steps to migrate our existing functionality, data, integrations, and reports to the MAS hosted environment will need to be performed by the selected support vendor and hosting provider. The Port will assist with User Acceptance Testing. Also, see Question 6.	Q-004225
011	What non-production environments are required, and who provides infrastructure, licenses, refreshes, access, and test ownership?	See RFP Attachment D and Question 1.	Q-004225
012	What OpenShift version, topology, hosting model, sizing, storage, networking, DNS, load balancing, certificates, and registry arrangements are acceptable?	We will look to the selected consultant and hosting provider to advise us on these items. See information in the RFP, including Attachment D.	Q-004225
013	Who owns the database engine, administration, patching, tuning, HA, backup, recovery, licensing, and costs?	As indicated in the RFP, the Port has 200 Maximo App Points licenses from IBM that we intend to continue using. Other environment hosting and administration costs would be managed by the selected hosting provider and/or support vendor.	Q-004225
014	What exact RTO/RPO targets and standby or failover model apply to MAS, Maximo, databases, storage, attachments, and integrations?	The RTO and RPO requirements defined in the RFP Attachment D are for the service, including all components required for the service to operate.	Q-004225

015	What disaster-recovery architecture and frequency of failover/restoration testing are expected?	Please share information on how your firm performs these activities for Maximo hosting in your proposal.	Q-004225																
016	What backup scope, retention, encryption, immutability, geographic replication, and restoration validation are required?	Please share information on how your firm performs these activities for Maximo hosting in your proposal.	Q-004225																
017	What identity and access model is required, including Entra ID/LDAP, SSO, MFA, privileged access, service accounts, role mapping, and user lifecycle?	We use Entra ID and require periodic MFA challenges. SSO for Maximo user logins is highly desired. We require privileged user access for users with elevated permissions. We use LDAP integration for user creation and deactivation in Maximo based on MS Security Group membership. We manage and assign roles in Maximo through the Maximo UI (not using role mapping currently). Continuing with this approach is acceptable. See also "User Authentication and Synchronization" section of RFP Attachment D.	Q-004225																
018	Which integrations must be migrated or rebuilt, and what interface SLAs apply?	See RFP Attachment D for integrations that we have today and uptime requirements.	Q-004225																
019	Do any integrations require direct database access? If so, which objects, accounts, volumes, and replacement approach apply?	See RFP Attachment D.	Q-004225																
020	Who owns MAS/Maximo upgrades, patching, vulnerability remediation, OpenShift updates, testing, rollback, scheduling, maintenance windows, and VM procurement?	The selected hosting provider and/or support vendor would own these items. You should indicate in your proposal how your firm(s) would cover these. See Initial Evaluation item #4b on page 8.	Q-004225																
021	What post-go-live support hours, severity definitions, SLAs, monitoring, capacity/performance, incident/change management, documentation, and IBM case ownership are required?	See RFP Scope of Services section C-2-b for high-level SLA requirements. Please share proposed SLA details in your proposal. The Port has a Change Approval Board that approves planned production changes. Support vendor will be authorized to coordinate on the Port's behalf with IBM on IBM support cases. The Port uses ServiceNow for incident/request ticket management and selected support vendor will be given access.	Q-004225																
022	What exact target MAS V9 version is expected?	As stated in the RFP, a recent stable version of MAS v9. We will look to the selected support vendor and/or hosting provider to advise us on the recommended version.	Q-004225																
023	Is Microsoft SQL Server mandatory, and what compatible version is required for MAS V9.x?	We will need a database server that will support our integration requirements. See RFP Attachment D. We would expect the selected consultant or hosting provider to advise on specific versions required.	Q-004225																
024	Please provide Production and Test infrastructure sizing, utilization, growth, users, transaction rates, integration volumes, and peak metrics.	TEST: There are only a few users that use the Test environment. Probably 3-5 people during testing and troubleshooting activities. PRODUCTION: There are approximately 20 leads/foremen that interact with Maximo daily to manage Work Orders, and Assets. We have 1 Planner/Asset Manager that plans PMs and manages Assets. We have 1 Admin that is backup for the Planner/Asset Manager and also audits labor entry records. We have a Storeroom staff of about 5 users managing Inventory items. There are 60 Maintenance crew members, the majority of those folks use paper printed Work Orders while out in the field and update labor hours and other information on the Work Orders at the end of their shift using 6 Kiosks. We last ran IBM's auditing script on 5/12/26 for the period from 11/1/24 --> 4/30/26. It shows 3 peak usage days, all in 2025. We expect our usage to remain similar in the near-term. Our peak usage time is around 3:00 PM PT, at day to evening shift change-over. Here is the output of that last script run: <table> <thead> <tr> <th>RECID</th><th>PEAKCC</th><th>PEAKDATE</th><th>TotalPoint</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>28</td><td>2025-01-28 14:53:23.517</td><td>145</td></tr> <tr> <td>2</td><td>25</td><td>2025-08-06 15:44:26.220</td><td>105</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>24</td><td>2025-03-10 14:33:04.093</td><td>130</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	RECID	PEAKCC	PEAKDATE	TotalPoint	1	28	2025-01-28 14:53:23.517	145	2	25	2025-08-06 15:44:26.220	105	3	24	2025-03-10 14:33:04.093	130	Q-004225
RECID	PEAKCC	PEAKDATE	TotalPoint																
1	28	2025-01-28 14:53:23.517	145																
2	25	2025-08-06 15:44:26.220	105																
3	24	2025-03-10 14:33:04.093	130																
025	Are Development, QA/UAT, performance, training, or DR environments required beyond Production and Test?	We anticipate that only Production and Test will be required.	Q-004225																
026	What architecture and connectivity mechanism must ADF use to access hosted MAS/database?	Direct database access is used today.	Q-004225																

027	Is direct database access mandatory for ADF, Power BI, Bartender, and Excel, or are supported API alternatives acceptable?	Direct database access is used today for these items. Direct database and APIs are both used today for integrations with D365. If direct database access is not an option for your proposed solution then you can propose alternative approaches. If API endpoints would need to be developed then you would need to develop those and include the development costs in your proposal for the MAS Migration project (Task Order 1).	Q-004225
028	Please provide the complete integration inventory, including frequency, volume, protocol, authentication, criticality, error handling, monitoring, and retry requirements.	Please see Addendum 1 which has added this information to the integration information in Appendix D of the RFP.	Q-004225
029	Please provide the inventory of automation scripts, Java customizations, BIRT reports, workflows, escalations, and other custom components.	We do not have any Java customizations, but there are some active custom workflows, BIRT reports, escalations, and automation scripts: Workflows = 10 BIRT reports = 11 Escalations = 13 Automation Scripts = 16	Q-004225
030	Is MAS compatibility remediation or redevelopment included in the fixed-price migration scope?	We would expect your proposal to assume a reasonable amount of effort for this, given your experience migrating other customers to MAS.	Q-004225
031	What data migration scope applies to historical data, attachments/Doclinks, audit history, exclusions, reconciliation tolerances, and acceptance criteria?	The selected Consultant would need to work with the Port to determine these items as part of initiating the migration project. See also Question 3.	Q-004225
032	What Production outage window is acceptable for final migration and cutover?	For planned outages, we typically try to schedule those to happen between 5:00 PM and 6:00 AM PT to avoid key shift change-over times.	Q-004225
033	For the 30-minute restoration SLA, is service restoration or permanent resolution required, and how are SLA events and exclusions defined?	SLA is for service restoration (impact to users is resolved). Share your SLA details in your proposal.	Q-004225
034	Please provide the previous 12 months of Production/Test ticket volumes by severity and type.	In the last 12 months, there were approximately 40 total tickets that our current Maximo support vendor helped with: 28 incidents, 7 service requests, and 6 problem tickets. The incidents consisted of 2 Critical, 9 High, 13 Moderate and 4 Low priority. There were also 3 outage tickets. Key issue areas included integrations, configuration, user administration, and system availability.	Q-004225
035	Please clarify the RACI between the Port, hosting provider, and support vendor for infrastructure, OpenShift, database, MAS, IBM Support, integrations, security, backup/DR, and upgrades.	The Port does not have dedicated Maximo support staff. We will need these to be covered by the hosting provider or the support vendor. You should indicate in your proposal how these will be covered. See Initial Evaluation item #4b on page 8.	Q-004225
036	Which services are included in the annual MAS hosting subscription, VM procurement/running costs, and Task Order 2 support fee?	If a hosting vendor and a support vendor are submitting a joint proposal, your proposal should indicate how these will be handled.	Q-004225
037	Is VM procurement for MAS hosting excluded from the stated MAS Hosting Subscription budget?	VM procurement would be included in the MAS Hosting Subscription costs.	Q-004225
038	Which cybersecurity and regulatory requirements are mandatory, and what evidence, assessment, notification, audit, insurance, and shared-responsibility obligations apply?	The Port is required to comply with U.S. Coast Guard cybersecurity regulations (33 CFR Part 101, Subpart F) and has adopted NIST CSF 2.0 to guide cybersecurity risk management. The selected solution must support these requirements and existing security controls. Vendors may be required to provide security documentation, assessments, audit evidence, incident notification procedures, and shared-responsibility details, as applicable. Insurance requirements are outlined in the Terms and Conditions in Attachment B of the RFP.	Q-004225
039	Is India based vendors allowed to bid for this RFP?	Yes, as long as requirements in the RFP are met.	Email
040	have you been working with a vendor to prepare teh RFP? would they be able to respond to this?	Our current Maximo support vendor is JFC and Associates. They did not help the Port write the RFP beyond answering technical questions we had when defining our requirements. They are eligible to respond to the RFP.	Bidders Conf
041	What mobile product is the Port presently using?	We are not currently using any mobile solution. See also Question 5.	Bidders Conf
042	Does the port have any specific security requirements?	See Question 38.	Bidders Conf
043	Migration complexity.. Can the Port provide a current inventory of Maximo customizations, automation scripts, integrations, reports, and other configurations requiring migration or remediation?	See Questions 28 and 29.	Bidders Conf
044	NIST requirements are in there then	See the National Institute of Standards and Technology website for the NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) 2.0 definition. The Port follows this framework. See also Question 38.	Bidders Conf
045	With the NIST and CG are you also being required to use a PIV authentication or CAC?	The Port does not currently utilize CAC.	Bidders Conf

046	Hosting architecture: Are there restrictions or preferences regarding the hosting provider's cloud infrastructure, network connectivity, database management?	The Port is open to solutions that utilize most major cloud hosting platforms from Google, Amazon, IBM, Microsoft, and others. For database, we use SQL Server today and access it directly using Azure Data Factory to support existing integrations and Power BI reporting. See Questions 7, 23, and 27	Bidders Conf
047	Common Access Card or smart card authentication	See Question 45.	Bidders Conf
048	Service restoration SLA: The RFP specifies a 30-minute production outage restoration requirement. Would the Port accept a tiered SLA distinguishing infrastructure availability from application or integration recovery, with defined recovery objectives?	Yes. The Port is open to considering a tiered SLA structure distinguishing between infrastructure availability, application-level outages, and integration recovery requirements.	Bidders Conf
049	200 app points i believe you guys have, they are concurrent as opposed to authorized or named users?	Yes, concurrent App Point licenses.	Bidders Conf
050	Proposers must include the hosting provider's subscription (SaaS) agreement as an attachment. Please state the order of precedence among the RFP, addenda, the accepted proposal (including the Statements of Work and their stated assumptions), the Master Services Agreement, the Hosting Subscription Agreement, and the hosting provider's SaaS agreement, including which document controls conflicts on liability, indemnity, insurance, records, termination, and service levels.	Per Terms & Conditions # 30 attached to RFP. ☐ Order of Precedence For the avoidance of doubt, in the event there are Statements of Work, Task Orders, Purchase Orders and/or Exhibits and Attachments to this Agreement, the order of precedence in event of conflict shall be: (1) Terms & Conditions of this Agreement; (2) Statement of Work; (3) Task Order; (4) Exhibits.	Q-004254
051	Please confirm which items are excluded from the 15-page proposal body limit: the cover letter, table of contents, section dividers, resumes, project profiles, reference forms, tables and figures (and whether the 10-point minimum font applies within tables and figures), the 18-area responsibility matrix, the two Statements of Work, the hosting provider's SaaS agreement, and cybersecurity or other supporting exhibits. Is the responsibility matrix expected within the Production Support Statement of Work attachment? Does the 20 MB limit apply to the combined submission, including the separate compensation PDF?	The following requested attachments will not count toward the 15-page limit for the proposal: - Eval Criteria 1: Subscription/SaaS Agreement - Eval Criteria 2: Optional resumes of up to 1 page per person - Eval Criteria 3: Task Order 1 SoW (MAS Migration Project) - Eval Criteria 4: Task Order 2 SoW (Production Support) - Eval Criteria 4: Responsibility matrix/table - Eval Criteria 5: Separate Compensation attachment PDF File size limit is a technical limit on upload size on our procurement portal. You may provide requested attachments as separate files if you get a file size limit error when uploading them to the portal. The 10-point font size limit is for the main proposal body so we can make sure it easy for evaluators to read. You may use a smaller than 10-point font within tables and figures as long as we can easily read it.	Q-004254
052	May proposers add rows or supplemental schedules to Attachment E (for example, subscription components, Task Order 1 milestone allocations, optional services, and rates by role)? Should Washington State sales tax be shown as a separate line, and which components does the Port consider taxable?	You may add additional lines to the tables in Attachment E to show the itemized cost breakdown. Costs should be exclusive of sales tax (do not include it in your cost breakdown). The Port uses the RCW to determine what is taxable. Total costs and blended hourly rate will be used when scoring the Compensation component of the RFP. Including optional services costs in the proposal could negatively impact overall score.	Q-004254
053	Are the fixed, fully burdened rates in Attachment E required to remain unchanged through all renewal years to the six-year maximum, or may a proposer state an annual escalation (for example, a named published index) for renewal years and for future task orders? How would the proposed escalation be evaluated?	Subscription costs and rates may escalate annually based on CPI.	Q-004254
054	Several Port-owned systems connect to Maximo today (ADF pipelines, Power BI datasets, Bartender label templates, Excel connections, and RIS). For the hosted environment, who is responsible for re-pointing, modifying, and revalidating those Port-owned components: the proposer under Task Order 1, or the Port? If the proposer's fixed price must include this work, please identify any components that are excluded.	The Port will own re-pointing and testing the Port-owned components in coordination with the selected Maximo support vendor, who will own the Maximo side of the integrations. The Port, selected Maximo support vendor/selected MAS hosting provider, and the Port's D365 support vendor will need to collaborate on the end-to-end testing of the migration and integrations.	Q-004254

055	Please identify any blackout periods or operational constraints affecting the Task Order 1 schedule (for example, fiscal year-end close, peak operating periods, or holiday freezes), and confirm that the expected migration completion in the second quarter of 2027 remains the target.	We have limited ability to make production changes in November and December due to black-out for major holidays and we try to avoid production changes in January due to year-end accounting period. Target for completing the migration is still end of Q2 2027 but that is not a hard deadline and we have some flexibility to adjust if needed.	Q-004254
056	Does Task Order 2 begin at contract execution on December 18, 2026, or at MAS go-live? Is support of the current 7.6.1.3 environment between execution and cutover included in Task Order 2, and what transition assistance will the incumbent support provider be required to provide?	Task Order 2 would begin at contract execution and does include support of our existing 7.6.1.3 environment. Incumbent vendor will be available through Dec 31 to provide transition assistance if needed.	Q-004254
057	ADF / direct database access Can the Port confirm the required connectivity method for Azure Data Factory to the hosted MAS/database environment, including whether direct SQL access is mandatory or whether supported API, read-only, or reporting-database alternatives are acceptable?	See Question 27.	Q-004264
058	Complete integration inventory Can the Port provide the complete current integration inventory, including frequency, transaction volume, protocol, authentication method, business criticality, monitoring, error handling, and retry requirements for each interface?	Please see Addendum 1 which has added this information to the integration information in Appendix D of the RFP.	Q-004264
059	Customization/migration inventory Can the Port provide the current inventory of automation scripts, BIRT reports, workflows, escalations, scheduled jobs/cron tasks, database scripts, and other Maximo configurations that will require migration or compatibility assessment?	See Question 29.	Q-004264
060	Identity and access requirements Can the Port confirm its desired identity and access model for MAS, including SSO, MFA, Azure AD/Entra ID integration, service accounts, privileged access, role/group mapping, and automated user provisioning/deprovisioning?	Duplicate of question	Q-004264
061	Historical support ticket volumes Can the Port provide the previous 12 months of Production and Test support-ticket volumes by severity and general category, such as application, integration, access, reporting, performance, and configuration issues?	Duplicate of question	Q-004264
062	SQL Server licensing/database flexibility Will the selected hosting provider be expected to supply Microsoft SQL Server licensing within the hosting subscription, or will the Port provide existing licensing? If the proposed architecture supports the Port's integration requirements, would the Port also consider an alternative IBM-supported database platform?	The hosting provider should provide the DB server licensing. If an alternative DB platform will meet the Port's integration and reporting requirements then we would consider this. All development costs required for the Port to use alternative platforms should be included in your proposal (Task Order 1-MAS Migration).	Q-004264
063	Backup retention and DR testing Does the Port have required backup-retention periods and a required frequency for formal disaster-recovery/failover testing, or should the proposer recommend these based on the Port's stated RTO/RPO requirements?	Your proposal should include how you would meet the stated RTO/RPO requirements.	Q-004264
064	Task Order 2 support sizing / minor enhancements Does the Port have an expected number of included monthly support hours and/or a definition of what constitutes a "minor enhancement" under Task Order 2 versus work that should be handled through a separate Task Order?	The selected Consultant and the Port can jointly determine if a requested change would better be conducted as a separate Task Order. Typically, smaller/minor changes requiring less than 40 hours of effort would be done using the Production Support Task Order and billed hourly. Larger changes that would better be handled with Milestone-based billing would be handled as a separate authorized project Task Order. Also see Question 34 for recent support ticket volumes.	Q-004264
066	The response to published question 21 states that the Port uses ServiceNow for incident and request ticket management and that the selected support vendor will be given access. Please confirm whether the support vendor is expected to work tickets within the Port's ServiceNow instance as the system of record, and whether any integration between ServiceNow and the hosted MAS environment is expected.	The selected Support Vendor may use their own ticketing system for working tickets, but the Port's ServiceNow system is the system of record and must be updated when the request or incident are resolved. The Port's ServiceNow can trigger an email when tickets are assigned to the Support Vendor. The Support Vendor will have 1 or 2 accounts set up in the Port's ServiceNow system for updating tickets. We do not have any integration between Maximo and ServiceNow today and we do not anticipate any being required for the Hosted MAS environment.	Q-004263

067	The response to published question 3 states that most document attachments are stored on the Maximo server. Please confirm (a) the approximate total volume in GB and the number of files of Maximo attachments (doclinks) to be migrated or re-pointed, and (b) where any attachments not held on that server are stored. (Section C.2.a page 4; item 1g page 7; Attachment D page 30)	The "doclinks" folder on our Maximo server currently has about 49,000 files totaling 16.5 GB. In addition to the above Attachment files stored on the Maximo server, we have some (small volume) of URL attachments today on Maximo objects that point to our SharePoint environment. As stated in Question 3, we are open to having attachments stored in Maximo directly today migrated to the Port's SharePoint environment. We have not researched how this might happen but would look to the selected Consultant/Hosting Provider to recommend the approach.	Q-004263
068	The response to published question 3 states the Port is open to migrating document attachments to its SharePoint environment and replacing the links in Maximo with URLs pointing to SharePoint. Please confirm whether that migration is within the scope of Task Order 1, or whether attachments are to be carried into the hosted MAS environment with the SharePoint option considered separately at a later date. (Section E item 1g page 7)	We are open to either approach and would look to the selected Consultant and/or Hosting Provider to recommend how we should proceed. Regardless of which approach (copy files to MAS hosted environment or copy files to Port's SharePoint) the user-impact should be minimal (users must be able to access the attachments through Maximo and do things like print Work Orders with Attachments using Maximo Print option like they do today)	Q-004263
069	Please confirm that the Port, or its current Maximo support provider, will take and provide full SQL Server backups of the Maximo 7.6.1.3 Production database for migration rehearsals and for cutover. (Section C.2.a page 4; Attachment D page 27)	Yes, the Port DBA will provide this support since the current Maximo environment is hosted in our Azure cloud environment.	Q-004263
070	The response to published question 40 identifies JFC and Associates as the Port's current Maximo support vendor. Please confirm the period during which that provider will continue to support the existing EAM 7.6.1.3 environment, and whether knowledge-transfer from that provider will be available during Task Order 1. (Section B page 3; Section C.2 page 4)	Our contract with JFC and Associates expires on December 31, 2026. They will be available to support the current environment and assist with knowledge transfer until then. If required, we can consider offering an extension on this contract so they are available for a few more weeks.	Q-004263
071	Please confirm the measures the Port will use to define "acceptable performance" for the migrated MAS environment (for example response-time targets or named transactions). (Section C.2.a page 5)	We don't have a specific measurement defined, but we want our users to have a good experience. The performance of our current environment is good. The new environment should have performance that is similar so we don't negatively impact the productivity and user satisfaction of our staff using Maximo.	Q-004263
072	Please describe the current auto-login method used by the six labor-entry kiosks (for example a shared Maximo account, Windows authentication, or a stored browser credential), and confirm whether a separate named account per kiosk would be acceptable in the hosted MAS environment. (Attachment D page 29)	We use a shared Kiosk login and stored browser credentials passed in an encrypted URL. A separate named account per kiosk would be acceptable, however a single shared Kiosk login is preferred.	Q-004263
073	Please confirm whether the barcode scanners at the labor-entry kiosks enter the scanned value as keyboard input to the Maximo screen, or whether scanning relies on a barcode component installed within the Maximo application. (Attachment D page 29)	The barcode readers enter the scanned Work Order number value as keyboard input on the Maximo screen.	Q-004263
074	The response to published question 38 confirms the Port complies with 33 CFR Part 101 subpart F and has adopted NIST CSF 2.0. Please confirm the specific incident- and vulnerability-notification timeframes the Port will require of the hosting and support vendors. (Section E item 1e page 7)	The Port's incident notification requirements are defined in the resulting contract. Vendors will be required to notify the Port as soon as practicable and without unreasonable delay upon discovery of a confirmed or suspected cybersecurity incident. The solicitation does not establish a separate notification timeframe for vulnerabilities.	Q-004263
075	Please confirm whether the Vendor Cybersecurity Self-Assessment (Section E Final Evaluation Phase item 3) is available for review before proposal submission. (Section E Final Evaluation Phase page 10)	Yes. Vendors may review the Vendor Cybersecurity Self-Assessment questions prior to proposal submission. To avoid inadvertently initiating a workflow within the Port's system, vendors requesting advance review of the questions should submit a request through the Procurement Office. A copy of the questions will be provided for review.	Q-004263
076	Please confirm whether the Port expects to approve each vendor administrative session to the hosted MAS environment, and if so, whether a pre-authorized emergency access procedure for Priority 1 production outages is acceptable. (Section C.1 page 4; Section E Final Evaluation Phase item 3 page 10)	The selected Support Vendor will be authorized to act on the Port's behalf for Maximo administration. The Port does not intend to approve each individual login session.	Q-004263
077	Please confirm whether system access logs and administrative session recordings for the hosted environment are considered records subject to the six-year retention in Attachment B Section 5.b, or whether a shorter retention period applies to them. (Attachment B Section 5.b page 17; Section E Final Evaluation Phase item 3)	The six-year retention requirement in Attachment B Section 5.b applies to Maximo business records, such as work order, and service request records. System access logs and administrative session recordings are not subject to this requirement and may be retained in accordance with the vendor's standard operational and security logging practices.	Q-004263
078	For Critical issues, Section C.1 states "1 day resolution or acceptable work-around time" and Section C.2.b states "24-hour resolution or acceptable work-around time", each with 6:00 AM - 6:00 PM Pacific coverage. Please confirm whether the resolution clock runs in calendar hours or only within the 6:00 AM - 6:00 PM coverage window, and whether the two values are intended to be the same. (Section C.1 page 4; Section C.2.b page 5)	They are intended to be the same. A business day (calendar business day) is what is expected. For example: If an Incident is logged at 3:00 PM on Friday then a resolution or acceptable work-around is needed by 3:00 PM on Monday.	Q-004262

079	Please confirm whether the Service Level Expectations in Section C.1 and Section C.2.b are minimum requirements, and whether the Port expects service credits or other remedies for missed service levels. (Section C.1 page 4; Section C.2.b page 5; item 1c page 7)	The Port would expect some level of service credits when the uptime SLA is not met. Please include SLA details in your proposal.	Q-004262
080	Please confirm the measurement period for the 99.9% Production uptime requirement (for example monthly or annually) and whether scheduled maintenance performed during a pre-agreed window is excluded from the calculation. (Attachment D page 29)	The Port measures uptime monthly. Scheduled and approved maintenance outages are excluded from the calculation.	Q-004262
081	The response to published question 32 states that planned outages are typically scheduled between 5:00 PM and 6:00 AM PT. Please confirm whether a recurring weekly maintenance window within those hours is acceptable for routine patching and identify any periods (for example fiscal close or peak cargo seasons) during which the Port requires no planned changes. (Section C.1 page 4; Section C.2.b page 5)	A short planned weekly maintenance window within the evening hours is acceptable. See Question 55 for Production change black-out periods.	Q-004262
082	The response to published question 25 states that only Production and Test environments are anticipated, while Attachment D requires an 8-hour Recovery Time Objective with "full recovery to recovery site". Please confirm whether the standby capacity required to meet the stated RTO and RPO is expected to be included within the MAS Hosting Subscription, and whether the Port considers it an additional environment. (Attachment D page 29)	The Port anticipates that there will be two environments for our use (Test and Production). Your proposal should indicate what you propose for being able to meet the 8 hour RTO requirement.	Q-004262
083	The response to published question 49 confirms the Port's 200 App Points are concurrent licences. Please confirm (a) that they are MAS AppPoint entitlements eligible for deployment in a third-party hosting provider's environment under bring-your-own-licence terms, and (b) the entitlement term and the current IBM Subscription and Support end date. (Section C.1 page 4; Attachment D page 27; item 4b page 9)	Our licenses are MAS AppPoint entitlements. They are perpetual with no term length and allow BYOL to 3rd party hosting. The Subscription and Support end date is June 30, 2027.	Q-004262
084	For the requirement that the database be encrypted, please confirm whether the Port requires customer-managed encryption keys, or whether encryption keys managed by the hosting provider are acceptable. (Attachment D page 27)	Encryption keys managed by the hosting provider are acceptable.	Q-004262
085	Please confirm whether any SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS) reports currently read the Maximo database and, if so, whether they are expected to continue against the hosted MAS environment. (Attachment D pages 27-28)	Yes and yes.	Q-004262
086	The Attachment D diagram (page 30) shows "Material Receipt (WO)" and "Work Order Cost (PoT & NWSA)" interfaces that the Attachment D table does not list, and the table lists "Item Master Integration" and "Work Order Detail", which the diagram does not show. Please confirm whether these are four distinct interfaces or duplicate labels for the same flows. (Attachment D pages 27-30)	Please use the integrations identified in Attachment D for in-scope items. Integrations in the Diagram are referencing the same integrations but using slightly different names.	Q-004262
087	For the Azure Data Factory integrations described in Attachment D, please confirm whether Azure Data Factory connects to the Maximo database today through a self-hosted integration runtime in the Port's network or through an Azure-hosted integration runtime. (Attachment D pages 27-28)	Self-hosted integration runtime.	Q-004262
088	Please confirm the network locations (Port Azure, Port on-premises network, or both) from which Power BI (including any data gateway), BarTender and the Excel spreadsheets connect to the Maximo database today. (Attachment D pages 27-28)	Both	Q-004262
089	Please confirm how Dynamics 365 reaches the Maximo API for the Item Master and Inventory Adjustments integrations today (for example, directly from Dynamics 365, or through a Port-hosted service such as Azure Logic Apps or API Management). (Attachment D pages 27-28; diagram page 30)	Direct API call from the Port's D365 instance calling the Maximo API.	Q-004262
090	Attachment D describes publish channels and enterprise services exchanging data with "external SQL Server tables". Please confirm whether those interface tables reside in the Maximo database or in a separate database. (Attachment D page 27)	It is a separate Azure SQL database currently.	Q-004262
091	For the Project Master integration, please confirm whether the scheduled task that processes the file is the standard Maximo flat-file consumer cron task or a custom cron task or automation script, and the file format used. (Attachment D page 28)	Standard Maximo flat-file consumer cron task	Q-004262

092	For the Azure Data Factory jobs, Power BI reports, BarTender label queries and Excel spreadsheets that read from the Maximo database, please confirm (a) their approximate frequency and run duration, (b) whether Power BI uses scheduled import or DirectQuery, and (c) the data-currency each requires (for example current to the minute, within the hour, or daily). (Attachment D pages 27-28)	This varies by situation and these details will be worked out with the selected Consultant during the MAS Migration project. Please include a reasonable level of effort for these tasks in your proposal along with your assumptions.	Q-004262
093	Please confirm whether the Attachment D integrations and direct database connections are required for the Test environment after go-live, in addition to Production. (Attachment D page 27, page 29)	These will generally be required during business hours to support troubleshooting and testing of any changes before before being promoted to Production.	Q-004262
094	Attachment Storage (Attachment D; Q&A #3): Q&A #3 states the Port is open to moving attachments to SharePoint. Would the Port also accept storing attachments in secure cloud object storage within the hosted MAS environment (for example, S3-compatible storage supported natively by MAS Manage), with users continuing to attach documents through Maximo as they do today?	Yes	Q-004258
095	How many organizations, sites, storerooms and security groups are configured? The environment diagram shows work order cost for both PoT and NWSA – is NWSA configured as a separate organization or site in the same Maximo instance?	We have one Organization. We have 45 Sites. We have 67 Security Groups. PoT and NWSA are two different Legal Entities in our D365 environment but are the Maximo instance/Organization. In Maximo, PoT and NWSA are differentiated by the Company Code in the GL account string.	Q-004258
096	Attachment D summarizes the current integrations. To support accurate migration scoping, could the Port provide, for each integration, the MIF components used (object structures, enterprise services, publish channels and endpoints), ADF pipeline logic and interface-table mappings, flat-file layouts, run schedules, average and peak volumes, and current error-handling, retry and reconciliation practices? Are integration specifications and sample payloads available to proposers, or only to the selected vendor?	Some additional information has been added to the Integrations section of Attachment D via Addendum number 01 and via answers to questions in this Q&A document. Additional details will be shared with the selected Hosting Provider and Support Vendor during onboarding activities and initiation/discovery phase of the MAS Migration project. Please include reasonable estimates and document assumptions in your proposal based on your prior experience and information that we have provided.	Q-004258
097	Material Receipt (WO) (Attachment D, environment diagram p. 30): The environment diagram shows a “Material Receipt (WO)” integration from D365 to Maximo via API, which is not listed in the Attachment D integration table. Is this a separate integration in scope for migration?	See Question 86.	Q-004258
098	Complete Integration List (Attachment D): The “Item Master” integration is listed in the Attachment D table but does not appear in the environment diagram. Could the Port provide a complete list of integrations to be migrated?	See Question 86.	Q-004258
099	Interface Naming (Attachment D, environment diagram p. 30): Could the Port confirm that “Work Order Cost (PoT & NWSA)” in the diagram is the same interface as “Work Order Detail” in the table, and that “Project Data” is the same as “Project Master”?	See Question 86.	Q-004258
100	D365 API Access – Current DMZ Server (Attachment D, environment diagram p. 30): The environment diagram shows D365 F&O calling Maximo APIs through a DMZ application server (“DMZ server: App”) for the Inventory Adjustments (PO), Inventory Adjustments (Invoice) and Material Receipt (WO) integrations. Could the Port clarify what this DMZ server currently runs (for example, a Maximo application server/JVM, a reverse proxy or an API gateway), and confirm whether the Item Master integration listed in Attachment D uses the same path?	DMZ server host the Microsoft Recurring Integration Scheduler (See Attachment D table Integrations section). Item Master integration uses API (See Attachment D)	Q-004258
101	Internet-Facing API Endpoint (Attachment D, pp. 27–28 and p. 30; Section E.1.f): Once Maximo moves to a third-party hosted environment, D365 API calls will need to reach the hosting provider rather than the Port’s Azure tenant. Does Port security policy permit an internet-facing Maximo API endpoint on the hosted environment, secured with TLS, API authentication and IP allow-listing restricted to D365?	Yes	Q-004258
102	Private Routing (Attachment D; Section E.1.f): If not, must D365 traffic continue to pass through the Port’s network (for example, a Port-managed DMZ, reverse proxy or API gateway) and reach the hosted environment over private connectivity?	No. API traffic can go directly from D365 to Hosted MAS environment.	Q-004258
103	Are separate D365, ADF and RIS Test endpoints available so integrations can be connected to the hosted Test environment for migration rehearsals and UAT, separately from Production?	Yes	Q-004258

104	Attachment D requires ADF, BarTender and Excel in the Port's environment to continue accessing the Maximo database. Does the Port intend to establish site-to-site VPN, ExpressRoute or equivalent private connectivity to the hosting environment? Who is responsible for the Port-side firewall, routing, DNS and costs?	No. We prefer not to. These details can be discussed during project initiation of the MAS migration project.	Q-004258
105	Read-Only Database Access (Attachment D; Q&A #2, #46; related to pending Q&A #27): Q&A #2 and #46 confirm that ADF and Power BI access the SQL Server database directly today. In the hosted environment, would the Port accept connecting its read-only consumers (Power BI, BarTender, Excel and the ADF extracts for Work Order List and Work Order Detail) to a continuously replicated, read-only copy of the Production database, instead of the primary Production database? What data latency is acceptable for these consumers, for example near real-time or within a few minutes?	Yes. This is acceptable. Minutes of latency is sufficient. Pipelines are set to run between every 15 minutes to once every 24-hours depending on requirements.	Q-004258
106	Project Master File Integration (Attachment D, p. 28): Today, RIS places the Project Master file on a Maximo application server, and a Maximo scheduled task loads it every 5 minutes. Attachment D suggests a shared file location in the Port's Azure environment as one option and states the Port is open to other ideas. Would the Port be willing to deliver the file to a secure cloud storage location provided by the hosting provider (for example, an S3-compatible bucket), using ADF or the RIS host? Could the Port also confirm the file format (for example, pipe-delimited CSV) and whether the current scheduled task is a standard Maximo file-import cron task or a custom script?	Yes, as long as cybersecurity requirements are met for the chosen cloud storage. File format is pipe-delimited CSV. It is a standard Maximo file import.	Q-004258
107	Please confirm the method used to score Compensation (Section E item 5, page 9): the formula applied to 5a, 5b and 5c, and, for 5c.b (3 points), how the hourly rates across roles and business-hours / after-hours bands are combined for scoring.	5a & 5b Formula: Lowest total cost divided by a higher total cost multiplied by number of available points equals the cost factor evaluation points. Points will be rounded to two places to the right of the decimal point using standard rounding method. The Vendor with the lowest Total cost will receive the maximum allotted points for pricing. All other Vendors costs points will be proportionate to the most favorable pricing. The example calculation below shows that a Vendor whose cost is twice as much as the lowest proposed cost would receive only half of the maximum available points. Lowest Bidder Total Cost ÷ Other Bidder's Total Cost x Maximum Available Points = Awarded Cost Points. (\$100 ÷ \$200 x 70 points = 35 points) 5c: We will calculate monthly support costs for a hypothetical situation of 20 hours needed for a month. Formula would be: [Monthly Fee] + ([Hours in excess of what is provided in monthly fee] * [Average hourly rate]). Lowest total Monthly cost would get the most points.	Q-004261
108	For item 5a, please confirm whether the evaluated hosting price is the recurring annual cost or the "Total first year costs" on Attachment E including one-time onboarding costs, and whether onboarding costs are considered within the \$90,000-\$130,000 annual budget target. (Section A.1 page 2; Section C.1 page 4; item 5a page 9; Attachment E)	This should include the recurring annual costs and the one-time on-boarding costs that are not being included in the costs for Task Order 1:MAS Migration project (do not double-count the costs). Costs for Task Order 1 are separate from the hosting costs and not included in the annual hosting costs budget estimate.	Q-004261
109	If a Final Evaluation Phase is held, please confirm (a) how many proposers will be shortlisted; (b) whether Oral Presentations (100) and Best and Final Proposal (100) scores are added together; (c) what the Best and Final Proposal is scored on (price, revised technical content, or both); and (d) whether references are scored or pass/fail, given page 10 lists them as Pass/Fail and page 13 states reference scores are tallied. (Section E Final Evaluation Phase page 10; page 13)	a: To be determined. b: These will be scored individually c: To be determined. d: Pass/fail.	Q-004261
110	Please confirm whether sub-items a-g of criterion 1, a-d of criterion 2 and a-c of criterion 3 are individually weighted, and the scoring scale evaluators use per criterion. (Section E items 1-3, pages 7-8)	Evaluators will provide one score for the section. There are not individual scores for each sub-item.	Q-004261
111	Please confirm the number of references required, whether they must be for similar hosted-MAS or Maximo support services, whether public-sector references are required, and at which stage they will be requested (shortlist per page 10, or Intent to Award per Attachment F). (Section E Final Evaluation item 4 page 10; Attachment F page 31)	References, if required, will be requested from the Proposer selected at the Intent to Award stage.	Q-004261

112	Please confirm how the Port will communicate its acceptance or rejection of alternative MSA language proposed during the question period, and whether any accepted changes will be issued by addendum so that proposals may incorporate them without being considered altered or conditioned. (Section A pages 2-3; Section E page 7)	Submitted changes during the Question and Answer phase will be reviewed by legal and we will publish an addendum of accepted changes.	Q-004261
113	Please confirm whether the Attachment B MSA Terms and Conditions – including insurance (Section 24), indemnity (Section 19) and records (Section 5) – apply to the Maximo Hosting Subscription Agreement, or whether the hosting agreement will be governed by the subscription/SaaS agreement submitted under item 1a, as reviewed after intent to award. (Section A page 3; Section E page 7; item 1a; Attachment B)	MSA Terms and Conditions govern the insurance, indemnity and records sections and apply to the Subscription Agreement. See questions 50.	Q-004261
114	If the Attachment B Terms and Conditions apply to the Maximo Hosting Subscription Agreement, please confirm the order of precedence between those Terms and Conditions and the subscription/SaaS agreement submitted under item 1a, and whether service-level remedies stated in the subscription agreement (for example, service credits) may apply to its availability commitments. (Section A page 3; item 1a page 7; Attachment B Section 30)	See questions 50.	Q-004261
115	Attachment E requests "annual escalation, with formula and cap", Section E item 5 requires rates "valid throughout the contract period", and Attachment B Section 26.d.i ties rate adjustments to the CPI for the Tacoma area. Please confirm which governs hosting fees and hourly rates over the initial term and renewal options, and whether Attachment E is the "Rate Sheet" referenced in Attachment B Section 26.e. (item 5 page 9; Attachment E; Attachment B Sections 26.d-e pages 24-25)	For hosting fees, the Port prefers escalation by CPI annually, but is willing to consider other escalation formula/approach. Hourly rates can escalate annually by CPI.	Q-004261
116	Attachment E requests the Task Order 2 monthly fee "if required", while item 5c.a awards 2 points for the monthly fee and included hours. Please confirm whether a monthly fee is required for Task Order 2. (Section C.2.b page 5; item 5c page 9; Attachment E)	Monthly Fee + Hourly Rate or Hourly Rate without Monthly Fee are both acceptable approaches. Some vendors may require a monthly fee in order to be able to meet response time SLAs. See Question 107 for how this section will be scored.	Q-004261
117	Attachment E's hourly-rate table provides a single "Other (specify)" row. Please confirm whether proposers may add rows to specify more than one additional resource category (for example, support analyst and integration specialist), each with business-hours and after-hours rates. (Attachment E page 1)	Proposers may add rows. Scoring will use a blended (average) hourly rate.	Q-004261
118	Attachment B Section 24.b.ii requires Automobile Liability of \$2,000,000 and Section 28 addresses TWIC, while Section C states services are to be provided remotely with no travel required. Please confirm whether Automobile Liability and TWIC requirements apply where all services are delivered remotely. (Section C.1 page 4; Section C.2.a-b page 5; Attachment B Section 24.b.ii, Section 28)	The TWIC and insurance requirements do not apply so long as all the work is remote.	Q-004261
119	Please confirm whether this procurement or the resulting agreements are funded in whole or in part by federal funds or are subject to federal award terms and, if so, which federal requirements (for example 2 CFR Part 200 or 49 CFR Part 26) will be incorporated into the contract documents. (Attachment A page 14; Attachment B Section 18.c page 22)	There are no federal funding requirements for the Subscription Agreement or for Task Order 1 or Task Order 2 of the Master Services Agreement.	Q-004261
120	Please confirm whether the Port expects a post-go-live stabilization (hypercare) or warranty period within Task Order 1 and, if so, its expected duration. (Section C.2.a pages 4-5; Attachment B Section 11.a page 18)	Please include a recommended post-go-live period that you would recommend based on your firm's experience with previous MAS migration projects.	Q-004261
121	Labor Entry Kiosks (Attachment D, p. 29; related to pending Q&A #17): How do the six labor-entry kiosks auto-login to Maximo today (for example, stored credentials, URL parameters or kiosk browser configuration), and which browser and operating system do they use? Are the restricted screens custom applications or standard applications limited by security groups? If SSO is enforced for users in the hosted MAS environment, will the Port permit a non-SSO login for the kiosks, or is the Port open to an alternative login approach?	See Question 72. The Kiosks use MS Edge browser with Windows 11 OS and Kiosk software to restrict access only to the browser and specified URL. The custom screen is a modified Work Order Tracking application that shows only the Labor Entry tab and restricted fields. The Maximo Kiosk user only has permissions to see this modified application. Non-MFA login is acceptable and preferred for the Kiosks. Per session MFA is primarily a requirement for elevated permission admin accounts. We are also open to considering other approaches that are supportable and continue to allow Maintenance staff a very quick/simple way to log hours on work orders.	Q-004259
122	User Synchronization and Non-SSO Accounts (Attachment D, pp. 27–29): Attachment D states that Azure AD LDAP integration is used in Production for user creation and deactivation. Could the Port confirm the LDAP source (Microsoft Entra Domain Services or an Active Directory domain controller in Azure) and whether it can be made securely reachable from the hosted MAS environment?	Today it is using AD domain controller in Azure. This approach is being phased out and we would prefer to modernize this and use a MS Entra Directory Services approach with SSO login authentication and provisioning. The way this works in the MAS hosted environment would depend on what the MAS hosted environment supports, but connecting with the Port's Entra ID service would be preferred for SSO authentication and provisioning.	Q-004259

123	SQL Server Licensing (Attachment D; Attachment E): Attachment D states that the Port will continue using its existing Maximo licenses. Should the hosting price include Microsoft SQL Server licensing, or does the Port intend to bring its own SQL Server licenses to the hosted environment?	Hosting price should include all required components to support the environment other than the IBM Maximo App Point licenses, which the Port will provide.	Q-004259
124	Inbound ADF Writes (Attachment D): ADF currently writes fuel and inventory count data directly to the Maximo MIF interface tables. In the hosted environment, would the Port accept these inbound loads through the Maximo REST API, MIF HTTP endpoints or file-based import instead of direct database writes?	The Port is open to other approaches as long as costs required to use the proposed approach are included in your proposed costs for Task Order 1.	Q-004259
125	Cutover Window (Q&A #32): Q&A #32 indicates a maintenance window of 5 PM to 6 AM. For the production cutover, which includes the database upgrade and data migration, would the Port allow an extended outage, for example over a weekend?	Yes.	Q-004259
126	Work Order Printing (Attachment D): How are BIRT work order reports printed today, from the user's browser or server-side to network printers?	Today, this is from the user's browser to their available printers.	Q-004259
127	Outbound Email: Which mail service does Maximo use to send notifications today, for example an SMTP relay or Exchange Online?	This is using an SMTP relay today but we use Exchange Online for our email so that may also be an available and even preferred option.	Q-004259
128	Inbound Email: Are any Maximo email listeners configured to create or update records from incoming email?	We don't believe so.	Q-004259
129	During the discovery and assessment phase, how will the selected vendor be given access to the current Azure-hosted EAM 7.6.1.3 environment (for example, Port-issued VPN accounts, a jump host or Azure Virtual Desktop)?	Port-issued VPN accounts.	Q-004259
130	Database Encryption: Is SQL Server Transparent Data Encryption (TDE) with provider-managed keys sufficient for data at rest, or does the Port require customer-managed encryption keys?	See Question 84	Q-004259
131	Section C.2 covers the existing Azure-hosted EAM 7.6.1.3 as well as the future hosted MAS. Should Task Order 2 support start at contract execution (covering 7.6.1.3 until cutover) or only after MAS go-live?	See Question 56. Task Order 2 should start at contract execution and includes support of our existing EAM 7.6.1.3 environment.	Q-004259
132	Please provide approximate monthly ticket volumes by priority, typical enhancement hours and recurring integration failures over the last 12 months, to help size the hours included in the Task Order 2 monthly fee.	See Question 34.	Q-004259
133	Support tiers: Will the Port's service desk handle Level 1 support (user calls, password resets, initial triage), with the selected vendor providing Level 2 and Level 3 support only?	Yes. The Port's ServiceDesk will handle most level-1 issues and the Port has a resource that can handle some level-2 issues and will escalate to the Maximo Support Vendor when needed. See Question 34 for volume of items that have been escalated to our current support vendor over the last 12 months.	Q-004259
134	Ticketing tool: Does the Port have an existing service desk or ticketing tool that the support vendor is expected to work in, or should the vendor provide its own?	See Questions 21 and 66.	Q-004259
135	Inherited backlog: Approximately how many open incidents, defects and enhancement requests would the vendor inherit at the start of Task Order 2?	There are currently no open Incident, Request, or Problem tickets assigned to our Maximo support vendor.	Q-004259
136	Incumbent contract end: When does the incumbent's (JFC's) support contract end?	See Question 70.	Q-004259
137	Incumbent handover: Will the incumbent be required to provide knowledge transfer, documentation and environment access during transition?	See Question 70. All documentation available will be made available to the selected Support Vendor. Environment access will also be provided at Master Services Agreement commencement.	Q-004259
138	Periodic activities: Are there recurring activities, such as fiscal year-end close or the annual physical inventory count, that the Port expects the support vendor to assist with?	The support vendor may be asked to support of these types of activities. For example, exporting and importing inventory count data for quarterly inventory counts (but vendor would not be conducting the counts), providing data or troubleshooting reports required for financial reporting.	Q-004259
139			