



Purchasing Department  
530 Water Street  
Oakland, CA 94607

August 29, 2023

### ADDENDUM No. 1

#### **RFP No.: 23-24/01, Flight Operations & Landing Fee Management Software Services**

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:** Do you want all the following features in single application or separate applications? Flight operations, Surface operation, Feet and Asset tracking, Landing Fee & Revenue management.

*Answer: A single application (or fewer applications) streamlines operations use of these functions so is preferable, especially as it relates to flight operations, surface operation, and fleet and asset tracking. Landing fee and revenue management is less likely needed real-time so although it would be preferable for it to be combined, it is less critical than combining the other aspects of this program.*

2. **Question:** Do you have any technology stack preferences?

*Answer: The Port will evaluate all proposals and consider the pros and cons with the proposed stack. Proposers should consider what they think would be the best fit for the airport with an emphasis on high availability and ease of maintenance.*

3. **Question:** What is the target date for getting applications online?

*Answer: Refer to the RFP noted contract start date of July 1, 2024.*

4. **Question:** Is there any priority of the applications? i.e. the Sequence in which you want them delivered? Or do you want all of them to be live at a time?

*Answer: A solution should be capable of providing all services at the inception of the contract, although we understand that certain aspects of each system, such as deployment and installation of vehicle transponders would likely take some time. Any response should*

*highlight a realistic implementation schedule, considering training and any installation time.*

5. **Question:** What is the estimated budget for this project?

*Answer: There is no estimated budget for this project.*

6. **Question:** Do you have any similar applications already in use? If yes, can you provide access to those for reference purposes?

*Answer: The Port currently has an agreement with PASSUR Aerospace.*

7. **Question:** Is there an existing style guide that we should adhere to for consistency?

*Answer: No. The Port will evaluate all proposals and consider the pros and cons.*

8. **Question:** Will you share the UI designs or want the vendor to design the UI?

*Answer: The vendor should design and propose the UI.*

9. **Question:** "the Port's Insurance requirements listed in Attachment 9": Where to find this attachment?

*Answer: Attachment 9 states "All of the Port's Insurance requirements are incorporated into Professional Services Agreement (PSA) attached to this Request for Proposal (Attachment 11)."*

10. **Question:** "Port's Standard Professional Services Agreement (Attachment 11)": Where to find this attachment?

*Answer: Refer to the RFP. The Professional Services Agreement (Attachment 11) is included.*

11. **Question:** Are you open to customizing and integrating COTS solutions or want only custom development solutions?

*Answer: We can accept COTS solutions but will evaluate based on how such solutions will work in the OAK environment, based on our specific needs.*

12. **Question:** This is regarding the information to be shown on the portal about all the arriving/ departing/ airborne flights. Will we get all this data from Amadeus Airport Operational DataBase (AODB)?

*Answer: AODB can be one source of information but should not be relied upon to be the only source of flight information.*

13. **Question:** How much period has to be considered to show the real time flight data on the platform? Ex: Hours/ days/ weeks etc.

*Answer: Real-time flight data should reflect all operations occurring at that time. Reporting should be capable of providing historical information on flight activity for multiple years.*

14. **Question:** From where to get the delayed flight information?

*Answer: The proposer should identify how to obtain this information and should not rely on an OAK-supplied data source to obtain this.*

15. **Question:** Ability to report delayed flights. Does this mean showing delayed flight information on the portal? or to send a notification to the passengers of the delayed flight?

*Answer: This is meant to show delay information to airport personnel, likely through the Portal.*

16. **Question:** What is meant by customizing real-time, visible layers (weather, map detail, etc.)?

*Answer: Generally, this is in reference to real-time flight tracking when there should be available default as well as user-customizable views such as adding a weather overlay to a flight tracking map.*

17. **Question:** "The Platform must enable activity reports customizable by the Airport, allowing querying of multiple diverse types of data (all flights, departures only, certain days/times, etc.)." I believe this is applicable to the list of real time data that has to be shown for each flight. Please confirm.

*Answer: The question is a bit unclear, but an example of how this might be used would be operations might be interested in something like running a report identifying all departures of a given type of aircraft from a specific airline off a given runway between the hours of 2pm and 5pm between January 1 and January 15, 2023. Another example might be running a report of how often a specific tail number operated at OAK over the past few months operated from a specific runway.*

18. **Question:** Please elaborate this: "Surface tracking must be able to be sufficiently granular to enable Port to be able to ascertain the location of an aircraft on a high-resolution map, including gate or other parking positions." Does this platform need to show the realtime position of flight on the high-resolution map as well?

*Answer: Yes*

19. **Question:** Apart from Fleet and asset tracking applications, do you want any other application to be accessible from mobile tablets?

*Answer: Real-time flight/delay information should also be available on mobile tablets.*

20. **Question:** "Software can be viewed on desktop/laptops and mobile tablets and other devices" Please specify What are the 'other devices'?

*Answer: This is intended to allow the Proposers to identify any other technologies, e.g. mobile phones, which can be used to interface with the product.*

21. **Question:** "The platform must be able to alert Airport and/or vehicle drivers when vehicles enter restricted areas defined by the Airport". Please specify what type of alert you want? Ex: Text notification to the driver or alarm or phone call to the driver? Etc.

*Answer: The Port will evaluate all proposed alerts.*

22. **Question:** Please elaborate what features do you want in this application? The requirement is very high level. Ex: In case of emergency what exactly do you expect?

*Answer: Refer to the RFP scope of services for the requirements.*

23. **Question:** "The system must also enable the airport to evaluate the use of a specific section of the Airport (e.g., Runway or Taxiway)." To evaluate the use, what data do you want to be shown in the app?

*Answer: This is another question where an example of a potential use might help illustrate what OAK is looking for – we might be interested in running a report on how often a given taxiway or segment of taxiway is used between the hours of 10p and 5a. The output should show overall numbers as well as allow the user to look at details regarding any specific operation (e.g. aircraft registration number, airline, owner, type...)*

24. **Question:** "The system must also enable the airport to evaluate the use of a specific section of the Airport (e.g., Runway or Taxiway)." Do you want the evaluation to be performed by the app or will it be done manually by the airport personnel? If by the app, then please specify what you want in the evaluation report?

*Answer: This should be done by the app, see above for the use case.*

25. **Question:** Give examples of NOTAMS that can be shown graphically on high-resolution map.

*Answer: Runway/taxiway closures, FICONS, Restrictions (e.g. wingspan), work in progress*

26. **Question:** "Platform must provide data regarding aircraft position and flight activity to 3rd party systems". Please list down all the 3rd party applications. Is this feature applicable only for the landed and parked flights?

*Answer: Gate Management System AODB and possibly other maintenance systems (jet bridge operation)*

27. **Question:** From where to get the information to be shown in this platform?

- Weight of Aircraft
- Actual Landing Weight of Cargo Aircraft by Type, e.g., Freight vs. Mail
- Number of Seats on Passenger Aircraft
- Number of Landing at OAK
- Departure Time of Origin Airport (Not mandatory but recommended to provide)
- Aircraft Landing Detail, e.g., North Field or South Field (Not mandatory but recommended to provide)

*Answer: The proposer should provide this and should not expect OAK to provide this data.*

28. **Question:** What is the criteria for the aircraft to be shown in this platform? i.e. how to decide which aircraft's data has to be shown on this platform. Ex: Only arriving flights? Or already landed flights? Or historical data?

*Answer: Both real-time and historical data should be available graphically.*

29. **Question:** Please provide more details of the Training Services Needed.

*Answer: The RFP outlines the training requirements. Any additional training or changes to what is identified in the RFP should be proposed.*

30. **Question:** Can an SBE Partner with a larger firm to get domain expertise of Flight Operations and NOTAMS etc?

*Answer: Yes, although the evaluation will consider the SBEs past-experience in providing this or a similar solution in addition to experience of a larger firm.*

31. **Question:** Can a bid be made excluding the Fleet and Asset tracking hardware and functionality?

*Answer: A vendor may elect not to bid on any portion of the RFP but the bid might be considered to be non-responsive.*

32. **Question:** Please confirm that consortium bidding is allowed for the RFP?

*Answer: Yes, consortium bidding is allowed.*

33. **Question:** Please confirm that sub-contracting with a non- Small/Local business is allowed.

*Answer: Yes, sub-contracting with a non-Small/Local business is allowed.*

34. **Question:** Please provide forecasts for number of passengers and flights operated for the next 5 years.

*Answer: Forecasts for the next 5 years is unavailable. Refer to our airport historical statistics found on our website. <https://www.oaklandairport.com/news/statistics/monthly-activity-report/>*

35. **Question:** Please provide details of the current operations systems in use at the airport.

*Answer: OAK has multiple systems currently in use that support operations but none that provide exactly what is being discussed in this RFP. Proposers therefore should reference the RFP and bid based on developing a complete system that meets OAK's needs.*

36. **Question:** Question about small and local business requirements: Since the requirements are for commercial off the shelf software and the RFP states that the VMATs are to be provided for OAK to install, what work within this RFP scope does OAK envision the contractor may use a small or local business for?

*Answer: The proposer should identify what work within the RFP scope is suitable to use a small or local business.*

The following questions are based on the requirement in II. Scope of Services, 3. Fleet and asset tracking, that states, "Platform must be able to alert Airport and/or vehicle drivers when vehicles enter restricted areas defined by the Airport, such as runway safety. Platform must enable the airport to also define specific areas that vehicles are able to operate and areas that they are restricted from operating (e.g., during construction activity defining an "electronic fence" for vehicles equipped with temporary transponders) and should be able to alert the Airport when vehicles are operating outside of approved areas."

37. **Question:** Is the assumption correct that the airport will test the Platform's Runway Safety Alerting capabilities to ensure the system is fully compliant in meeting the safety and performance requirements of the FAA's current RIWS advisory circular [150/5210-25A, Performance Specification for Airport Vehicle Runway Incursion Warning Systems \(RIWS\), 12/19/2019 \(faa.gov\)](#)? Please note that the FAA has communicated that it is up to the airport operator to determine compliance with the AC prior to procuring any equipment.

*Answer: It is the goal of the procurement to identify a solution that will, as stated in 150/5210-25A to, "help the vehicle driver avoid potential for runway incursions. The RIWS should be used as a situational awareness tool. The use of RIWS does not relieve vehicle operators of their responsibilities relevant to airport familiarity, situational awareness, driver training, and following air traffic controllers' instructions when driving on the AOA."*

*In addition, the Airport would like to view the location of all equipped vehicles/equipment on the AOA from, at a minimum, at a centralized location (such as the Airport Operations Center). Also, ideally, the system can be tuned to allow notification to Airport Operations, real time, if a vehicle leaves or enters a given area (e.g. leaves a pre-defined construction area).*

*Understanding that there are few if any systems that meet the performance standards of 5210-25A, strict adherence to this AC is not mandatory but the Airport will evaluate the ability of each system to meet the spirit of the AC.*

38. **Question:** As the FAA requires the Airport Operator to determine compliance with FAA AC 150/5210-25A, must the vendor demonstrate full compliance with the FAA AC requirements at OAK prior to the Platform Runway Safety Alerting capabilities being formally procured and deployed?

*Answer: No, the vendor should identify how their technology, given a reasonable ramp-up period, would be able to either meet the spirit of AC 150/5210-25A, insofar as it provides enhanced situational awareness for vehicle drivers and Airport Operations. OAK may evaluate to what extent a system can enhance situational awareness vis a vis another proposer but strict adherence to the AC is not necessarily required.*

39. **Question:** If OAK determines that the Platform Runway Safety Alerting capabilities do not meet all the safety and performance requirements of FAA AC 150/5210-25A at OAK will the vendor be responsible for modifying the solution to ensure full compliance with FAA AC 150/5210-25A requirements at their own cost?

*Answer: As noted above, the intent of the system is intended to meet the spirit of the AC but full compliance of the AC, especially understanding the lack of approved system, is not strictly required.*

40. **Question:** As it is our understanding that no commercial vendor has had their RIWS system fully tested to meet the performance specifications of FAA AC 150/5210-25A, is OAK willing to indemnify the vendor of all liabilities associated with the use of the Platform Runway Safety Alerting capabilities that do not fully meet the safety and performance requirements of FAA AC 150/5210-25A?

*Answer: The Port is not willing to indemnify Consultant, however, as noted in question 37, the goal of the system is to enhance situational awareness for Airport Operations and vehicle operators. It does not, however abrogate an individual's responsibility, independent of the functionality of the system, to know where they are on the airfield and to avoid critical areas unless specifically given access in coordination with air traffic control.*

41. **Question:** Is the vendor able to “No-Bid” the Platform Runway Safety Alerting capabilities requirement due to liability concerns?

*Answer: A vendor may elect not to bid on any portion of the RFP but the bid might be considered to be non-responsive. As noted in the previous questions, the goal of the system would be to enhance awareness but not shift liability onto a vendor to ensure safety on the airfield.*

**There are no other questions to RFP No. 23-24/01.**