

**Port of Tacoma Request for Proposal # 83043**  
**Addendum #4**  
**Date 7/30/2018**

The following is additional information regarding **RFP-83043** titled **Photo Management System** released on 7/23/2018. **The due date and time for responses remains as 8/7/2018 @ 2:00PM PST.** This addendum includes both questions from prospective bidders and the Port's answers, and revisions to the RFP. This addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and therefore, the information contained herein shall be taken into consideration when preparing and submitting a bid.

Item #	Date Received	Date Answered	Vendor's Question	Port's Answer	RFP Revisions
1	7/24/18	7/24/18	Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)	Firms outside the United States may propose if they can meet the requirements of the RFP.	
2	7/24/18	7/24/18	Whether we need to come over there for meetings?	Meetings and training can be done remotely via phone/web.	
3	7/24/18	7/24/18	Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)	Assuming the submitter can meet the requirements of the work, home office location is negotiable.	
4	7/24/18	7/24/18	Can we submit the proposals via email?	See instructions in RFP 83043, Attachment A on page 8, Submittal of Proposal	
5	7/24/18	7/25/18	How many internal PoT users will need access to the Photo Management System?	5 concurrent users	
6	7/24/18	7/26/18	How much storage do you require for the SaaS solution?	5GB	
7	7/24/18	7/26/18	In attachment E  Do you require geographic redundancy for all components or offsite backups of data and database only?  If the data center is on the East Coast- Seismically braced server racks are not standard? Is this okay  We are compliant with the HIPAA Security Rule, HITRUST Common Security Framework and NIST Special	1 Offsite backups of data and database only  2 While our preference is for seismically braced racks, this is not a deal breaker if they are not  3 See section A paragraph 3 on how to propose alternate terms  4 Yes  5 See section A paragraph 3 on how to	

**Port of Tacoma Request for Proposal # 83043**  
**Addendum #4**  
**Date 7/30/2018**

			<p>Publication 30 and 34. Is that good enough?</p> <p>Is full disk encryption (FDE) rather than TDE acceptable.</p> <p>Are you open to " Within ten (10) business days any remediation items needed as a result of the Security Vulnerability"</p>	propose alternate terms	
8	7/24/18	7/26/18	There does not appear to be an Exhibit B with the SLA	Will be posted by contracts	
9	7/24/18	7/26/18	<p>Attachment F</p> <p>2.4 virus protection-we would like to make it mutual so you will not send us virus'</p> <p>4.8-SSAE16 Audits-these are done by the data center</p>	<p>1 In your proposal include language as to how it would be made mutual</p> <p>2 If these reports can be made available to the Port of Tacoma, it is acceptable</p>	
10	7/24/18	7/26/18	9-Indemnification-will you offer mutual and can there be a cap on liability	See section A paragraph 3 on how to propose alternate terms	
11	7/30/18	7/30/18	<p>Attachment D, Sections 5 "System has iOS and Android mobile apps"</p> <p>Can the system clarify what it expects in this requirement other than being able to upload from a cell phone with one of these two operating systems?</p>	<p>1 Upload, download, and view files in both mobile OS</p> <p>2 Can function with these systems. Is able to import and export to and from these software products</p>	

**Port of Tacoma Request for Proposal # 83043**  
**Addendum #4**  
**Date 7/30/2018**

12	7/30/18	7/30/18	9-10 "System works with Photo Mechanic, Photo Shop and . . . Adobe Premier" Can the City expand upon what it expects from the use of the term "works with?"		
13	7/30/18	7/30/18	23. System can integrate with the Port's Active Directory . . . Is this a permissive requirement? Or Should we assume that we must propose the cost of AD integration in our cost?	This is a permissive requirement	
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					