



Purchasing Department  
530 Water Street  
Oakland, CA 94607

December 5, 2019

### ADDENDUM No. 1

#### RFP No. 19-20/03 – Identity Management Systems at Oakland International Airport

This Addendum modifies the original RFP Documents for the above-mentioned RFP. **Acknowledge receipt of this addendum in the space provided on the RFP Acknowledgement and Signature Form (Attachment 3). Failure to do so may disqualify your proposal.**

**The following questions were submitted by the deadline and are answered in this addendum.**

1. Question: IV Submission Requirements, #2 Knowledge & Experience. Will an organization with over 20 years of experience implementing and maintaining VMS at facilities nationwide other than airports fulfill this requirement?

*Answer: No*

2. Question: In Section 2.2.1 – Suspension and Early Termination. The RFP has noted that the Port may determine at its sole discretion the suspension of services which will be treated as an excusable delay. Suspending a project of this type will incur unforeseen costs due to ex. the reassignment of dedicated resources working on the project. Will the Port be willing to pay any reasonable compensation to the Consultant during the duration of the excusable delay?

*Answer: No. Payment can only be made during the active performance of Services, not including any periods of excusable delay.*

3. Question: Appendix A-4 - Liquidated Damages – This solution that will be implemented is not construction and is software and service installation. Would the Port consider removing this section as a requirement for the project? We would consider agreeing to the Port holding a financial retention of 10% until project completion.

*Answer: No. The liquidated damages provision is an integral part of the Professional Services Agreement. Additionally, Appendix B of the Professional Services Agreement requires a 10% retainage to ensure performance and payment of any liquidated damages.*

4. Question: Appendix B – Retainage for Performance – Would the Port be willing to agree to withholding a sum of 10% from the sum of the entire project? The retainage of 10%

from each milestone will be a nightmare for our financial system to invoice and manage without manual intervention throughout the project.

*Answer: Yes, withholding an upfront sum of 10% of the entire project value could be an option. Note, however, that this would mean that the first payment(s) to the selected contractor would be greatly reduced and/or reduced to \$0 given the size of the retainage.*

5. Question: Section VI. Additional Provisions Part E. Indemnification: This section states that in order for a Respondent to receive the contract, it would be required to agree to the Indemnification clause. You are asking for the Respondent to agree to this indemnification clause in advance of the award without discussion between the Port and Consultant. Would you please consider amending or removing this requirement from the language in the RFP?

*Answer: No. This is the standard indemnification clause for all Professional Service Agreements, including the one that would apply to this contract. The full text of the indemnification is available in the draft agreement for Respondent's review and acceptance.*

6. Question: Section 10.2 Attorney Fees. States that in the event of a lawsuit between our two parties that the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover from the losing party reasonable attorney fees. Company Y would like to recommend that each party be responsible to pay their own attorney's fees. Would you please amend this language in the RFP so that each party pays for their own attorney's fees?

*Answer: No. This is the standard attorneys' fees provision for all Professional Service Agreements, including the one that would apply to this contract.*

7. Question: When a requirement is marked as "Mandatory", does that mean proposers will not be considered if the proposer designates their solution as non-compliant?

*Answer: No, in Attachment 12-3, "Mandatory" means that the requirement / item is a critical need for the Port's ID Badging Office. The Port understands that each IdMS solution may not be able to meet all such critical needs. Proposers / vendors should indicate on Attachment 12-3 if the IdMS solution being proposed meets the requirement / item "compliant out-of-the-box," if "compliant custom development" is required (and being proposed by the proposer / vendor; these requirements / items will be incorporated into the contract if awarded), or if "non-compliant" (and not being proposed by the proposer / vendor; these requirements / items will not be incorporated into the contract if awarded). If a proposer / vendor believes its IdMS solution partially meets a requirement / item or needs to make an exception or exclusion, the proposer / vendor should describe in detail these limitations in the Comments column of Attachment 12-3 (if additional space is required, please use additional sheets to provide explanations). Proposals will be evaluated based, in part, on responses shown on Attachment 12-3. Proposers / vendors who meet or can meet more of the Port's critical needs may receive a higher score in Plan and Approach (Evaluation Criteria Item 4). Proposers / vendors who perform less custom development may be able to propose a lower cost, which is also a key evaluation criteria (Evaluation Criteria Item 5).*

8. Question: If a proposer designates that the solution is non-compliant, will that requirement be taken out of the contractual requirements for the project?

*Answer: See response to #7.*

9. Question: There are approximately 67 of the 500+ requirements that Company X may need to take exception to because our off-the-shelf software definitively does not meet the requirements or may only partially meet the requirement based on the wording in the RFP. Would the Port of Oakland consider removing any of these requirements from the project?

*Answer: See response to #7.*

10. Question: Should all exceptions to the sample contract be provided as part of the bid response, or should those exceptions be address prior to the question deadline?

*Answer: All exceptions to the sample contract should be provided as part of your proposal (See IV. Submission Requirements, #1 Company Information).*

11. Question: Section 2.2 discusses termination, and in particular, contract suspension (2.2.1) and term for convenience (2.2.3). These provisions say that the contractor (Company X) can recover its costs incurred until susp/term, plus a “reasonable profit.” But it doesn’t say how reasonable profit would be calculated. I would prefer this to be tied back to the schedule of values and percentage of project completion. Is this acceptable to the Port of Oakland?

*Answer: Yes, that would likely be acceptable, but please provide proposed language to that effect in your proposal so that the Port may consider it.*

12. Question: Section 8.2 gives the Port Authority the power to audit the payment records related to the project. That’s generally fine. However, in support of the audit provisions, Company X would be required to “toll” the running of any period of a statute of limitations for so long as the audit is going on plus 4 additional years upon the audit’s conclusion. In short, Company X may finish the project in 2021, but could conceivably be dealing with OAK through this audit process (and subject to claims by OAK) for most of the next decade. We cannot agree to an unlimited tolling/extension period. Can we limit this period to 1 year after project sign-off?

*Answer: No. This is the standard audit and tolling provision for all Professional Service Agreements, including the one that would apply to this contract.*

13. Question: Appendix A-4 authorizes the Port to impose liquidated damages. This is unacceptable. Particularly in a contract such as this where your payment is tied to performance milestones, and the Port is holding onto 10% of the fee as retainage. In other words, the Port already has mechanisms to ensure your prompt performance; the addition of liquidated damages is unnecessary, if not unnecessarily punitive. Can liquidated damages be removed from this contract?

*Answer: No. Retainage is intended, in part, to ensure that liquidated damages can be collected. Neither retainage nor liquidated damages standing alone would be sufficient to ensure adequate performance of all aspects of a complex and detailed project such as this one. See also response to #3.*

14. Question: Appendix C requires you to have auto insurance that names the Port as an additional insured. This makes no sense in the context of the work Company X would do for OAK. Can auto insurance requirements be removed from the contract?

*Answer: No. Auto Liability requirement will not be removed.*

15. Question: Appendix F pertains to indemnification. It is written rather broadly. And while we would not eliminate the indemnification obligation entirely, Company X requests that the contract narrow its scope with the Port before signing the agreement. Is this acceptable?

*Answer: See response to #10.*

16. Question: The IdMS System Architecture drawing shows a connection to 3<sup>rd</sup> party connections to “Lexus/Nexus”, “Save”, “SSN Checks”, and “USPS Address Checks”. The functional specification does not mention any automation to Lexus/Nexus or LexisNexis. However, it does mention LexisNexis as a possible data source for importing information:

*26.02 – Provide the capability to import DNI, 3rd party watch list and stop lists (e.g. Secure Flight, SAVE, LEXIS-NEXIS) and run the comparisons as often as the System Administrator desires.*

- A. Question: Does the Port of Oakland required automated integration to any of the systems mentioned in 26.02?

*Answer: Yes, to the maximum extent possible, the Port requires automated integration so that Port staff does not have to manually fetch data and then manually upload it to IdMS to run required comparisons. Proposers / vendors should indicate which connections can be automated and which connections will be provided via manual data imports. For example, the Port envisions that connections to USPS and SSA would be automatic so that when data is validated and accepted by an Authorized Signer, the applicant’s address would be validated by USPS and the applicant’s SSN would be validated against SSA database (name and # match with SSA records). This would require an automated integration. As an example, automated, near real-time address validation through USPS is incorporated into many retail web sites to validate delivery and/or billing addresses.*

- B. Question: If not, Does the Port of Oakland require preconfigured imports for file formats that may be generated by the 3<sup>rd</sup> party systems mentioned in 26.02?

*Answer: See response to above (#16, A).*

17. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide system administrators the ability to implement changes to business rules and variables options without code modifications or programming.	Our business rules are not base software code changes but can required SQL code changes. Therefore we do not believe it complies with the letter of the specification. Some business rule changes are available through the graphical user interface. Some other rules are too complex, and require SQL code changes.	Is it acceptable for SQL Scripts to be used to enforce complex business rules? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes, please see response to #7. Please note any differences or clarifications, such as the one provided here, in Comments field of Attachment 12-3. Please also note requirement / item #2.01.*

18. Description/Comments/Question:

Restrict Trusted Agent ability to change/delete comments they entered. Allow Security Manager, ASC or other Trusted Agents to make modification to the comments entered by the Trusted Agents.	Users with read/write access to comments in the IDMS are not restricted based on who created the comment.	Is this requirement essential to the operation of the Oakland ID office? Is this something that airport can live without?
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

19. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide ability to make comments private based on user roles.	We do not have the ability to make a comment 'private'.	Can this requirement be removed?
---------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

20. Description/Comments/Question:

The IdMS shall have capability to interface with USPS address validation API.	We currently do not have an interface to the USPS for address validation	Can this requirement be removed?
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

21. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide ability to generate SSN's starting with 999-99 that is unique to the airport database for use by applicants that object to providing their own.	The IDMS does not generate SSNs.	This feature would most likely decrease efficiency and create more confusion and support issues. Can this requirement be removed?
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

22. Description/Comments/Question:

IdMS shall allow system administrators to add/modify fields to any screen/page including managing access to that field by user groups.	Each screen is not modifiable to the extent of adding new data elements. We do allow admins to control what each user can see, so if that is the intent of the requirement we are compliant.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

23. Description/Comments/Question:

Integrate with Oracle Business Suite Version Release # 12.2.6	We currently do not have an integration with Oracle Business Suite.	Can this requirement be removed?
---------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

24. Description/Comments/Question:

Integrate with CyberLock System Version # 8.0.57	We currently do not have an integration with CyberLock. However, we are currently investigating this with another client so it might be we have one in the future.	Can this requirement be removed as mandatory for the current project and be an additional feature listed for a future update?
--------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

25. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Subcontract contract expiration date cannot exceed the contract expiration date of the primary company. If the subcontracting company already exists in IdMS and the new expiration date is greater than the existing expiration date, the expiration date for the subcontractor will be set to the new greater date. The airport may decide to relax contract expiration with badge expiration rule.</p>	<p>Contracts across companies do not change based on other contract end dates.</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed or can the wording of the request be changed to comply with what our off-the-shelf solution provides?</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

26. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall enforce Reason for de-activation when the company status has changed from active to another status.</p>	<p>Company status changes do not require a reason. However, if a company is denied during the onboarding process a reason is required.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No, see response to #7.*

27. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Provide the ability to send via email to a new badge applicant (mandatory field for all applicants), an expiring link to enter demographic application information and attest to a disqualifying felony statement.</p>	<p>Currently the IDMS requires the authorized to input all of the required applicant information. However, a current client is potentially desiring this option, so it might be available in the future</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? Can this requirement be removed/edited as mandatory for the current project and be an additional feature listed for a future update?</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port would need to further understand your proposed solution's new badge applicant process to respond "yes" or "no"; see response to #7. The Port prefers that the new applicant web page (where applicants' enter all required information) not be persistent, but a URL link sent to them that will expire if it goes unused).*

28. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall allow the AS to enter minimum applicant identifiable information (name, DoB and email Id) and payment method if paid by Applicant or AS (pay-as-you-go by Individual, pay-as-you-go by company(AS)) and trigger a link to the applicant email ID. Provide ability to complete and submit NEW badge application request via Authorized Signatory portal prior to arrival of applicant in the Security Badging Office.</p>	<p>See above response</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? Can this requirement be removed/edited as mandatory for the current project and be an additional feature listed for a future update?</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port cannot answer this because your current process is not articulated (it says “see above response”). See response to #7.*

29. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall flag to the AS, potential duplicate persons during the badge application review and submission process and provide a means for the AS and / or Security Office staff to merge or de-couple the potential match, prior to submission and IdMS assigning a UPID.</p>	<p>Duplicate checks happen solely for trusted agents while processing applications. Authorized signers are never faced/responsible for choosing who may or may not be a duplicate in the IDMS.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*



30. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Applicant portal is available to the applicant only when Authorized Signatory has authorized for the applicant to perform specific task. (e.g. pre-enrollment, address validation/update. For First Authorized Signatory of a new company, the badging office superintendent will initiate the applicant portal link.</p>	<p>Application information is provided by the authorized signer.</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed?</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

31. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Applicant portal will allow for payment processing or integrate with the Oracle Business Suite for payment processing of badge fees, fingerprint fees and fines.</p>	<p>Payment processing solely happens in the badging office.</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed?</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

32. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Old photos for up to 2 last renewals should be stored in the system for historical reference. Include a field that displays the date photo was taken. Prior photos should be archived and available for reference as needed.</p>	<p>Previous pictures are removed with new pictures</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

33. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall have capability to send notifications to the AS (via email and print letter on airport letterhead for mailing as certified mail to the AS) if the applicant has failed one or both (STA and CHRC) security checks. The IdMS shall track date when the security checks status was changed. The IdMS shall allow the ASM or Badging Office to set Appeals flag if the Applicant has appealed the CHRC results within 30 days or configurable by the system administrator. The IdMS shall limit any further processing of training, badge issuance or payment for the applicant.</p>	<p>Notifications via email are not an issue, however print letterhead for mailing is not available.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7 (please note any differences or clarifications, such as “our solution can do email notifications but not letterhead” in Comments field of Attachment 12-3).*

34. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>IdMS shall integrate with the existing CyberLock system.</p>	<p>We currently do not have an integration with CyberLock. However, we are currently investigating this with another client so it might be we have one in the future.</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed as mandatory for the current project and be an additional feature listed for a future update?</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

35. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Assignment, Issuance and Tracking: Programming of new Cyber Keys will continue in the CyberLock system where system captures the name, badge #, key number, status, expiration date and other fields. The IdMS shall pull this information from the Cyber Lock system and associate the cyber key with the correct badge holder and make available from issuance.</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed as mandatory for the current project and be an additional feature listed for a future update?</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

36. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>IdMS shall track when the key is delivered to the Badging Office from the Airport department that is managing the Cyber key system.</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed as mandatory for the current project and be an additional feature listed for a future update?</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

37. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Cyber key de-activation: When a badge holder is terminated and no longer has an Active badge for the company that the Cyber Key is issued to, IdMS shall immediately de-activate the Cyber Key in the CyberLock system.</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed as mandatory for the current project and be an additional feature listed for a future update?</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

38. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Allow the company to have multiple vehicles. (South field only)</p>	<p>Currently vehicles are only assigned to person's and not companies.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

39. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall have capability to integrate with the Oracle system for payments functionality. The IdMS shall have capability to collect payments from the AS and / or Applicant via AS portal, Applicant portal or part of the Appointment scheduling steps. The payment collected will be for fingerprinting, badges and fines.</p>	<p>We currently do not have an integration with Oracle.</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed?</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

40. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Track changes in badge and vetting dispositions, automatically generating invoice detail to be transmitted to Oracle Business system for monthly billing.</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed?</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------	-----------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

41. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Allow for credit card transactions as part of the integration with Oracle PoS or online payment platform. IdMS shall transmit the necessary information to the payment portal and receive transaction details. No other details of credit card data will be stored in the IdMS.</p>	<p>See above. The IDMS can take credit card transactions with Clover devices.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port cannot answer this question because it is not familiar with Clover devices. The Port is requesting integration with Oracle PoS or other online payment platform. Please clarify your proposed solution to payment processing in your proposal. See response to #7.*

42. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Restrict the ability to invoice badges only if the company is set up in Oracle Business Suite as billable.</p>	<p>See above. However, the IDMS does allow for companies to be invoiced vs paying at the counter</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

43. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall integrate with the Livescan fingerprint devices. The Airport submits fingerprints for certain 1544 air carriers (e.g. UPS, Southwest, Hawaiian). There are airline and airport specific SONs in the Livescan system. Currently, the Airport submits the fingerprints to DAC with 1544 carrier SON first and then 24 hours later re-submit the fingerprints to DAC with Airport specific SON. This allows RAP sheets to be received by both airlines and the airport for adjudication. The IdMS shall automate the dual submissions. The airline has to provide a letter of fingerprint check complete.</p>	<p>Based on the DAC used, the Livescan device used with continue to integration directly with the TELOS site. The IDMS prepares the enrollment by creating all the necessary data points in TELOS. Afterwards the workflow for submitting the investigation is the same. The results of the STA is automatically pulled in to the IDMS</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

44. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall obtain change in status information from the DAC for CHRC and notify the Badging Office when the results are available on the FBI FRPD.</p>	<p>TELOS does not currently provide a means of notification via their API</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed?</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port desires this functionality but understands if it is not available from TelosID or via TSA's Finger Print Results Distribution (FPRD) web site (if true, then no vendor will be able to comply with this requirement / item, either out-of-the-box or with custom development). See response to #7.*

45. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall have capability to provide automated feedback from FBI of a Rap Back hit either directly from FBI or via the DAC interface.</p>	<p>No service is available to notify anyone of rap back hits. The feature is not something offered by FPRD</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed?</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #44.*

46. Description/Comments/Question:

The IdMS shall pre-populate a CBP application when requested. IdMS shall forward application to CBP.	CBP applications cannot be pre-populated.	Can this requirement be removed?
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

47. Description/Comments/Question:

Integration with Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Seals program / “e-badge”	TELOS does not currently integration with E-Badge	Can this requirement be removed?
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

48. Description/Comments/Question:

If the CBP submission is possible via the DAC interface, the vendor will provide the submission of CBP Seal request via the DAC. Allow responses from CBP to be automated via the DAC.	See above	Can this requirement be removed?
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

49. Description/Comments/Question:

Implementation of identity quiz	We are not familiar with identity quiz	Can this requirement be removed?
---------------------------------	----------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: Identity quizzes are administered to badge applicants in a Q&A format using financial or publicly available information (e.g., information available in a credit report); if an applicant successfully answers his/her unique questions, it can “prove” (confirm) the identity of the applicant (in addition to relying solely on breeder identity documents). The Port tested identity quiz application in the ID Badging Office with TelosID in the 2014 timeframe. Therefore, this requirement cannot be removed; see response to #7.*

50. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Require a comment if a badge is moved to any status except active and an explanation must be inserted in order to make the change / save the record.</p>	<p>Comments are not required for badge status changes.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

51. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>IdMS shall provide the ability to manage badge card inventory including incoming inventory and usage as badges are printed.</p>	<p>Inventory is not managed in the IDMS</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

52. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>IdMS shall capture the card stock number for the badge being issued. The card stock number will change each time a new badge is issued for a badge holder. The card stock number will be used by the PACS for granting and tracking access.</p>	<p>See above answer</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*



53. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>IdMS shall provide capability to pre-printing or bulk print badges (e.g. company name changes, mergers or rebadges).</p>	<p>Pre-printing is not supported</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

54. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Provide ability to pre-print badge when CHRC/STA are cleared or other wise approved, while applicant is undergoing training (e.g. driver practical training or CBP Seal request is pending).</p>	<p>Pre-printing is not supported, unless the business rules required are overwritten</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

55. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Provide capability of reprinting a badge with the same badge number based on permission level (e.g. production error or production void)</p>	<p>New badge number are created each time a badge is created</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

56. Description/Comments/Question:

Alerting incorrect clearance code assignments. (e.g. Southwest Airline employee cannot be issued American clearance code. Some clearance codes are defined by company name).	Any access code can be give to any badge. However, specific reports might be able to be created to find certain anomalies.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

57. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide capability to limit which access codes can be used by a company or job title for specific badge types (prevents assignment of wrong access code).	See above	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

58. Description/Comments/Question:

Authorized Signatory should be able to respond to a violation notice via the Authorized Signatory portal.	Currently the IDMS does not have a way for the authorized signatory to respond to a violation via the web portal. However, authorized signatories do have a way to see any for the company/division via the web portal.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

59. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall have integrated appointment scheduler and queue management system to track employees appointments, check-ins, no shows.</p>	<p>The IDMS does have a scheduler product, but not a queue management product.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

60. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall integrate with queue management system such that the IdMS will not allow the same Trusted Agent / badging employee who fingerprinted the applicant to service the same applicant for badge issuance. The IdMS shall have capability to assign badge issuance service to a different Trusted Agent / badging employee.</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

61. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The employee shall register him / herself in the queue management kiosk / workstation in the waiting based on scheduled appointment or walk-in. The IdMS shall allow the Trusted Agent to view the queue on the dashboard, select the next employee inline.</p>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

62. Description/Comments/Question:

The IdMS shall allow display on existing monitor in the waiting area the badging counter that the Trusted Agent select for processing the employee in queue.	See above	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

63. Description/Comments/Question:

The IdMS shall report on wait times in the Badging Office, statics on service levels and employee performance / efficiency.	See above	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

64. Description/Comments/Question:

The IdMS shall allow sending .ics files along with appointment confirmation email notifications.	Can this requirement be removed?
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

65. Description/Comments/Question:

Oracle Business Suite Version Release # 12.2.6 -(existing system)	We currently do not have integration with Oracle Business Suite	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

66. Description/Comments/Question:

CyberLock system Version # 8.0.57 -(existing system)	We currently do not have an integration with CyberLock. However, we are currently investigating this with another client so it might be we have one in the future.	Can this requirement be removed as mandatory for the current project and be an additional feature listed for a future update?
------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

67. Description/Comments/Question:

Customs and Border Protection (eBadge Program) - for automation of Customs Seal applications	TELOS does not currently integration with E-Badge	Can this requirement be removed?
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

68. Description/Comments/Question:

US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) web service - to verify immigration and naturalization status.		Can this requirement be removed?
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

69. Description/Comments/Question:

FBI National Crime Information Center (NCIC) - to verify background check status		Can this requirement be removed?
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

70. Description/Comments/Question:

USPS Address Validation API - to validate address entered by the badge applicant		Can this requirement be removed?
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

71. Description/Comments/Question:

TSA Watch List vetting of badge holders, badge applicants, and escorts – Secure Flight	We currently do not have an integration with Secure Flight. The IDMS does have the capability to compare applicants against the TSA watch list.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

72. Description/Comments/Question:

Queue Management System (Qminder) - (existing system or vendor suggest alternate)		Can this requirement be removed?
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

73. Description/Comments/Question:

HID Fargo HDP 5000 or later - (use existing system or suggest alternate); Printer should have in-line encoding, laminate and internal reader to read the badge number back to IdMS.	We currently do not support inline encoding with Fargo printers. Inline encoding is currently only supported with Matica printers	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7. Please note that this requirement specifically states “or suggest alternate.” The Port agrees that Matica printers are an acceptable alternate.*

74. Description/Comments/Question:

Port Email system (e.g. Outlook, Office 365)	Unsure of what is being requested. The IDMS does not integrate with any specific mail client.	Can this requirement be removed?
----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

75. Description/Comments/Question:

Automatic audit trail logging and generate report for data viewed by any user (e.g. record or file, date/time, user).	The IDMS currently does not have a way to determine who viewed any specific data points.	Can this requirement be removed?
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

76. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide ability to monitor and automatically report system health, notifying support staff using standard technologies such as SMS and SNMP.	The IDMS currently does not utilize SMS or SNMP technologies. However, those technologies can be leverage against typical Windows Event viewer logs.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

77. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide capability within IdMS for ASC to set a flag or recommend alternate approach to bulk de-activate and bulk re-activate badges. Justification is mandatory when bulk de-activating or re-activating badges.	Company X allows the functionality of bulk deactivation and reactivate of badges to be limited to certain users. However, the software does not require a justification for these functions.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes; however, partial exceptions or exclusions should be noted in Comments column in Attachment 12-3.*

78. Description/Comments/Question:

Assign RAMP permits to Authorized Signers. Automatically require the return or reassignment of the ramp permit when a badge or credential expires.	The Oakland process of ramp permit issuance is vague. Can Oakland provide more information regarding the desired functionality so that we can make certain to designate whether we comply with this requirement?	Can Oakland provide more information on how ramp permits work, and why authorized signers who do not require driving privileges are automatically issued ramp permits?
Restrict ramp permit issuance if insurance is expired or updated.	See above	See above
Report list of all permits issued, active permits, expired permits, company names.	See above	See above

*Answer: Ramp permits are issued to Authorized Companies (through Authorized Signers) that require vehicle access to the Air Operations Area (AOA). Authorized Companies submit a South Field Ramp permit application and proof of insurance to the Port's Risk Department.*

[https://www.oaklandairport.com/wp-content/uploads/southfield\\_ramp\\_app\\_in\\_word.pdf](https://www.oaklandairport.com/wp-content/uploads/southfield_ramp_app_in_word.pdf)

*Once approved, Risk notifies the ID Badging Office that the permit(s) have been approved. ID Badging staff then generates a decal with an expiration sticker (which coincides with the insurance expiration). Staff also maintains a spreadsheet of active permits with vehicle description (make, model, license plate #) sorted by company. Please note, ramp permits are assigned to Authorized Company vehicles, not individual badge holders.*

79. Description/Comments/Question:

The IdMS should produce a report of all business rules configured in the system along with the status if rule is active or inactive	A report could be created, however there is not a way to 'turn off' a rule in our system. If a rule is no longer required, we would remove the content of the rule, thereby turning it off.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes; if a proposer / vendor wishes to provide clarification in terms of a possible limitation or how its product complies with the requirement / item in Attachment 12-3, we suggest the proposer / vendor provide that clarification in the Comments column in Attachment 12-3.*



80. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>AS must request access levels / clearance codes at time of badge application. If there are multiple access levels available for a company then all options should be available and the AS will select appropriately for the badge applicant. A justification for employee access to secure areas, and the areas the employees must have access to, must be provided during application submission. If the AS does not select access levels then the default access levels for that company will be assigned.</p>	<p>Access levels are set a job title level in the IDMS. Specific clearances not related to the default are unable to be requested</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

81. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Provide an annual onsite system review with Port staff. System performance will be reviewed and discussed as well as vendor insight provided to future software and other changes and/or upgrades.</p>	<p>After go-live onsite reviews are as needed.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have the highest level of support as needed while decreasing time that Oakland staff would be required to attend onsite reviews without cause. If needed, we will do onsite system reviews often, but we have found that once our system is up and running, the need for an annual review is normally not warranted. If this item could be removed as mandatory, it would help the efficiency of support from our side and the efficiency of staff time for Oakland.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

82. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The Authorized Signer must complete an application for airport security badge and select the Authorized Signer option. The application must be approved by another Authorized Signer (primary sponsor) or provide a letter with the nominated Authorized Signatory name on company letterhead and signature from Company Principal or Manager.</p>	<p>Authorized signers can sign any badge for their company/division, including their own.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

83. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall have capability identify Primary Authorized Signatory, also allow the badging office to set an authorized signatory as Active or Inactive.</p>	<p>Authorized signers in the IDMS are not noted to be primary or some other ranking of level. At any point badging office personal can change an authorized signer to be active or inactive.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

84. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Provide capability within IdMS for ASC to set a flag or recommend alternate approach if the company is eligible for the "Opt-In Mass notification Program" (Everbridge). If the flag is set, then the IdMS shall require the applicant to respond to the "Opt-In" question at the time of badge enrollment (via AS and/or applicant portal) as well as require the existing badge holder (via AS and/or Applicant portal) to verify the contact information in IdMS. If the flag is not set, the Opt-In is a non-mandatory requirement.</p>	<p>Badge applications can include a flag to determine if the user wants to be included in Everbridge.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port is not able to answer this question because proposer / vendor does not indicate what actions IdMS will take if the flag is set or not set.*

85. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall allow at a minimum the following badge statuses with capability for the system administrators to add / modify statuses and reason for de-activation: Active, Inactive, Suspended, Terminated, Revoked, Lost, Stolen, Damaged. The IdMS shall also provide drop down list for "Reason for De-activation"</p>	<p>Badge statuses do not have a subsequent reason.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: See response to #7.*

86. Description/Comments/Question:

Automatic audit trail logging and generate report of all configuration updates made by any user (e.g. business rules, validation, required fields, lookup tables).	Changes in system objects, views/triggers/stored procedures, are tracked via SQL Server's objects table. This does not include altered objects.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes, but please also note requirement / item #2.01 (database queries and reporting should be intuitive and require minimal training).*

87. Description/Comments/Question:

IdMS should have ability to read back changes made in the PACS made by Security Operations Control Center for badge statuses. All other changes should be tracked and reported / notified via email to the ASC, Security Manager	Changes made in PACS should be limited to changing of badge statuses only. Changing regarding access or person/credentials must happen in IDMS only.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

88. Description/Comments/Question:

Allow company enrollment to be saved as <i>Draft</i> prior to final submission by Badging Office staff or AS.	Company packages are not submitted until the principal has completed each required section and has requested the package be submitted	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port cannot answer this question because the proposer / vendor does not indicate if a company enrollment package can be saved as a draft before submission to the ID Badging Office.*

89. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Provide ability to identify whether a training event was conducted with translation assistance. The Authorized Signatory or Applicant should provide language preference for training during pre-enrollment. The language should then be coordinated with the SSi system.</p>	<p>Course are manually assigned to individuals in SSI</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port cannot answer this question because the proposer / vendor does not indicate whether their proposed IdMS solution will allow Authorized Signers or applicants to identify whether the applicant needs an accommodation to accomplish the SSi training courses required.*

90. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall provide a action oriented dashboard. The dashboard should list the pending tasks or actions for the Badging Office, AS and other users of the IdMS.</p>	<p>Dashboards are created using SSRS for internal users of the system. Company X will work with project stakeholders to ensure dashboards are created with the specific needs of the individuals in mind. Authorized Signers utilize the web portal.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

91. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall capability to manage driving privileges only if the company has valid certificate of insurance. If the insurance is expired or does not meet the insurance amounts required by the airport, then driving privileges cannot be assigned to the badge for that company. The Airport may decide to relax this rule and not restrict the badge expirations based on insurance dates.</p>	<p>Driving designation can always be requested, however the issuance of the designation can absolutely be restricted based on insurance dates and such.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

92. Description/Comments/Question:

IdMS shall have capability to detect duplicate records / existing person record (e.g. criteria SSN, DoB, Name) and immediately indicate to the Trusted Agent or the Authorized Signer (AS) of the existing record.	Duplicate checks happen solely for trusted agents while processing applications. Authorized signers are never faced/responsible for choosing who may or may not be a duplicate in the IDMS.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

93. Description/Comments/Question:

The IdMS shall display limited information as per the Airport requirements including a photo of the person that is identified as existing or duplicate in the IdMS. Allow the AS or Trusted agent to accept or deny the individual.	Duplicate checks happen solely for trusted agents while processing applications. Authorized signers are never faced/responsible for choosing who may or may not be a duplicate in the IDMS.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

94. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide a mechanism for identifying applicants and checking for undisclosed prior records such as badges previously/currently held that may have been unrecovered or were related to violations resulting in permanent suspension.	During the duplicate check process, the IDMS displays information regarding the person and their previous badges.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

95. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The Port highly recommends the Contractor to propose system architectures (on premise or a hybrid on premise-cloud solution (Azure(preferred), AWS, other)) that provide cost effective and operationally efficient IdMS without losing any functionality. FOR COST PROPSAL use ON-Premise and provide Cloud solution costs proposal separate.</p>	<p>Company X does not currently offer a cloud-based solution.</p>	<p>Can this requirement be removed?</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7. Proposer / vendor should provide cost-proposal for on-premise solution and indicate that it does not use or offer any cloud solution and therefore cannot provide any costs for doing so.*

96. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall be available at all times to business operations. Provide details of (west coast hours) telephone or email customer support services. Provide access for the Airport to the vendor online tracking system with ticket numbers and real time updates for technical issues being resolved. Provide details of minimum and maximum response times that should be expected for vendor to resolve service issues.</p>	<p>Company X general support hours are Monday - Friday 8:00 am to 6:00 pm EST. System down issues can be raised 24/7</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes; however, proposers / vendors should address the full requirement here for a tracking system, ticket numbers, real-time updates, response times, etc.*

97. Description/Comments/Question:

IdMS shall allow capability by the Trusted Agent to search and merge multiple badge holder records of the same single individual.	Merging badge holders is a very complicated process. It should done in very rare occasions. Merging can cause orphaned records in external system.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port cannot answer this question; we suggest the proposer / vendor provide additional information in its proposal. The question asks if the proposer / vendor solution's current process is acceptable or meets this requirement / item, but the proposer / vendor does not provide any information about its IdMS capabilities to accomplish this requirement / item.*

98. Description/Comments/Question:

IdMS shall allow the system administrator to create and modify business rules without requiring major code changes.	Our business rules are not base software code changes but can required SQL code changes.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7 and requirement / item #2.01.*

99. Description/Comments/Question:

FBI - Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS)	Our integration with the FPRD is via the TELOS or AAAE DAC.	Can this requirement be removed?
----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #44.*



100. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide ability for a system user to create new reports as well as modify existing reports.	Our reports are created using SSRS.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes, but please also note requirement / item #2.01 (database queries and reporting should be intuitive and require minimal training).*

101. Description/Comments/Question:

Photo should be captured every time badge is printed (e.g. replacement, renewal)	Photo capturing is configurable and be set as low as every year.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes, but the Port requires retention of every taken for historical reference, and a new photo should be able to be captured if a badge is replaced (e.g., a badge holder with a 2-year expiration loses his or her badge after 9 months, when the replacement badge is issued, a new photo should be able to be captured and printed on the badge).*

102. Description/Comments/Question:

The IdMS shall have capability to allow the Badging Office staff to select the company reviewer using a drop down list. The reviewer will be a Port employee from various Port departments (e.g. Finance, Properties, Risk Management).	Reviewers are a role in the IDMS. Each reviewer has the ability review initial company packages. A specific reviewer is not assigned to a company package.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

103. Description/Comments/Question:

Be able to rotate and zoom in to review scanned documents.	Scanned documents are in PDF format. Using Adobe Acrobat users can view the file and rotate/zoom.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

104. Description/Comments/Question:

The IdMS will provide a dashboard for Badging Office staff and the AS. The dashboard should be configurable for each user group and user.	See above	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port is not able to answer this question because the prosper / vendor does not provide any information on how its system does or does meet this requirement. Proposer / vendor is encouraged to provide additional details about how it may meet this requirement in its proposal.*

105. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide on dashboard those STA and CHRC results that have not been returned in 10 business days.	See above	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port is not able to answer this question because the prosper / vendor does not provide any information on how its system does or does meet this requirement. Proposer / vendor is encouraged to provide additional details about how it may meet this requirement in its proposal.*

106. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide users with the ability to design dashboards illustrating high-level metrics (e.g. number of badges awaiting pickup, number of badges expiring within user defined timeframe), and providing the ability to drill down to the supporting detail.	See above	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port is not able to answer this question because the prosper / vendor does not provide any information on how its system does or does meet this requirement. Proposer / vendor is encouraged to provide additional details about how it may meet this requirement in its proposal.*

107. Description/Comments/Question:

If the Authorized Signer indicated customs clearance is required on the application, IdMS will display instructions on how to obtain clearance through Customs and Border Protection (CBP). The CBP Staff will provide proof of Customs approval. The IdMS will allow printing CBP forms 3078 filled with the necessary demographic information available in the IdMS.	See above answer	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port is not able to answer this question because the prosper / vendor does not provide any information on how its system does or does meet this requirement. Proposer / vendor is encouraged to provide additional details about how it may meet this requirement in its proposal.*

108. Description/Comments/Question:

Pop up indicating critical information (e.g. open citation / violation, terminated for cause, expiring documents), when record is opened by Authorized Signatory or Trusted Agents	Specific pop-ups when accessing a person record are facilitated via Hot Notes. These notes can be created for any of the reasons stated.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes. This is the type of clarifying information that is appropriate to place in the “Comments” column in Attachment 12-3.*

109. Description/Comments/Question:

Automatic audit trail logging and generate report for all queries and reports run (e.g. query/report name or SQL code, date/time, user).	SQL Server can be setup to track each and every query run against it.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes. This is the type of clarifying information that is appropriate to place in the “Comments” column in Attachment 12-3. Please also note requirement / item #2.01 (database queries and reporting should be intuitive and require minimal training).*

110. Description/Comments/Question:

SSN check via Telos DAC or other method (vendor to suggest)	SSNs are passed to TELOS during enrollment. However, the IDMS does not have an independent check out side of this case.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

111. Description/Comments/Question:

System shall be available 24/7; design shall be reflective of that business environment such that no single point of failure will disrupt operations.	System availability relies heavily on the infrastructure at the airport.	Can this requirement be removed?
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #7.*

112. Description/Comments/Question:

Integrate with a TSA certified DAC (the current DAC is the Telos ID) for processing of STA's and CHRC's. Automate submission of applicant demographics and biometrics to the DAC and return of vetting results directly into individual records.	Telos does not currently return CHRC related information.	Can this requirement be removed?
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

*Answer: No; see response to #44.*

113. Description/Comments/Question:

The IdMS shall have the capability to provide an automated method to enroll badge holders in the Rap Back program upon submission of fingerprint to Telos and not wait for badge issuance. Also, the IdMS shall have capability to remove badge holder from the Rap Back program after badge is not active (expired / terminated) for more than 30 days. Suspension of a badge will not trigger de-enrollment from Rap back.	TELOS rap backs can be setup automatically.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port is not able to answer this question because the proposer / vendor does not provide any information on how its system does or does meet this requirement (proposer / vendor only indicates what TelosID may or may not be able to do). Proposer / vendor is encouraged to provide additional details about how it may meet this requirement in its proposal.*

114. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Provide ability to capture multiple names such as - Business Legal name, Doing business as, abbreviated name to be printed on the badge. All these could differ from the company name used for billing. Also allow mechanism for capturing company name from the PACS for historical purposes.</p>	<p>The company names will be captured from the PACS system. Afterwards the IDMS allows for two separate company names: long and short.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes; this is the type of clarifying information that is appropriate to place in the “Comments” column in Attachment 12-3.*

115. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Company configuration including: Security checks (e.g. CHRC, STA, CBP, Secure flight, other 3rd party checks) including capability to set exemption at the company level; Badge types allowed including privileges (e.g. driving, CBP seals) for each badge type; Financial configurations (e.g. monthly invoiced, no fee, pay-as-you-go by Individual, pay-as-you-go by Company(AS), escrow) and Company specific badge and non-badge fee configurations.</p>	<p>The configurations of badge types and privileges are defaulted, but not limited. Such is the same with company/division financial pricing.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes; this is the type of clarifying information that is appropriate to place in the “Comments” column in Attachment 12-3.*

116. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Provide and describe mechanisms to incorporate 2-factor authentication for the Authorizing Signatory Portal. The IdMS shall have the capability to implement OTP / authentication codes via text or email. Specific functions such as badge application, renewal authorizations, audit responses the airport might choose to use 3rd level of authentication - either an OTP or a PIN used for door access in the PACS.</p>	<p>The IDMS allow for two factor authentication via TOTP (Time-Based One Time Password) authentication Google/Microsoft Authenticator</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes; this is the type of clarifying information that is appropriate to place in the “Comments” column in Attachment 12-3.*

117. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall provide capability for the AS to perform at a minimum, the following functions for his / her company and any other company that the AS is assigned to:          1) Enroll new applicants, 2) Authorize renewal of badges, badge management including de-activation, 3) Manage company information including updates to contact, insurance contract information, 4) Request access levels, keys, permits, 5) Responds to badge audit, 6) Payment of badge fees, 7) Pre-enroll sub-contractors, 8) Manage other AS profiles within his/her company, 9) Schedule appointments for applicants.</p>	<p>The IDMS allows for authorized signers to handle a majority of the functions and company principals to handle the rest.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port cannot answer affirmatively because the proposer / vendor does not provide enough detailed information to determine if the solution meets the requirement in full or part. The Port suggests that the proposer / vendor provide additional clarifying information in the “Comments” column in Attachment 12-3.*

118. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>IdMS shall have capability to maintain separation of duties for Trusted Agents. The Trusted Agent user that processed the employee badge application and verified identification cannot issue the employee’s badge. Other restrictions to enforce separation of duty may apply. Security Badging Office supervisors may override this restriction.</p>	<p>The IDMS allows for different users to have different access, thereby differentiating what each individual can do with in the system.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: No. All badging staff must have the capability to do all badging tasks in IdMS (e.g., check ID / process an application and issue a badge) and therefore “separation of duties” must be enforced dynamically (not by access level). For example, if Port staff member A checks ID / processes application of applicant X, then staff member A should be precluded from issuing the badge (without supervisor override) and another other Port staff member (e.g., B, C, D, or E) must do it. However, if Port staff member B checks ID / processes application of applicant X, then staff member A should be able to issue the badge. As shown in this example, both Port staff members (A and B) must have the ability to both check ID / process application AND produce / issue the badge (just not to the same applicant, X).*

119. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall have capability to clearly indicate the sponsoring /primary company and sponsored (sub-contractor) company relationship. A company could have multiple companies sponsoring badges and similarly, one company could sponsor multiple companies.</p>	<p>The IDMS allows for multiple contracts for each company. Those contracts can be used to affect badge expirations</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port is not able to answer this question because the prosper / vendor does not provide any information on how its system does or does meet this requirement. Proposer / vendor is encouraged to provide additional details about how it may meet this requirement in its proposal. The proposer / vendor is discussing contracts and badge expirations; meanwhile the requirement / item is discussing relationships between primary companies (which can sponsor another company) and companies sponsored by primary companies.*



120. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Notify the designated Airport or Badging staff if a badge is updated but not going to be printed, and any elements were modified that would change the appearance of the badge if it were to be reprinted.</p>	<p>The IDMS captures all the data at the time of printing to ensure previewing the badge should always view as it was printed, even if data is changed afterwards.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port is not able to answer this question because the proposer / vendor does not provide any information on how its system does or does meet this requirement. Proposer / vendor is encouraged to provide additional details about how it may meet this requirement in its proposal. See response to #7.*

121. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Provide a standardized API for use by Airport IT developers to integrate or interface third-party systems and custom solutions.</p>	<p>The IDMS does have a limited API which can be used to retrieve person/badge data.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes, proposers / vendors are encouraged to information in the Comments column of Attachment 12-3 (or separate sheet if more space is needed) describing how their proposed IdMS solution meets the requirement / item or if there are any limitations or exclusions to meeting the requirement / item (e.g., limited to person / badge data retrieval).*

122. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Provide the capability to mask all or specific Personal Identifiable Information (PII) (e.g. SSN) and non-PII (e.g. PIN) data fields for display after initial input. The masking will be based on business rules and allow the airport to modify PII fields. The UI will clearly indicate if the data is missing.</p>	<p>The IDMS has several fields that can be displayed based on users access. Even further, some of the fields can be displayed, but masked.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes*

123. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide the capability to mask all or specific Personal Identifiable Information (PII) (e.g. SSN) and non-PII (e.g. PIN) data fields for display after initial input. The masking will be based on business rules and allow the Airport to modify PII fields. The UI will clearly indicate if the data is missing.	The IDMS has several fields that can be displayed based on users access. Even further, some of the fields can be displayed, but masked.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes*

124. Description/Comments/Question:

Integration with payment processing systems (Port's Oracle PoS system) or with external services such as PayPal, Stripe, Square - (vendor to suggest)	The IDMS specifically only uses Clover for credit card processing.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port cannot answer this question because it is not familiar with Clover devices. The Port is requesting integration with Oracle PoS or other online payment platform. Please clarify your proposed solution to payment processing in your proposal.*

125. Description/Comments/Question:

IdMS shall support the use of templates for emails to the Security Bading Office staff, companies, and Authorized Signers.	The IDMS utilizes its NotifyICE application to email interested parties after user/system events. These notifications can be completed customized to fit the needs of the airport and notification receiver.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes*

126. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>Times out IdMS web or client sessions according to system administrator-configured period of idle time no longer than 30 minutes. The re-login should open the same screen / page where auto logout triggered. IdMS must save work prior to auto time-out.</p>	<p>The IDMS web portal supports auto logout sessions. The main thick client does not auto logouts.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes*

127. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall check for duplicate company names. If the company name exists, the IdMS shall notify the ASC and Badging Office staff of a potential duplicate. At a minimum the "Doing Business as", FEIN / Tax ID, and the "abbreviated / badge printed" name for a company should be unique in the system.</p>	<p>The IDMS will not allow a company to added unless the name is unique.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes*

128. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>IdMS will provide capability for the Badging Office staff to pre-enroll a new company and provide at a minimum the following information including but not limited to company name, legal name, address, company representative (CR) / company contact person with name, email, and DoB and position/job title, start and end dates, contract information, contract start and end dates.</p>	<p>The initial company enrollment includes many of the fields, but not all of the fields.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes; proposers / vendors should disclose any limitations or exclusions in the Comments column of Attachment 12-3 if the proposed IdMS solution is not fully compliant out-of-the-box or cannot be made to be fully compliant through custom development.*

129. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>IdMS will provide capability for the Authorized Signatory (AS) to pre-enroll a new company sub-contractor via the AS portal. The AS will provide at a minimum the sub-contractor company (contractor/ vendor) information including but not limited to company name, legal name, address, contact person with contact information and position / job title, start and end dates, contract information, contract start and end dates.</p>	<p>The initial company enrollment is completed by principals in the IDMS.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port is not able to answer this question because the proposer / vendor does not provide any information on how its system does or does meet this requirement. The requirement / item asks for capabilities for companies / Authorized Signers to pre-enroll subcontractors; meanwhile, the proposed process discusses “principals.” The proposer / vendor is encouraged to provide additional details about how it may meet this requirement in its proposal (e.g., in the Comments column in Attachment 12-3). See response to #7.*

130. Description/Comments/Question:

<p>The IdMS shall allow reporting of employees that kept the appointment, no shows, late arrivals.</p>	<p>The schedule can distinguish between appointment that were kept and those that were not. Late arrivals are not tracked.</p>	<p>Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes; however, the proposer / vendor should describe in detail limitations or exclusions, such as late arrivals are not tracked, in the Comments column of Attachment 12-3 (if additional space is required, please use additional sheets to provide explanations).*

131. Description/Comments/Question:

Support input of unlimited comments associated with persons, company, security checks, training, badges, access levels, keys, permits, each of which is automatically user/date/time stamped.	The system has individual comments/notes for persons, companies and divisions. Other comments/notes are available through out the system but may or may not be kept separate for previous comments/notes.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

132. Description/Comments/Question:

Manage concurrent user sessions on a single shared credentialing workstation while accurately identifying the user making the change, for audit purposes.	To clarify, each person logging into IdMS is audited. Each person is unique. However, the workstation can only have one user logged in at a time.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes.*

133. Description/Comments/Question:

Provide invalid or non conforming entries (e.g. red color) on the screen and prevent invalid or incomplete submissions.	Validate checks through out the system ensure users complete all necessary/required data elements.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: The Port is not able to answer this question because the prosper / vendor does not provide information on how its system does or does meet this requirement. The requirement / item asks for on-scene highlights or notification of invalid or non-conforming entries; meanwhile, the proposed process discusses “validation checks.” The proposer / vendor is encouraged to provide additional details about how it may meet this requirement in its proposal (e.g., in the Comments column in Attachment 12-3). See response to #7.*

134. Description/Comments/Question:

The IdMS shall provide capability to clearly display in the company profile, if the company is reaching or reached badge quotas, is nearing (30 days ahead) company / contract end date, has no active AS, documents or insurance requirements have expired and other visual indicators as required by the Airport Badging Office.	Whether or not a company is reaching or has reached a quota or limit can be made available via SSRS reports.	Is our current process acceptable for this requirement? This would enable Oakland to have an off-the-shelf product, and decrease the amount of development time required to meet all possible business rules.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Answer: Yes, but please also note requirement / item #2.01.*

135. Question: **Small Local Business Participation:** Regarding the non-discrimination policy and the requirement to use small-local business for a certain percentage of the project, Company X would be happy to comply with this requirement. Since we are headquartered in a different state/region, we will need to know what percentage of the project cost needs to be used in this manner so we can adjust our bid accordingly. We would like you to know, that this will impact our overall price by at least that same margin since we will not only have to use resources that will add cost to the project, but then we will be tasked with managing those resources as well.

*Answer: The Port's Non-Discrimination and Small Local Business Utilization Policy (NDSLBP) awards preference points for meaningful utilization of Port certified firms and it is not a requirement to use small-local business(s). Please reference Attachment 5 of the RFP.*

136. In what types of situations will the Port assess liquidated damages?

*Answer: The final scope of liquidated damages is subject to mutual agreement before execution of the agreement. At a minimum, however, liquidated damages must be assessed in cases of: (a) project delays during the entire term of the contract; (b) lack of compliance with contractual, technical, and/or functional requirements; (c) system availability and uptime (at least 99.99%); (d) response times of the application on workstations and in the web portal; (e) contractor response times; and (f) failure to badge printing.*

137. How much will liquidated damages be?

*Answer: The final amount of liquidated damages is subject to mutual agreement before execution of the agreement.*

**There are no other questions to RFP No. 19-20/03.**