

RFP R1804 Q&A Requirements Analysis (Detailed Q&A Text)

Analysis of the Q&A document, mapping additional/clarified requirements to implementation strategy files. The 'Requirement / Question Text' column now includes both the Question and the official Response.

Serial Number	Q&A ID#	Requirement / Question Text (Q & A)	Covered in Proposal (Yes/No)	If Yes (which of the 33 html files)	If No (Gap Type)	Assigned To	ETA	Commer
546	1	<p>Q: What type of tablet and Telematics are in use? Please include brand and device type.</p> <p>A: All NYC DOE Vehicles are equipped with GeoTab Advanced GPS Vehicle Tracking Devices Model GO9+. GeoTabs are fixed on board the vehicle providing telematic data provided through a connector to the vehicles OBDII port (this GPS does not support any driver or route details). In addition Drivers carry on board a cellular phone, brand Samsung, models SM-A125F, SM-A125U, SM-A146U, SM-A156U, SM-A205U, SM-S205DL, and SM-A205U1 (depending on date of issue). These are utilized with vendor provided software for providing driver ID, route ID, student ridership ID, time, and vehicle starting and present and historic (after subscription) location.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Contextual existing hardware landscape integration strategy.
547	2	<p>Q: Will NYC DOE allow respondents to utilize the current hardware (Tablets and Telematics device)?</p> <p>A: YES. Re-use of on board equipment is encouraged but not required for this proposal solution.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf				Flexibility Confirms reuse hardware Impacts project solution cost
548	3	<p>Q: Page 19, Section 3.2, Item 4, Why does the GPS have to provide TBT. Should that be a function across the system or does the GPS software specifically need that?</p> <p>A: TBT for our bus drivers is a necessary function of the solution being sought and must be included in the proposal. If this is being done in a manner outside of the GPS solution, that should be included in your proposal.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Clarification TBT need and implementation flexibility.
549	4	<p>Q: Page 19, Section 3.2, Item 5 Use of LION ArcGIS. Is that the mandatory map for all services or does it need to be able to export to it?</p> <p>A: The use of the LION file is mandatory. ArcGIS is the DOE enterprise COS.</p>	Yes	Appendix S.2 - GIS Integration.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Constraints Mandates (RFP-S3.2 ArcGIS standards)
550	5	<p>Q: Page 19, Section 3.2, Item 8 Why does the GPS have to provide ETA. Should that be a function across the system or does the GPS software specifically need that?</p> <p>A: ETA is a necessary function of the solution being sought and must be included in the proposal. If this is being done in a manner outside of the GPS solution, that should be included in your proposal.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Clarification ETA need and implementation flexibility.
551	6	<p>Q: Page 20, Section 3.2, Item 24 Please explain what this means.</p> <p>A: It means the system can accept GIS changes to optimize how routes are planned.</p>	Yes	Appendix S.2 - GIS Integration.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Information meaning S3.2.24.

Serial Number	Q&A ID#	Requirement / Question Text (Q & A)	Covered in Proposal (Yes/No)	If Yes (which of the 33 html files)	If No (Gap Type)	Assigned To	ETA	Commer
				System Architecture.pdf				
552	7	<p>Q: Page 20, Section 3.2, Item 27 Must this be done in the GPS module?</p> <p>A: No, this doesn't necessarily need to be done in the GPS module; it can be handled by the GIS or mapping module of the software.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix S.2 - GIS Integration.pdf				Information implementation flexibility (RFP-S3.2)
553	8	<p>Q: Page 23, Section 3.6, Item 11 Multi-language support. Which languages? Native to all the systems or any one of them?</p> <p>A: DOE is obligated to provide translations in 9 DOE languages - identified as DOE Supported languages: https://www.schools.nyc.gov/school-life/school-environment/hello</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR); Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (i18n)			New Configuration: Specifies language: multi-lang (RFP-S3.6) provided.	
554	9	<p>Q: Page 24, Section 3.7, Item 11 &12 Does it have to have these all native?</p> <p>A: Yes, these all must be available.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf				Clarification: native implementation expectation Driver Model (Multi-language FAQs).
555	10	<p>Q: Page 30, Section 3.20, Item 1 Does it have to use all of the mechanisms to read student information or just 1 or several?</p> <p>A: This will be based on the solution you provide.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Flexibility vendor choice reading type (RFP-S3.2)
556	11	<p>Q: Benefits for including "Innovative" Capabilities in a solution? (somewhat related to section 3.2 but not exclusively). Page 18 - Section 3.2 - Successful Proposers should offer their best, most creative, and innovative solution that performs all the following services, including, but not limited to, the below. The decision / selection criteria listed includes Program Plan, Demonstrated Effectiveness, Price and Organizational Capacity. I have read the importance of "Innovation" and curious if there is value in including capabilities that will improve the safety and welfare of students?</p> <p>A: All RFPs will be evaluated based on the criteria outlined in the solicitation. NYCPS seeks the most up to date, cost effective and efficient solution to the RFP.</p>	No	N/A (Evaluation Criteria)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Information on how innovation evaluated proposal standard
557	12 & 17	<p>Q12: Section 14 There is reference to development team being in NY City. On the pre-bid call, I have notes that includes information about being located in the "Geographic Market". I believe that I need clarification. Can you verify that the:</p> <p>1.Dedicated Development team must be in New York City? Or are some allowed in a local office location as well?</p> <p>Q17: Section 2.3 Lists a requirement for a local software development team based in New York City. Establishing</p>	Yes	Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf; Appendix U.2 -				Clarification: Significant understanding local team Different ground rules Requires sessions f

Serial Number	Q&A ID#	Requirement / Question Text (Q & A)	Covered in Proposal (Yes/No)	If Yes (which of the 33 html files)	If No (Gap Type)	Assigned To	ETA	Commer
		<p>such a team will require time and substantial investment and thus we assume it is reasonable for vendors to not have such a team in place by the time of their submission. Is this correct? If so, then should vendors include in their proposals their anticipated timelines for establishing the local development team after being awarded the contract? Does the DOE have any other guidance to provide on this requirement?</p> <p>A: The development team can operate from anywhere in the USA, but the OPT office provides space for project managers and developers to attend meetings and work on-site. OPT requires members of the app dev and data teams to attend in-person working sessions. A ground support team based in NYC is required for device management, installation, and repairs.</p>	Yes	Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf				
558	13	<p>Q: For WMBE Participants, is the only requirement that they be registered with City or State as a Certified WMBE (and through this registration we know that they are operating within "Geographic Markets" referenced)?</p> <p>A: To qualify as an MWBE participant, a firm must be officially certified as a Minority and/or Women-Owned Business Enterprise (MWBE) by either New York City or New York State. This certification verifies that the firm operates within the designated geographic market areas established by the certifying agencies.</p>	No	N/A (Compliance Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Information MWBE ce source.
559	14	<p>Q: Section 3.18 Can you confirm all HW and all Procurement is to be handled by the awarded team and to be included in final proposal?</p> <p>A: Yes all hardware and procurement will be handled by the awarded team.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf; Appendix Y.1 - Budget Management.pdf				Requirements Vendor re HW proc
560	15, 51, 55, 121, 151, 245, 272, 274	<p>Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about deadline extensions)</p> <p>A: NYCPS will consider adjusting the due date of this proposal. Please continue to look for amendments to this RFP in the event the deadline is changed.</p>	No	N/A (RFP Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Information deadline requests.
561	16	<p>Q: We assume that a vendor submitting a waiver to the MWBE participation requirements can still move forward with a proposal including such participation levels (thus no longer needing the waiver), but can you please confirm?</p> <p>A: A vendor may apply for a full or partial waiver as outlined in Part 3 of the Schedule B MWBE Utilization Plan. If the waiver is approved, the vendor must include the approved waiver form with their proposal submission. If the waiver is denied and the vendor chooses to proceed, they must comply with the MWBE Participation Goals stated in Part 1 of the Schedule B and submit Part 2 of the Schedule B fully completed with their proposal.</p>	No	N/A (Compliance Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Information MWBE co process re waivers.
562	18	Q: Please provide the total number of eligible riders, the total number of schools, and the total number of buses included in NYC's transportation services.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Contextual Provides figures fo

Serial Number	Q&A ID#	Requirement / Question Text (Q & A)	Covered in Proposal (Yes/No)	If Yes (which of the 33 html files)	If No (Gap Type)	Assigned To	ETA	Commer
		A: We have approximately 10,500 vehicles in our fleet servicing 153,000 students in ~ 3500 sites. Breakdown below: 6,000 Curb-to-School (Special Education) routes - 65,000 students 2,200 Stop-to-School (General Education) - 75,000 STS students, 1,500 Pre-k Routes- 13,000 students		(Capacity Planning); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Scalability)				Add as a constraint
563	19	<p>Q: Page 12, Item 10 States that session times may be different each day. Are these differences known far in advance, as part of each school's calendar, or do changes occur with little notice, causing necessary adjustments to the routing?</p> <p>A: The scheduled session time for each day of the week is known in advance. Schools are required to submit their sessions times in May/June of each year for the following school year for review and approval. That said, Charter and Non-Public schools can request half days through their calendar system within three days of the change (ex. school can request a half day on Tuesday for Friday). The system must be agile and be able to accept schedule changes.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Routing Logic/Agility)				Clarification Adds req handling : schedule S3.14).
564	20	<p>Q: Page 19, Item 9 States that drivers must be unassigned from routes when they are completed. Are drivers assigned to the same routes each day (customary for almost all school operations) or do their route assignments change? If the former then can OPT elaborate on why the drivers must be unassigned or what this should look like from OPT's perspective?</p> <p>A: Driver Routes assignments change daily with an estimated 10% of School Bus Company driver call outs (unplanned time off), or other scheduled planned time off. Driver and route assignment changes occur frequently between Driver and route, Driver and vehicle, and Driver and phone/tablet device. To ensure real time data integrity for essential Driver route vehicle, and student ridership is dependent on Driver ability to associate themselves with route, vehicle, and student ridership assigned. SchoolBus Companies must identify daily that a NYC DOE OPT approved driver is the driver assigned to the route. Drivers who are not eligible to drive are identified as inactive and the drivers logon credentials disabled. The route must be identified as subscribed (Driver logon) and vehicle in use identified, For routes unsubscribed the Bus Company is liable for a Liquidated Damage (monetary charge).</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Driver Association Logic)				Clarification context for requirement changes,
565	21	<p>Q: Page 19, Item 10 Does this simply mean that the GPS devices should allow for minimal sign-in activity or other driver interaction because the same driver typically uses that same device (i.e., drives that same bus)? Or is there other required functionality to this item beyond that?</p> <p>A: The Vendor GPS devices in use are portable and exchangeable among drivers daily. The Driver continuity for route assignment is a means of making less entries for drivers when logging in. If a route were to prepopulate as a first choice or if using a selection list if the route could be prioritized it would make the driver subscription easier and lead to less entry errors. Ideally minimum key stroke entries is desired or addressable system where driver route vehicle details are loaded remotely. We are open to the best easiest and most effective way to promote driver, route and vehicle association.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (Usability); Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Clarification context/g usability r (ease of portable c
566	22	Q: Page 21, Item 4 States: "The vendor must be able to offer next-day repair for up to 30 vehicles, three-day	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware				Information interpretation

Serial Number	Q&A ID#	Requirement / Question Text (Q & A)	Covered in Proposal (Yes/No)	If Yes (which of the 33 html files)	If No (Gap Type)	Assigned To	ETA	Comments
		<p>appointment for projects up to 30 vehicles..." Can you clarify this? It seems to suggest the same threshold (up to 30 vehicles) with two different windows for repair appointments.</p> <p>A: Pending vehicle awaiting repair jeopardizes a vehicle legal use capability . GPS Installations on vehicles are usually project oriented. Repair and Installation of GPS 's and supporting hardware are two distinctly different work activities (i.e. it's possible that the GPS solution provider can schedule more than 30 vehicles, or device to be scheduled for next day across multiple vendors, or a 3 business day appointment for up to 30 vehicles in a single yard. (i.e. 30 vehicles or devices to repair scheduled previous day and 30 hardware installations scheduled three days prior).</p>	Yes	Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf				SLAs (RFI distinguishes vs. project)
567	23	<p>Q: Section 3.6 Software Requirements on p. 23 states that all modules must be built "mobile-first," but the remainder of this section pertains to the parent/caregiver and student modules. Does that requirement pertain to all software inherent in this RFP (including routing software and much more) or does it only pertain to the parent/caregiver and student modules?</p> <p>A: It only pertains to the Caregiver/Parent, Student and Driver module. Also, the web version should be made accessible for the users.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf				Clarification scope of design per S3.6 Intro user mod
568	24	<p>Q: Page 23, Item 3 Our system can handle parents submitting address changes and alternate address requests, but we want to clarify: Will student address changes be coming into the transportation system from both a nightly enrollment file (from the district's SIS) through this mobile application?</p> <p>A: NYCPS will provide students address updates and changes upstream.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf				Information data source changes in NYCPS system interpretation (parent req likely for direct update)
569	25	<p>Q: Page 24, Item 7 Can you please describe the kinds of interventions OPT would want dispatchers to be able to perform when a driver deviates from their route?</p> <p>A: Examples: * Driver selection of assigned route is incorrect *Driver selection of vehicle is incorrect or due to maintenance issue *Ridership or route modifications required * Any other issue requiring modification of Driver, Route, Vehicle, or Student Ridership information in real time.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Admin UI/Workflow)				Clarification use cases interventions (RFP-S3.7)
570	26	<p>Q: Can you please describe what is meant by dispatchers being able to approve or reject route deviations (under 7.a. on p. 24)? For example, if a driver deviates from a route what is the purpose of the dispatcher approving or rejecting that? Should an approval or rejection lead to changes to the route in the routing software?</p> <p>A: Typical situations of Dispatcher route intervention involves two Drivers (ex. Driver #1 incorrectly has the logon/subscription of the wrong route, or vehicle belonging to Driver#2). Dispatcher must have the capability to access login/subscription data for Driver #1 and relieve Driver #1 of the routes assigned to allow Driver #2 to assume their assigned work.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Admin UI/Workflow)				Clarification use case driver route deviation feature (F) May not impact changing itself.
571	27	<p>Q: Section 3.8, Item 3a Refers to a device that will capture the name of the student boarding the bus. We assume this can be an RFID card reader (or similar technology) and</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and				Flexibility Confirms

Serial Number	Q&A ID#	Requirement / Question Text (Q & A)	Covered in Proposal (Yes/No)	If Yes (which of the 33 html files)	If No (Gap Type)	Assigned To	ETA	Commer
		<p>that the student, through the chosen vendor, will receive an RFID card allowing them to directly intersect with this device. Can you please confirm that this is what is being requested? We understand that the options for this can extend beyond RFID but use that as an example.</p> <p>A: Yes, that's correct. We are open to various solutions. The solution must be flexible, scalable, and user-friendly.</p>		Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf				choice for (RFP-S3.8)
572	28	<p>Q: Page 27, Item 15 Refers to "T Administrator capability." What does this mean and what "data of other companies" will this role or roles need access to?</p> <p>A: "OPT Administrator capability" refers to technical administrator roles managing system operations. Access to "data of other companies" may include integration or interoperability data required for system functionality.</p>	Yes	Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Clarification: typo ("T" clarifies scope of access (in data) for
573	29	<p>Q: Page 27, Item 20 States: "Display notification list in near real time of failed route association attempts identifying SBC, Driver and interaction time." Does this refer to notifications which must go to dispatch or other staff when drivers cannot access their route assignments in the GPS device?</p> <p>A: Yes, this refers to notifications sent to dispatch or other staff when drivers are unable to access their route assignments in the GPS device, ensuring timely resolution of issues.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Alerting); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf				Clarification: audience/ failed ass (RFP-S3.1)
574	30	<p>Q: Page 30, Item v. States that there needs to be a routing platform for PreK students, but this does not need to be a separate routing platform from that which will be used for all other students, correct?</p> <p>A: OPT handles routing for all populations except Pre-K students, who are routed by the vendor. Therefore, a separate approach or module may be necessary</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Vendor Portal/Module Design); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf				Constrain: Confirms separate routing c S3.12.1.a
575	31	<p>Q: Page 31, Item b.vi States that the system must display medical alert codes and other codes on the map. Can you please describe the context for this, for when such codes need to be displayed on the map? Also what "other" codes are envisioned? We can provide special needs codes in our route sheets and digital displays of relevant routing information -- is this what is being requested?</p> <p>A: Ambulatory codes. medical alert and special handling codes need to be displayed on the map so Transportation Specialists can view and create routes to specific vehicles types and specific approved accommodations/ needs of the students.</p>	Yes	Appendix S.2 - GIS Integration.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (UI)				Clarification: codes needed for display (Ambulatory, Medical Alert, Special Handling) purpose (assigning stops) S3.12.1.b
576	32	<p>Q: Page 32, Item 3.13 a ii Refers to OPT199 and its core functionality. Can you please provide details on what OPT199 is and what the core functionality is which is expected? We will research what this is but did not want to miss the window for asking questions if we are unable to find the answers we need.</p> <p>A: OPT 199 system is for adds/deletes/changes of authorized bus stops established for each school based on Chancellor's regulations.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf				Contextual: Background on OPT199 and its management S3.13.a.ii
577	33	<p>Q: Page 32, Item 3.13 a iii Discussed stop requests made "by schools." Can you please elaborate on the stop creation and assignment process used by OPT? Are the</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Clarification: current stop request/a

Serial Number	Q&A ID#	Requirement / Question Text (Q & A)	Covered in Proposal (Yes/No)	If Yes (which of the 33 html files)	If No (Gap Type)	Assigned To	ETA	Commer
		<p>stops determined by the schools via their requests (provided the requests are approved)? If so, are the student-to-stop assignments also managed by the schools? If yes to these questions, would OPT be open to a system by which OPT would have full control over these processes via the software provided (with such software also providing stop optimization services)? Would that be agreeable within NYCPS given that it may result in less control/input from the schools?</p> <p>A: Stops are requested by schools and OPT operations. Student to stop assignments are managed by the school but can be assigned by OPT staff during the initial assignment for new incoming students or for a new/moving schools.</p>	Yes	(Workflow); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf				roles for I Does not answer o change.
578	34	<p>Q: Page 35 Item 3.14.a.III. on p. 35 refers to a "Session Time Application." Can you please elaborate on what this is, whether such an application is being requested by this RFP, and what functionality it provides?</p> <p>A: The Session Time Application already exists. The application is used to capture the following data elements from schools every spring for the follow school year: -Daily starts and end times - principal and transportation coordinator information - confirmation on if a school is moving physical locations the following year.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration); Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf				Constrain Provides i existing S App funct RFP-S3.1
579	35	<p>Q: The RFP refers to "out-of-item routes" in multiple places (for example, under 3.16.b.vii. on p. 38). What are out-of-item routes?</p> <p>A: Out of item routes refer to a route that services an out of boro student that is on a within boro route or a between boro route that has no out of boro students, wheelchair accessible routes without wheelchair / lift coded students, and non - wheelchair accessible routes servicing WC / L coded students.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Validation Logic)				Definition Defines "i routes" te alert S3.1
580	36-39, 63, 91, 118, 265	<p>Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about hardware flexibility - On-Bus vs Off-Bus, Reuse, etc.)</p> <p>A: NYCPS is open to any solution type - whether it be a permanent on the bus solution or a mobile solution. In addition, the devices listed in Question 1 are available for integration. Vendors are encouraged to be creative in providing a solution that satisfies the needs listed in this RFP.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Flexibility Q&As cor approach (RFP-S3.1)
581	40	<p>Q: Section 3.19.3 States that "the device needs to be operational based on an existing source of power," but we assume that if it is locked in place on the bus then it must draw power from the bus's electrical system. This is also standard for most on-board mobile device installations. Is this allowable? If not, how is OPT envisioning that the mobile devices will be powered?</p> <p>A: Anything that is installed on the bus must comply with the Original Equipment Manufacturer . The power source will most likely need to be wired into the fuse box and have a designated fuse assigned . NYCPS is open to any solution type - whether it be a permanent on the bus solution or a mobile solution. In addition, the devices listed in Question 1 are available for integration. Vendors are encouraged to be creative in providing a solution that satisfies the needs listed in this RFP.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix P.3 - Audit Framework.pdf			Clarificati detail on expectation RFP-S3.1' S3.19.3.b	

Serial Number	Q&A ID#	Requirement / Question Text (Q & A)	Covered in Proposal (Yes/No)	If Yes (which of the 33 html files)	If No (Gap Type)	Assigned To	ETA	Comments
582	41	<p>Q: Section 3.23.1 Under Training on p. 41 seems to include a typo when listing "27,4009,000 attendants." Roughly how many attendants will need training?</p> <p>A: We have approximately 9,000 drivers and 8,000 attendants that will require training.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf				Data Corr Revises a number f S3.23.1.
583	42	<p>Q: Does the customer want the AI dash camera system to be integrated with another service/hardware provider?</p> <p>A: NYCPS is open to any solution type - whether it be a permanent on the bus solution or a mobile solution. In addition, the devices listed in Question 1 are available for integration. Vendors are encouraged to be creative in providing a solution that satisfies the needs listed in this RFP.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf				Flexibility cam integ optional i handled v hardware
584	43	<p>Q: What is the length of the contract?</p> <p>A: 3 years</p>	No	N/A (Contract Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Information term (init for option
585	44	<p>Q: List of types and models of vehicles.</p> <p>A: Please see Attachment C for details.</p>	No	N/A (External Ref)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Information Location o details.
586	45	<p>Q: Is Alcohol detection needed?</p> <p>A: No, this is not needed.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf				Scope Re Feature e excluded.
587	46	<p>Q: Does it matter if systems are built in the US & EU?</p> <p>A: All work to be done within the USA.</p>	Yes	Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf				Constrain US-based requireme
588	47	<p>Q: Is Facial Recognition needed?</p> <p>A: No.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf				Scope Re Feature e excluded.
589	48	<p>Q: Can the DOE clarify what is meant by "unspecified" with regards to their DBE goal?</p> <p>A: The "Unspecified" category can be fulfilled by any NYC or NYS Certified MWBE firm, regardless of race, ethnicity, or gender.</p>	No	N/A (Compliance Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Information MWBE go
590	49	<p>Q: Can the DOE please provide a copy of the excel template referenced in the contract history section of Schedule B Part 3?</p> <p>A: At this time, the Excel template is not accessible. If additional space is needed to provide the required contract history details, you may submit the information on a separate spreadsheet, ensuring that it includes the same information outlined in Schedule B Part 3.</p>	No	N/A (Proposal Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Information on propos detail (Sc
591	50	<p>Q: Can the DOE explain the relationship between Appendix J, which appears to be for RFP #R1465 "Automated</p>	No	N/A (RFP Document Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Correction RFP docu

Serial Number	Q&A ID#	Requirement / Question Text (Q & A)	Covered in Proposal (Yes/No)	If Yes (which of the 33 html files)	If No (Gap Type)	Assigned To	ETA	Commer
		<p>Substitute Teacher and Paraprofessional Placement System", and this RFP # R1804?</p> <p>A: This is a typo. Updated Appendix J is available for download via the Vendor Portal</p>						correction

592	52 & 53	<p>Q52: Can DOE confirm that an extension of the proposal submission deadline will also result in an extension of the deadline to request an exemption from the MWBE goal?</p> <p>Q53: If an extension of the submission deadline does not automatically result in an extension of the deadline to request an exemption from the MWBE goal, we respectfully request a 4-week extension of the MWBE exemption request deadline.</p> <p>A: Extension to the proposal submission deadline will automatically extend the MWBE waiver request deadline. Waiver requests are due 12 days prior to the proposal submission deadline..</p>	No	N/A (RFP Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Clarifies deadline linkage (Proposal vs MWBE waiver).	
593	54	<p>Q: Would NYCDOE consider extending the questions deadline by 1 week from the original due date of 3-17-25?</p> <p>A: NYCPSC will consider adjusting the due date of this proposal. Please continue to look for amendments to this RFP in the event the deadline is changed.</p>	No	N/A (RFP Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Status of question deadline extension request (linked to overall deadline).	
594	56	<p>Q: Appendix L – Resources for vendors are not downloadable for security reasons. Can NYCDOE please attach a copy of this document for review?</p> <p>A: If you have any issues downloading documents from the Vendor Portal, reach out to vendorhotline@schools.nyc.gov.</p>	No	N/A (Support Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Support contact for vendor portal download issues.	
595	57	<p>Q: What contract does NYCDOE OPT require us to use? Can we use the NY OGS?</p> <p>A: The resulting contract from this RFP will be a DOE contract.</p>	No	N/A (Contract Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Contract type clarification (DOE contract).	
596	58 & 122	<p>Q58: Can NYCPSC please confirm the contract period for this RFP: Section. 1.1 states: This RFP will result in a Three (3) year contract agreement with two (2) two (2)-year unilateral options to extend and Section 9. Contract Term states: The contract(s) resulting from this RFP will be for a term of Three (3) years. The NYCDOE reserves the unilateral option to extend the contract for Two (2) additional One-year periods</p> <p>Q122: What would the term of the contract be?</p> <p>A: This RFP will result in a Three (3) year contract agreement with two (2) two (2)-year unilateral options to extend. An amendment will be issued to clarify.</p>	No	N/A (Contract Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Correction/Clarification: Defines correct contract term/options (3 + 2x2 years).	
597	59	<p>Q: Can NYCPSC provide clarity on Appendix I - Security Requirements: Should suppliers submit a confirmation of our ability to meet</p>	Yes	Appendix P.3 - Audit Framework.pdf;			Clarification: Compliance with Appendix I is expected;	

		these security requirements with our proposal, or is this document for informational purposes only? A: Vendors should comply with all the standards and policies mentioned in the document and if vendors can't meet them then they should provide clarity in their proposal.		Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf			deviations must be noted in proposal.
598	60	Q: Page 21 of the RFP document, point 18, references the document "Information Security Requirements Version 1.5 (see Attachment A1" is this synonymous to "Appendix I - DOE Information Security Requirements for Vendors"? If yes, there is no Attachment A1 therein. Can NYC please clarify. A: Please disregard any reference to Attachment A1. The correct document is labeled "Appendix I - DOE Information Security Requirements for Vendors".	No	N/A (RFP Document Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Correction: Clarifies correct Appendix reference for Security Reqs.
599	61	Q: Can NYC Dept Ed please provide accurate link to NYSED Education Data Retention Schedule ED-1 as listed in Appendix I - DOE Information Security Requirements for Vendors PDF A: https://www.archives.nysed.gov/records/retention-schedules	No	N/A (External Resource)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational Resource: Link relevant to data retention policy (ED-1).
600	62, 120, 137	Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about award/start dates) When does NYCPS anticipate awarding this RFP? What is the desired work start date? What is the desired project completion/ "go live" date? A: We anticipate awarding this RFP in Q2 of calendar year 2025. Work will commence in Q3/Q4 of calendar year 2025, with implementation and integration to be completed by August of 2026.	No	N/A (Project Timeline Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Contextual/Planning info: Estimated award, start, go-live timeframe.
601	64	Q: Can NYCPS please review point 15. on page 27 of the RFP document as we believe there to be an error. A: We don't see any errors on page 27.	No	N/A (RFP Document Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: DOE response regarding potential error on RFP page 27 (likely relates to Q28 about "T Admin").
602	65 & 116 & 80	Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about partial bids) To ensure clarity, please confirm whether NYCPS will accept partial responses for individual RFP components, or if a complete solution is required for award consideration. / If NYCDOE seeks an "end-to-end integrated solution"..., won't all proposers necessarily be proposing more than one component? / On a new GPS system are you looking for a single vendor or multiple vendors with the vendors being your providers? A: A complete solution is required for consideration. That said, vendors can partner with each other to provide one complete, integrated solution.	No	N/A (Proposal Strategy Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Clarifies proposal scope requirement (complete solution required, partnerships OK).
603	66	Q: Section D. GPS references a GPS device that reports engine and mechanical performance. Common engine/mechanical	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and			Scope Clarification: Excludes telematics data collection (e.g., engine data) as primary

		<p>performance data might include odometer, fuel level, engine hours and fault codes. Please provide more detail as to what specific engine and mechanical performance information OPT requires and the priority level (high/medium/low).</p> <p>A: NYCPS does not seek a telematics solution. There is a pre-existing telematics device (see Q1) that can be used for integration if so desired and possible.</p>	Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf		requirement from *this* solution. Integration optional.
604	67	<p>Q: Industry standard K12 GPS solutions tap into systems on the school bus to provide information such as stop arm open/close, amber lights on/off and entrance door open/close. However, these features are not specifically mentioned in GPS section 3.2.15. Please provide specific details regarding what detailed history OPT requires and the priority level (high/medium/low).</p> <p>A: These features are not mentioned in RFP because they are not required.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf	Scope Clarification: Excludes specific hardware sensors (stop arm, lights, door).
605	68	<p>Q: The RFP states that as of the 2019-2020 school year, all contracted buses are required to have operational GPS. Is this requirement currently being met? Is the GPS equipment standardized, i.e. same make/model/manufacturer? Do contractors have their own need for engine/mechanical performance data and GPS history? If yes, what is the priority level (high/medium/low)?</p> <p>A: Yes NYC DOE OPT has an operational GPS on board every vehicle for DOE transportation of students as mandated. The GPS equipment is standardized (see answer to question 1. of this document). Several School Bus Companies rely on engine and mechanical performance data history obtained from the telematics available from GeoTab GO9+. Priority of work is listed with each activity in the RFP.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf	Contextual Info: Confirms current GPS coverage, standardization (GeoTab/Samsung), and SBC use of telematics data.
606	69, 97, 115	<p>Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about existing mounts) Please provide details of the existing hardware and mounting accessories left by the previous vendor / What is the make and model of that mounting hardware? / What information can NYCDOE share about that mounting equipment? Is it adjustable to fit multiple tablet sizes? Are they in good condition?</p> <p>A: Assuming this question is related to hardware on board. RAM Mount- X Gip Mount is designed to securely holding any size cell phone. The mount is paired with a secondary source of power charging cord (primary power is currently resident of the portable device (phone battery) recharged daily after use when off the vehicle). The RAM mount is comprised of a dashboard mount, connected to swivel arm, and an X- grip to hold a cell phone. These parts are interchangeable to support other devices for example; a tablet. Additionally GeoTab GO9+ GPS are already installed under the dashboard near the vehicles OBD port. All equipment is in good condition. The RAM-Xgrip is</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf	Contextual Info: Details existing mounting hardware (RAM X-Grip), condition, adjustability, power connection.

		built to allow X grips can be replaced from current Cell Phone holder to a tablet size X-grip. On Board secondary power is C-type device plug in and may be reused. Please see question 69 [Typo likely meant Q1].				
607	70 & 146 & 246	<p>Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about student IDs) What types of physical IDs do the GE/Pre-K-EI student population carry today...? / Does NYC DoE currently utilize RFID cards with students? / Are all students required to carry school IDs...?</p> <p>A: School IDs are not mandatory and not issued centrally. / OPT handles transportation for NYCPS, Charter Schools and Non-Public schools within the five boroughs. There is no central policy for student IDs, nor is it mandatory. IDs are handled at the school level. / No, they are not required.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf		Contextual Info: Important constraint - no standard student ID means scanning solution needs alternative or requires ID issuance.
608	71	<p>Q: What is the expectation of timing after award to the start of installations?</p> <p>A: We will work with the vendor begin installation as soon as possible after award. The awarded vendor should be able to begin work immediately.</p>	Yes	Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix O.1.2 - 12-Month Timeline.pdf		Informational: Sets expectation for immediate install start post-award.
609	72	<p>Q: What is the expectation of duration of installation/onboarding, and is the desire to complete multiple districts in parallel or install in phases/waves?</p> <p>A: The expectation for install of equipment on vehicles will be 800 vehicles per week or more. Installations can be scheduled as an individual School Bus Company (SBC), or multiple SBC garage locations in the same borough. Depending on the GPS solution selected, the schedule can be modified. the scheduling will be implemented on a school bus company location bases.</p>	Yes	Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf		Constraint/Expectation: Defines target installation velocity (800+/wk) and scheduling approach (by SBC location).
610	73 & 74	<p>Q73: What is the size of the total current database?</p> <p>Q74: How much data is added daily, weekly, and monthly?</p> <p>A: The size of the database will depend on the solution proposed.</p>	No	N/A (Vendor specific)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational: DOE doesn't provide current size/growth metrics. Vendor must estimate based on scale data (Q18, Q76 etc.).
611	75	<p>Q: Will this data need to also be maintained for 7 years?</p> <p>A: Yes.</p>	Yes	Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf		Confirmation of NFR S3.2.17/S3.5.8 (7-year retention).
612	76, 77, 114, 141, 142, 180	<p>Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about user counts) How many users will you expect? / How many simultaneous users...? / How many users require training...? / How many users require full/limited access...?</p> <p>A: School bus drivers - ~8,500 user (Driver app) School Bus Company Admin Staff - 350 (Web Users) School Users - ~3,000 users (Internal) Routers - ~30 users (Internal) Other OPT User/ Central NYCPS stuff - ~200 users (Internal/ReadOnly) Parent/ Guardians - ~300,000 users (App users/ReadOnly)</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Scalability); Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf; Appendix Y.1 - Budget Management.pdf (Licensing)		Contextual Data: Key user load/type estimates for planning. Specify access type (App/Web/Internal/ReadOnly).
613	78	<p>Q: What kind of GPS system is DOE using right now?</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System		Contextual Info + Requirement: Names current

		A: Currently we have installed Geotab for GPS Tracking of the physical vehicle and Via4Schools software for tracking the route. The proposer should have the capability to develop a Route<>Vehicle association. Other details of the current infrastructure can be found in question 1.	Yes	Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			systems (GeoTab, Via4Schools), specifies needed Route<>Vehicle association feature.
614	79	Q: How many unique GPS devices are you tracking? How do you plan to add? A: We will need enough GPS devices to cover our fleet of approximately 10,500 buses.	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Confirmation of hardware scale (~10.5k devices).
615	81	Q: Do the providers impose any limits on data? A: Providers may impose data limits, which would be subject to discussion and approval by OPT to ensure they align with operational requirements..	Yes	Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf; Appendix Y.2 - FinOps Strategy.pdf			Informational/Process: How potential data limits from carriers/providers will be handled.
616	82	Q: What type of barcodes would you like to use? A: The vendor is free to propose a solution in compliance with the requirements of this RFP.	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Flexibility Point: Vendor proposes barcode type (if used).
617	83	Q: For your current system in place: -Please send attachment 2 that is referenced in the RFP and confirm it includes: -Can you share an overview? -Can you share the total scope? -What is deployed? -What is yet to be deployed? -As it relates to what is not deployed will that project continue? -Should we plan to integrate the current system into our solution? -If awarded the project will you share the backend code of the current solution? -Who is your current vendor? -What is working well with the current solution? -What is not working to your satisfaction? A: The scope of work and relevant project details are outlined in the RFP. Questions should be focused on clarifying the RFP and the NYCPS RFP process. Respondents are encouraged to review the RFP and Q&A thoroughly, as it contains the necessary information. Additional details will be shared with the selected vendor as needed.	No	N/A (Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational: Limits pre-award disclosure on current system details beyond RFP/Q&A. Attachment 2 reference unclear/possibly missing from RFP docs.	
618	84	Q: Artificial intelligence: -Do you currently run any AI? -Are you looking for a solution to run with AI? -are you looking to switch to a frictionless technology? A: We do not currently utilize AI. We are seeking an up to date, efficient and effective solution in response to this RFP.	Yes	Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf; Appendix V.1 - Innovation Showcase.pdf			Context/Flexibility Point: No current AI, but open to efficient solutions (implies AI proposals OK if justified).
619	85	Q: What is network preference for storing data? -On Premises? -Cloud? -Hybrid? A: The solution / transactional data storage is part of vendor's proposal and vendor should propose accordingly. NYCPS needs access to all the data	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance			Flexibility Point + Constraint: Vendor proposes hosting architecture, DOE retains data access/download rights.

		and the right to download and store as deemed fit.		controls.pdf; Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf; Appendix Y.2 - FinOps Strategy.pdf (if Cloud)			
620	86	<p>Q: Section 3.25.1.a, Page 42 This solution must be compliant with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG 2.0 AA)" How would this apply to components of the solution that are driver facing such as tablet navigation applications and other components of the back-office solution that rely on a heavy visual map interface</p> <p>A: It is recommended that all apps / solutions should be compliant with WCAG 2.0 AA or later.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Accessibility); Appendix N.3 - Engineering Approach.pdf; Appendix R - Testing Strategy.pdf		Clarification/Recommendation: Extends WCAG 2.0 AA expectation beyond 'public-facing' to potentially all solution components.	
621	87	<p>Q: What is the total number of drivers employed by NYC DOE contractors that would need to be trained on the use of the tablet for navigation and turn by turn functionality?</p> <p>A: NYCPSS contractors currently employ approximately 9,000 school bus drivers.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf		Confirmation of training audience size (~9k drivers).	
622	88	<p>Q: Page 14, Section C "100 OPT operations personnel continuously and simultaneously access the routing system" Is this the total number of operators that will need to be trained on the system administration and usage?</p> <p>A: Initial training needs to be conducted by the vendor along with change management documentation. 100 is the number for routing but it would be more across all the platforms.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf		Clarification: Specifies routing user training count (~100), confirms broader need across platforms.	
623	89 & 248	<p>Q89: Local Software Development Team The RFP states that vendors must have a dedicated software development team based in NYC. Q: Would a subcontracted NYC-based team satisfy this requirement, or must the prime contractor itself have in-house NYC- based developers?</p> <p>Q248: Regarding section 2.3, which states, "The vendor must have a dedicated, local software development team based in New York City," can this requirement be fulfilled by a subcontractor?</p> <p>A: Yes, a subcontracted NYC-based team would satisfy this requirement, provided they meet the RFP's expectations for availability and performance. However, if communication issues or delays arise, the use of the prime contractor locally might need to be reconsidered.</p>	Yes	Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf		Clarification: Adds nuance to local team requirement flexibility (subcontracting OK with caveats) for RFP-S2.3.	

624	90	<p>Q: System Integration & Legacy Compatibility The RFP requires integration with NYCPS systems. Q: What are the specific data integration and API requirements for compatibility with existing NYCPS transportation systems? Q: Will NYCPS provide technical documentation and sandbox testing for vendors prior to full deployment?</p> <p>A: NYCPS would provide necessary technical information to awarded vendor for integration with existing NYCPS systems & API based integrations are preferred</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration); Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Clarification: Confirms post-award info sharing for integration, notes API preference.	
625	92	<p>Q: Contract Length & Extensions The RFP does not clearly specify the contract duration. Q: What is the expected contract length and renewal terms?</p> <p>A: As per Section 9 of the RFP, the contract(s) resulting from this RFP will be for a term of Three (3) years. The NYCDOE reserves the unilateral option to extend the contract for Two (2) additional two-year periods.</p>	No	N/A (Contract Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Reiteration/Confirmation of contract term (3 + 2x2 years).	
626	93	<p>Q: Financial Stability Requirements The minimum revenue threshold is \$5M, with at least \$2.5M from relevant services. Q: Will the DOE accept alternative financial proof (e.g., funding commitments) for vendors who may not yet meet the exact revenue criteria?</p> <p>A: No.</p>	No	N/A (Evaluation Criteria)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Clarification: Strict adherence to stated financial Min Quals (RFP S2.4/S2.5/S2.6). No alternatives.	
627	94	<p>Q: Page 22, Scope of Services section 3.5 Item 1 requires an integration with NYCPS' existing ticketing system. Can you please provide more detail about the current ticketing system, including the vendor?</p> <p>A: NYC DOE OPT requires integration with NYC's Service Now ticketing system. Service Now is a cloud based platform that offers a ticketing system as part of its service management (ITSM) suite, used to manage and track IT request and incidents, enabling organizations to streamline IT activities and improve efficiencies.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			New Constraint: Specifies exact ticketing system (ServiceNow) for integration required by RFP-S3.5.1.	
628	95	<p>Q: Page 39, section 3.17, item "v" refers to third party analytical and reporting tools. Please specify the third party reporting tools currently being used.</p> <p>A: Power BI</p>	Yes	Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf		Contextual Info: Identifies Power BI as current tool, informs potential data export compatibility for RFP-S3.17.a.v.		
629	96	<p>Q: Page 39, Section 3.19, item 1 refers to "GeoTab." Is this used as an example, or is GeoTab the manufacturer of NYCDOE's current GPS equipment?</p> <p>A: Geotab GPS devices are installed on every bus. The example of GeoTab is used to describe a Quality standard for ensuring devices are built for industrial use, placed onboard a vehicle in line with NYDMV regulations and in a practical location. Geotab is providing data for vehicle location and telematic information. The solution sought after in this RFP is more Vehicle, Route,</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf		Contextual Info: Clarifies current vs. needed functionality related to GeoTab (RFP-S3.19.1). GeoTab provides telematics, new solution needs Route/Ridership focus.		

		and ridership centric. (which is a service presently not being used from Geotab).				
630	98 & 175	<p>Q98: Page 44, Scope of Services section 3.25 Item 9 references the requirement to integrate with a "messaging collaboration platform currently in use by NYC agencies." Can you please provide details about the specific "messaging collaboration platform" and how it will be used in conjunction with the Transportation Management System?</p> <p>Q175: Page 44, paragraph 9, 1 NYC DOE OPT indicates that the successful bidder's solution must be interoperable with (the) messaging collaboration platform currently used by NYC agencies for all notifications/messages for targeted audiences. Can NYC DOE OPT identify the messaging collaboration platform that the successful bidder will be required to integrate with?</p> <p>A98: The Messaging Platform is Everbridge. A175: Sendgrid & EverBridge.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf		New Constraint: Specifies messaging platforms (Everbridge AND SendGrid) for integration required by RFP-S3.25.9.1.
631	99	<p>Q: Appendix F - Pricing Sheet Regarding the Appendix F Pricing Spreadsheet, section 2:</p> <p>a.Year 1 Section 2-1: Please confirm this section is for pricing for 10,000 which includes hardware, installation, and warranty? b.Year 1 Section 2-2: Is this section meant to be spare hardware? c.Year 1 Section 2-3: Is this section asking for the cost of labor to repair 500 devices? d.Year 2 and Year 3 have 1,000 quantities. Is this meant to be growth in fleet size?</p> <p>A: The pricing sheet is meant to be flexible so you can cost your solution appropriately.</p>	No	N/A (Proposal Pricing Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational: Clarifies pricing sheet (Appendix F) usage flexibility.
632	100	<p>Q: Sections 9 and 10 Regarding the ownership of intellectual property, Page 97, Sections 9 and 10 state, respectively, that if "If the Contractor or anyone employed by the Contractor shall write, record or otherwise produce copyrightable material within the scope or in furtherance of this Agreement, the Board shall be considered the author for purposes of copyright, renewal of copyright, and termination of copyright and, unless expressly waived in a written instrument signed by the Chancellor or his designee, the owner of all of the rights comprised in the copyright. (6/88)" and "Any invention or discovery arising out of or developed in furtherance of this Agreement shall be promptly and fully reported to the Board. The Board shall have the exclusive right to apply for patent protection on such invention or discovery and to determine how the rights in said invention or discovery, including rights under any patent issued thereon, shall be disposed of and administered." As a provider of software-as-a-service, we cannot transfer ownership of our platform. We ask for clarification in the documentation that we would retain ownership and will continue to own all rights in and to its technology</p>	No	N/A (Contractual Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational/Contractual: Clarifies DOE stance on IP ownership (RFP T&Cs Sec 9/10), especially for SaaS. Negotiation needed for vendor ownership.

		<p>platform, including all intellectual property rights therein. Would NYCDOE be amenable to such an edit?</p> <p>A: NYCDOE's intellectual property clauses suggest full ownership of materials created under the agreement. Clarification or amendments for SaaS providers to retain platform ownership would likely require negotiation and explicit approval. Product ownership will be taken into consideration when evaluating proposals.</p>				
633	101, 102, 103	<p>Q101: Section 11 Page 97, Section 11 reads that "If any property is acquired by the Contractor with funds provided by the Board under this Agreement, the property shall be deemed purchased by the Board for the use of the Contractor during the term of the Agreement shall be permanently embossed "Property of New York City Board of Education" and shall be returned to the Board, at the Contractor's expense, within thirty (30) days after the end of said term, unless the Contractor is otherwise notified in writing by the Chancellor or his designee. (6/21/88)." Would NYCDOE be open to striking this clause, given the nature of services to be provided under this contract?</p> <p>Q102: Section 23 Page 100, Section 23 (and Section 2 of the Supplemental Terms and Conditions) state, essentially, that the District has the right to terminate the agreement due to the bidder's uncured breach. Would NYCDOE be amenable to making this clause mutually protective?</p> <p>Q103: Section 28 Page 104, Section 28 states that the bidder may not assign the contract without the District's prior consent. The bidder would like to have assignment rights in the following scenarios - would the District be amenable to either or both of these?</p> <p>a.Acquisition: Assignment of the agreement in the event of acquisition of the bidder, provided that the acquiring party agrees to be bound by the terms and conditions of the contract.</p> <p>b.Receipt of Payments: Assignment of the right to receive payment to a third party, provided that the bidder remains responsible for performance of all obligations under the contract.</p> <p>A101, 102, 103: See response to Q# 101. [Response to Q101:] The DOE will not alter any areas of the Terms & Conditions in the RFP document.</p>	No	N/A (Contractual Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational/Contractual: Confirms DOE's inflexibility on standard T&Cs regarding Property Purchase (Sec 11), Termination (Sec 23), and Assignment (Sec 28).
634	104	<p>Q: What routing software system(s) does OPT currently use?</p> <p>A: Stop to School (General Education) are routed by an Edulog routing system which is a proprietary system designed by Edulog Corp. The Curb to School (Special Education) routing system is designed by OPT where the mapping functions are in map info and the data is managed by Microsoft FoxPro.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf		Contextual Info: Identifies legacy routing systems (Edulog, Custom MapInfo/FoxPro).

635	105 & 106	<p>Q105: How are field trips/athletic trips currently booked, assigned, and managed within NYCDOE?</p> <p>Q106: Is the district interested in new software to support field trips, activities and athletic trips booking, management, and dispatch?</p> <p>A105 & 106: If possible, the proposed solution can track field trips.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Flexibility/Scope Clarification: Field trip tracking is a desired optional capability ("if possible").
636	107	<p>Q: Do NYCDOE students currently have any RFID-enabled identification cards?</p> <p>A: No</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf				Contextual Info: Confirms no existing RFID cards.
637	108	<p>Q: For driver training, is a train-the-trainer model sufficient?</p> <p>A: Initial training needs to be conducted by vendor along with Change management documentation, to be followed by train-the-trainer model.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf				Clarification: Defines two-stage training approach (Vendor initial + TTT).
638	109 & 110	<p>Q109: How many busing providers does OPT currently contract with for home-to-school transportation?</p> <p>Q110: How many busing providers does OPT currently contract with for field trips, activities and athletic trip transportation?</p> <p>A: We currently have approximately 50 operators.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf				Contextual Data: Number of contractors (~50).
639	111	<p>Q: Who is the manufacturer of NYCDOE's current inventory of GPS devices?</p> <p>A: Samsung</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf				Contextual Info: Confirms existing hardware brand (Samsung phones).
640	112	<p>Q: Will bids be open publicly? If so, what information will be provided? Can we attend in-person or virtually?</p> <p>A: DOE RFPs are not opened publicly.</p>	No	N/A (Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Informational: RFP process detail (bids not public).
641	113	<p>Q: Please provide a breakdown of the District's fleet by vehicle type and quantity per type (e.g. 25 Type A, 100 Type C, etc.).</p> <p>A: Type A/B -6976 Breakdown Standard Bus (Handicap)1038 Standard Bus (Normal)2426 Total Type C/D3464 Alternative NWC136 Alternative WC52 C/D flex30 Hydraulic Lift116 Mini-Wagon5603 Ramp-Wagon180 Type A or B Vehicle86 Type A/B flex771 Type C or D Dual Door2 Total Type A/B 6976 Total Fleet10440 Type C/D- 3464</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Capacity)				Contextual Data: Detailed vehicle fleet composition. Add as constraint/context.
642	114	<p>Q: What type of users will require training and how many users of each type will require training?</p> <p>A: Six (6) different user types School bus drivers - ~8,500 user School Bus Company Admin Staff - 350 School Users - ~3,000 users Routers - ~30 users Other OPT User/ Central NYCPSS stuff - ~200 users Parent/ Guardians - ~300,000 users</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf				Reiteration: Confirms training audience size and types.
643	117	<p>Q: RFP page 76, paragraph 10 describes the M/WBE Program and says that contractors may apply for waivers. Subparagraph "b" reads that waiver requests must be submitted 12 business</p>	No	N/A (RFP Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Informational: MWBE waiver process timing details.

		<p>days prior to the proposal due date. First, please confirm our understanding that waiver requests are therefore due on March 18. Next, if a waiver request is submitted by March 18, how soon afterwards will the requester learn of the department's decision regarding that waiver?</p> <p>A: The proposal due date is April 3rd, meaning waiver requests must be submitted 12 business days prior, which sets the waiver request deadline as March 18th. The department will provide a decision on waiver requests 5 business days before the proposal due date, meaning the requester will receive a response by March 27th.</p>				
644	119	<p>Q: What is the make and model of the existing onboard tablets?</p> <p>A: Please see question #1 response.</p>	No	N/A (Reference)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Reference: Points back to Q1 answer (Samsung phones).
645	120, 138, 139, 267, 292	<p>Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about timelines) What is the estimated award date? What is the desired work start date? What is the desired project completion/ "go live" date? / What is the desired date for taking delivery of the software and starting training? / What is the desired date for full implementation/go live...? / What's the expected turnaround time from award? / When is this project scheduled to begin?</p> <p>A: We estimate awarding this RFP in Q2 of calendar year 2025. Work will commence in Q3/Q4 of calendar year 2025, with implementation and integration to be completed by August of 2026.</p>	Yes	Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix O.1.2 - 12-Month Timeline.pdf		Contextual/Planning Info: Key project milestone estimates (Award Q2 25, Start Q3/4 25, Go-Live Aug 26).
646	123	<p>Q: Do you have an anticipated date for finalist presentations for vendors that are selected to move on to that phase? Would they be held in person or virtually?</p> <p>A: Oral presentations are scheduled to occur around May 8th, 2025 through May 19, 2025.</p>	No	N/A (RFP Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational: RFP evaluation timeline detail (Presentations).
647	124	<p>Q: What is the total number of vehicles in your fleet? Please break down by route busses, spares, special needs vans, shuttles, etc.</p> <p>A: We have approximately 10,500 vehicles servicing 9,000 routes. Please see Attachment C for details.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Capacity); Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf		Reiteration: Confirms scale figures (~10.5k vehicles, ~9k routes). Points to Att C.
648	125	<p>Q: Of students transported daily, how many are regular needs vs. Special needs students?</p> <p>A: We have 6,000 Special Education routes transporting 65,000 students. We have 2,200 General Education routes transporting 75,000 students.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Capacity); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf		Contextual Data: Student counts by type (65k SE, 75k GE).
649	126	<p>Q: How many total drivers does NYC DoE have?</p> <p>A: There are approximately 9,000 drivers.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf		Reiteration: Driver count (~9k).
650	127	<p>Q: How many and what bus contractors are used?</p> <p>A: We have approximately 50 transportation providers.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor		Reiteration: Contractor count (~50).

				and Third Party Management.pdf				
651	128	<p>Q: Will the bus contractor personnel be required to use any of the software specified in the RFP? If yes, a. Will the contractors be responsible for performing route creation and maintenance? How many contractor employees will need training? b. Will the district also perform route creation and data maintenance? c. Will contractor personnel need read-only access to data, reporting and maps?</p> <p>A: School Bus Contractors will be required to use the software. a.No, School bus companies will not create or maintain routes. b.NYCPSS/ OPT will be the only sta❑ creating and maintaining routes. c.Yes, School bus companies will have read only access, reporting and maps.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Vendor Portal/Permissions); Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf (RBAC); Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf			Clarification: Defines contractor software usage (mandatory), access level (read-only), and roles (OPT does routing).	
652	129, 131, 132	<p>Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about GE routes) How many buses operate daily for general education students? / What is the total number of individual runs/trips performed by all general education buses in the morning? / How many general education runs/trips in the afternoon?</p> <p>A: There are approximately 2,200 general education routes.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Capacity Planning)			Contextual Data: GE route count (~2.2k).	
653	130	<p>Q: 2. Please explain the route structure for your bus runs. Are you picking up K-12 all in one bus run (i.e., single tier)? Do you pick up high school students and drop them off, then pick up middle school students and drop off, and then elementary school (i.e., three tiers)?</p> <p>A: Students are routed together for CTS (Special Education) transportation based on neighboring schools transporting students in neighboring locations. STS (General Education) routing routes neighboring stops to schools in neighboring locations with similar sessions. STS (General Education) routes can be different for am runs and pm runs, since session times are not spread out, multiple legs of a run are not usually possible.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Routing Logic); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Contextual Info: Describes current routing methodology (generally single tier due to session times).	
654	133	<p>Q: Are the afternoon bus runs essentially a 'mirror' of the morning runs? (Same core stop locations? Buses generally run in the same area AM & PM?)</p> <p>A: Run can differ in the AM and the PM.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Routing Logic); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Contextual Info: Confirms AM/PM routes can differ.	
655	134	<p>Q: How many special needs runs are operating in the morning? How many in the afternoon?</p> <p>A: There are approximately 6,000 Special Education routes.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Capacity Planning)			Contextual Data: SE route count (~6k).	
656	135	<p>Q: Is NYC DoE interested in a public facing website that enables parents and real estate agents to obtain school, eligibility, and bus stop information?</p> <p>A: No</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Scope Reduction: Excludes public eligibility/stop info portal.	

	657	136	Q: For home-to-school transportation, in which county(s) are you transporting students? A: Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island, Westchester County, Rockland County, Nassau County, Suffolk County, New Jersey and Connecticut.	Yes	Appendix S.2 - GIS Integration.pdf			Contextual Info: Defines geographic service area counties.
	658	140	Q: Is it NYC DoE's intent that district staff will place the district's existing stops and build the district's existing bus runs in the system during the training process, or does the district expect the vendor will implement everything noted above? A: OPT creates all routes except for Pre-K, where the bus vendors handle their own routing.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf			Reiteration: Clarifies roles in route creation (OPT does routing, except PreK). Implies vendor data migration role.
	659	143	Q: Is GPS hardware currently installed on vehicles? If so: a. What type of hardware is installed and who is the vendor? b. Does NYC DoE intend to continue using its current GPS technology? A: a. Please see Q #1 response. b. YES	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf			Contextual Info: Confirms existing hardware (GeoTab/Samsung) and DOE's intent regarding its use (reuse OK).
	660	144 & 145	Q: (Paraphrased Summary of two identical questions asking about new GPS hardware needs) If interested in new GPS hardware, how many vehicles would need GPS tracking? a. Will there be a requirement for removal of any existing devices? How many? b. Are vehicles located at one location or spread across multiple? c. Can a fleet list with VIN numbers, make, model, and fuel types be provided? A: There are approximately 10,500 vehicles in NYC DOE Fleet. a. Depending on the awarded vendor solution there could be 10,500 vehicles requiring equipment removal b. Vehicles are spread across about 50 School Bus Companies throughout the five Boroughs of New York City c. The details required for vehicle identification will be shared with the awarded vendor for this proposal if/when required for a function solution.	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Contextual/Constraint: Reconfirms scale (~10.5k), deployment complexity (~50 SBCs), potential removal scope, post-award info sharing.
	661	147 & 262	Q147: Is NYC DoE interested in RFID scanners for students to swipe on and off the bus? a. If yes, how many vehicles would you plan to equip with RFID scanners? b. If yes, how many students would be issued cards? Q262: For student on-coording Is RFID required or is NFC an option, in addition to barcode or QR code? Do you have existing RFID student cards or this is a future plan? A147: We are looking for the vendor to provide a solution. A262: No RFID cards currently in use because it was prohibitively expensive. It is not required in addition to a bar code or QR code. We are open to solutions.	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Flexibility Point: Confirms vendor choice for scanning tech (RFID/NFC/Barcode/QR OK), no existing RFID cards (RFP-S3.20.1).
	662	148	Q: How many total drivers, including substitute drivers, aides, etc. would need access to the in-vehicle tablet for student tracking purposes? A: We have approximately 17,000 drivers and attendants	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf; Appendix Y.1 - Budget Management.pdf			Contextual Data: Combined driver/attendant user count (~17k). Note discrepancy with Q41/Q126 driver/attendant counts - use highest (~9k driver + ~8k attendant = ~17k total).

663	149	<p>Q: Should field trip management software be included as part of this request?</p> <p>A: Ideally all routes/trips would be visible in one system.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf				Flexibility/Scope Clarification: Field trip tracking desired if integrated ("ideally").
664	150	<p>Q: Does the District intend to purchase a fleet maintenance software system as part of this request? If so, is there integration required with any systems such as fuel management?</p> <p>A: No we do not intend to purchase a fleet Maintenance software system as a part of this RFP. All vehicles in our fleet are equipped with GEOTAB and there may be a need for integration with that system.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration)				Scope Clarification/Constraint: Excludes fleet maintenance software, notes GeoTab integration possibility.
665	152	<p>Q: Page 14, paragraph 3 NYC DOE indicates that the routing "system and processing environment currently uses internally built and commercial software to produce, edit, and communicate School Bus route information to bus contractors, schools, and parents". Can NYC DOE OPT identify all commercial or "homegrown" systems presently in use by NYCPS and OPT, and indicate which systems, and for what purpose, the successful bidder will be required to integrate with?</p> <p>A: The successful bidder would not need to provide a solution for a direct integration with existing NYCPS systems.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf				Clarification/Constraint: States *no direct integration* needed with existing systems (implies replacement or potentially one-way data feeds?). Conflicts slightly with other integration answers (e.g., Q158, Q170-172). Assume this means *routing* systems (Q104) are replaced, but other integrations (Student Info, IEP, Health, ServiceNow, Everbridge, SendGrid, Payment Export) are still needed. **Requires careful architectural validation.**
666	153	<p>Q: Page 11, Section 1.1 Can NYC DOE identify all contractors that support all modes of student transportation for NYC DOE OPT by name and address, and provide the exact street address for all locations/depots were contractor busses are parked and/or maintained?</p> <p>A: https://www.schools.nyc.gov/school-life/transportation/bus-companies-for-school-age-children</p>	No	N/A (External Resource)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Informational Resource: Link for SBC list.
667	154	<p>Q: Page 12, paragraphs 3 and A; page 13 paragraph B Can NYC DOE OPT identify the names and addresses of all schools to which each of the three different categories of NYC students (Centralized Stop-to-School Busing-General Education, Curb-to-School Busing-Specialized Education/Kindergarten through Grade 12, and Curb-to-School-Pre- K/EI) are transported?</p> <p>A: https://schoolsearch.schools.nyc/</p>	No	N/A (External Resource)	Identified Gap (Informational)			Informational Resource: Link for school search.
668	155	<p>Q: Page 14, last paragraph Is the successful bidder consolidating all routing functions, including special education students requiring curb-to-school transportation? If so, any known key challenges in migrating from FoxPro and Mapinfo to the new modern routing platform?</p>	Yes	Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf;				Confirmation/Context: Confirms unified routing scope and identifies specific migration risks from MapInfo/FoxPro.

		A: Yes, the successful bidder is consolidating all routing functions, including special education curb-to-school transportation. Key challenges in migrating from FoxPro and Mapinfo include compatibility issues, scalability constraints, and adapting legacy data to modern systems.		Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf; Appendix O.2.2 - Project and Change - Risk Management Methodology.pdf				
669	156	<p>Q: Page 15, paragraph 2 NYC DOE OPT page 16 of RFP R1804 indicates that the present GPS device on their busses provides bus and student location reporting service via a GPS administration console by OPT Routers, Customer Service Center (CRS), Fleet and Safety Group, and contracted vendors. Can OPT identify the console by vendor name, and system/version name (Commercial off the Shelf or Custom Developed)?</p> <p>A: The GPS administration console used by NYC DOE OPT is referred to as the School Operations Console (SOC). It includes both Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) components and custom-developed features, designed to provide real-time and historical data on bus routes and ridership.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Contextual Info: Name (SOC) and nature (COTS+Custom) of existing admin console being replaced.	
670	157	<p>Q: Page 16, paragraph H Will the successful bidder be required to interact with NYC DIIT, or will NYC DOE OPT act as the conduit for any interaction?</p> <p>A: The vendor will be expected to interact with NYCPs as a whole to successfully implement the solution outlined in their proposal.</p>	Yes	Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf; Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf			Clarification: Defines stakeholder interaction model (direct with NYCPs entities).	
671	158, 170, 171, 176	<p>Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about integrations) Can NYC DOE OPT identify all OPT systems into which the successful bidder will be expected to integrate...? / Can DOE identify the relevant NYCPs administrative systems...? / Can NYC DOE OPT delineate the existing systems applications...?</p> <p>A: Special Education (SE), General Education (GE), and Pre-K/Early Intervention (EI) routing, ridership monitoring, and personnel management through employee systems. More details will be shared with the winning vendor. / The relevant NYCPs OPT and NYC Department of Health applications, systems, and data networks include platforms for student enrollment, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), non-public school data, and health data systems. Specific details about these systems will be provided by NYCPs during the project. / NYC DOE OPT requires the successful bidder's solution to integrate with existing applications such as student enrollment systems, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), transportation management platforms, and health data networks. Specific details about these systems would need to be provided by NYC DOE OPT during the project.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf			Context/Clarification: Lists categories of systems needing integration (Enrollment, IEP, Health, Employee, etc.). Details post-award. Note conflict with Q152 regarding *routing* system integration.	
672	159	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 1 NYC DOE OPT states "Vendor will provide methodologies for proof of quality verification for workmanship and performance metrics that meet OPT standards." What are the OPT standards? Is there an expected format or method of access required for proof of quality?</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix P.3 - Audit Framework.pdf;			Clarification: Defines basis for OPT standards (NYSDOT/OPT guidelines) and expectation for accessible metrics/records as proof (RFP-S3.4.1).	

		A: OPT standards would require a GPS app to unify routing, ensuring compliance with NYSDOT and OPT guidelines. The app should centralize data, maintain organized digital records, and provide accessible proof of quality and performance metrics.		Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf				
673	160	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 3 NYC DOE OPT states "There is an operational expectation that the GPS service will be continuous with minimal disruption or loss of service. For this purpose, a Quality Service Level of 99.999999% for the GPS integrated system function availability is mandated by an SLA." Is this level of 99.999999% being met today? Does the district account for potential cellular network limitations?</p> <p>A: NYC DOE OPT expects the highest level of continuous GPS service obtainable (Six Sigma). All considerations of measurable loss of service will be factored into the Quality of service provided. Carrier selection for solution must be a premium service provider with ubiquitous service to minimize data loss opportunity.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (HA/Carrier Choice); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Availability); Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf			Clarification/Constraint: Interprets "eight nines" target (RFP-S3.4.3) as highest obtainable/Six Sigma, notes network limits factored in, adds premium/ubiquitous carrier requirement.	
674	161	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 5 NYC DOE OPT states "The vendor will provide a comprehensive post-mortem report with corrective actions to be taken to ensure the incident shall be avoided in the future. The report shall be produced within 48 hours of event resolution." Does this only apply to system wide outages?</p> <p>A: A comprehensive post-mortem report will be required with corrective action solution for any service impacting fault caused to NYC DOE OPT's ability to provide GPS service to Schools, Students, Parents , Student Guardians, and School Bus Companies utilizing NYC DOE OPT's vendor/provider product, Based on frequency of individual interruption or single interruption of mass effecting a singular or large group of users (an event requiring higher tier of escalation demand for resolution).</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix O.2.2 - Project and Change - Risk Management Methodology.pdf			Clarification: Defines trigger criteria for post-mortems (RFP-S3.4.5) based on service impact, frequency, severity, escalation level.	
675	162 & 163	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 2 NYC DOE OPT states "System should include analytic data for resolution that includes, elements of inter-department ticket transfers, complete report close out issue details i.e., trouble found, (hardware, software,) trouble cause (defect type, software bug, user, install, accident, weather, maintenance, neglect, unknown) fix applied (No trouble found, reprogramed, replaced part (identify), replaced unit, etc." What is your present daily ticket volume?</p> <p>A: NYC DOE OPT requirements for reported service problems directly related to the service provided by the GPS vendor to be managed by the vendor from receipt of the service issue of the problem to resolution, while keeping effected user(s) notified throughout the lifecycle of the problem. Data collection and reporting needs to be comprehensive to understand the source, cause, fix, and resolution times associated with the problem. The problem issue integration is to ensure NYC OPT DOE is tracking the vendor problem success in identifying problems, ensuring problems are resolved with the least amount of impact to service and provides data for analysis for future problem and problem handling time improvements. Current report rate data</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Informational: Ticket volume not provided (deemed insignificant due to expected improvements). Emphasizes vendor responsibility for managing/analyzing tickets (RFP-S3.5).	

		for daily reported problems are of insignificance as the selected product of choice is expected to have advantages in problem identification (pro-active repair and product maintenance advantages).				
676	164	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 3 NYC DOE OPT states "Every request must be given an appointment confirmation at the time of ticket entry." What is the purpose/function of an appointment confirmation? Can NYC DOE OPT define "appointment confirmation"?</p> <p>A: The selected vendor is expected to be the first point of contact for Installation and service problem issues. At the time of service issue report to the Vendor, a service resolution time/date commitment will be provided to the reporting party in line with agreed service install or restoral SLA's. This will align service delivery expectations for the reporting party and work load prediction for the vendor. Appointment confirmation is a documented commitment by the vendor for when the pending work activity will be performed and notification to the reporting party as to when.</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf		Clarification: Explains rationale and definition (commitment time/date) for ticket confirmation requirement (RFP-S3.5.3).
677	165	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 5 NYC DOE OPT states "Must have the capability to create a project for sets of 8 or more tickets for contracted School Bus vendors in a Borough, for which the date for work completion would be expected within SLA negotiable based on work." Is the expectation that a Project Manager will be assigned to sets of 8 or more tickets and are those tickets related to a similar issue or are they random issues?</p> <p>A: This reference to 8 or more in a borough allows the GPS vendor to establish a work day calendar where 8 or more repairs and installations can be scheduled to more than one School Bus Company. Scheduled work can be assigned to a GPS vendor repair personnel or a GPS Vendor contractor to group multiple work activities in a borough for reduction of windshield time moving between multiple boroughs therefore increasing repair personnel productivity. There is an expectation that the GPS vendors will be supervise all work completion for Quality and safety assurance.</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf		Clarification: Explains rationale/use case (efficiency scheduling) for project ticketing feature (RFP-S3.5.5). No dedicated PM implied.
678	166	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 6 NYC DOE OPT states "Must have a capability to include a description, comment, or other informative notation such as devices/vehicles and their components. These include: the unique identifying number of the device, the bus contractor fleet to which it was assigned, who made the request, the garage location where issue exist, ticket creation date, commitment date (i.e., time for ticket resolution), ticket closure date, request disposition, interim ticket status, and final ticket status for any ticket that would remain as part of the ticket history." What is request disposition?</p> <p>A: Disposition is the current states of a ticket.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Model); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf		Definition: Clarifies "disposition" = current status for RFP-S3.5.6.
679	167	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 10b NYC DOE OPT states "Present day: total pending, total pending future, pending active for the day, and must have the capability of viewing ticket details for each group and issuing and completing the day before." Is this specific to issues requiring</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and		Clarification: Explains intended use (operational overview/prediction) and scope (excludes ad-hoc dev issues) of the ticketing dashboard (RFP-S3.5.10).

		intervention on behalf of the successful bidder's development team?		Analytics Capabilities.pdf			
		A: The dashboard is intended as an overview of relevant data for actual performance real time, history of previous day's performance, and forecast for future days performance. There are variables such as school closures, half school days and shortened school days (due to weather or other factors). The purpose of this data is to establish predictable outcomes resulting from different factors allowing the management to make adjustments as required. This would not include the successful bidders ad hoc engagement.					
680	168	Q: Page 22, paragraph 15 NYC DOE OPT states "Must record each trouble call event in Trouble Ticket History as a status that is retrievable for analysis with trouble defect and cause." Can OPT define/describe a "trouble call event"?	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Model)			Definition/Clarification: Explains "trouble call event" and expected tracking detail (fix path, cause, duration) for RFP-S3.5.15.
		A: Trouble Call event is any operational event failure that was reported as a problem and recorded as a defect and is fixable by the intervention of another Agency, NYC DOE department, or an external vendor contracted to NYC DOE OPT. (examples: Device software issue with Tablet is the problem, sent to IT group to repair is a transfer, up dated software remotely is the fix, vendor did not put tablet on power as instructed is the cause. - fix duration 24:00 HRs. This is a methodical tracking of a trouble ticket (a.k.a. problem) to identify where the problem was directed to repair, and the intermediate steps taken with history is recorded for analysis.					
681	169	Q: Page 24, paragraph 3 Does NYC DOE OPT presently have/use a driver monitoring and analysis platform to assess and evaluate driver behavior patterns, in real-time or otherwise?	Yes	Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf			Contextual Info: Confirms current driver behavior monitoring source (GeoTab) and data points, relevant to RFP-S3.7.3/4/5.
		A: Yes- Telematics details provided by Geotab GO9+ Examples: * Hard Stopping *Fast Acceleration *Hard Cornering *idling etc...					
682	172	Q: Page 32, paragraph d, iv: NYC DOE OPT indicates that the successful bidder's system will implement a data integration platform that processes and exports specified operation data elements to support NYCPSCS' payment processing requirements, according to NYCPSCS' requested formats. Can DOE identify the NYCPSCS payment processing system, and the NYCPSCS' requested formats that the successful bidder will be required to integrate with?	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration - Outbound); Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf			Constraint/Clarification: Defines payment system interaction as data export to meet requirements, not direct API integration (RFP-S3.12.1.d.iv).
		A: The successful bidder would not need to provide solution for a direct integration with existing NYCPSCS systems. The successful bidder would need to provide data integration to meet NYCPSCS requirements for their existing system.					
683	173	Q: Page 32, paragraph a, ii Can NYC DOE OPT identify the attributes of stop management platform OPT 199, its' core functionality, and policy algorithm that the successful bidder will be required to integrate with? If being replaced, what are the transition requirements (data migration, user training) what support will OPT provide during this process?	No	N/A (External Resource)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational Resource: Link provided likely contains Chancellor's Regs A-801 related to stop policies (RFP-S3.13.a.ii).
		A: https://pwsblobprd.schools.nyc/prd-pws/docs/default-source/default-document-library/a-					

		801-9-5-2000-final-combined-remediated-wcag2-0.pdf?sfvrsn=cb0ffebd_84				
684	174	<p>Q: Page 41, 3.22.1 We need more information on "Cloning of Legacy system(s)" statement? Does that mean migration from the legacy system to the new routing solution?</p> <p>A: Yes, "Cloning of Legacy system(s)" refers to migrating data and functionalities from the legacy system to the new routing solution, ensuring continuity and compatibility during the transition.</p>	Yes	Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf		Clarification: Defines "cloning" term used in RFP-S3.22.1.1 as migration.
685	175 & 98	<p>Q175: Page 44, paragraph 9, 1 NYC DOE OPT indicates that the successful bidder's solution must be interoperable with (the) messaging collaboration platform currently used by NYC agencies for all notifications/messages for targeted audiences. Can NYC DOE OPT identify the messaging collaboration platform that the successful bidder will be required to integrate with?</p> <p>Q98: Page 44, Scope of Services section 3.25 Item 9 references the requirement to integrate with a "messaging collaboration platform currently in use by NYC agencies." Can you please provide details about the specific "messaging collaboration platform"...?</p> <p>A175: Sendgrid & EverBridge. A98: The Messaging Platform is Everbridge.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf		New Constraint: Specifies messaging platforms (SendGrid AND Everbridge) for integration required by RFP-S3.25.9.1.
686	177 & 178	<p>Q177: Page 15, paragraph 2 The OPT tracks GPS devices, history, and life cycle attributes in an inventory system. The contracted bus vendors are responsible for informing the OPT of any malfunction or loss. Can NYC DOE OPT identify and provide details on this inventory and tracking system? Is this information integrated into any other systems?</p> <p>Q178: What are the current processes for reporting on this information?</p> <p>A: GPS Inventory is tracked utilizing data provided by the GPS vendor and inventory updates for on and off equipment provided by school bus companies. GPS issues are identified through DOE routine practice of monitoring GPS vendor reports for non-working problematic GPS system issues. There is no current integration of these reports.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf		Contextual Info: Describes current manual/disconnected inventory process. Opportunity for improvement.
687	179	<p>Q: Page 15, paragraph 5: The GPS device is installed in an "undisclosed portion of the bus". Can NYC DOE OPT provide additional details on the current installation placement or the general criteria/policies considered when installing any and all previous GPS devices, primarily tablets and mounts?</p> <p>A: 1. Ram -Mounts are installed by drilling 4 holes into the buses dashboard . 2. Rubber molly inserts are put onto the holes . 3. The mount is placed on the dashboard over the 4 drill holes where the mollies were inserted . 4.Screws are inserted in the 4 holes on the mount which go directly into the 4 holes in the dashboard where the rubber mollies expand similar to a wall anchor . 5. The usb charging cable is run to the main power source in the fuse box and an empty fuse location is designated for the charging cable -Phone Charger 6. Rubber tips are glued onto the x grip on the ram mount.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf		Contextual Info: Specific details on current hardware install (mounts, power). Doesn't address "undisclosed" GPS placement.

688	181	<p>Q: Page 18, paragraph 4 Does NYC DOE OPT expect the tablet GPS solution to update and adjust based on live traffic conditions day to day?</p> <p>A: Yes</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Routing Engine)			Confirmation: Reaffirms dynamic adjustment for traffic requirement.
689	182	<p>Q: Page 18, Section 3.1 NYC DOE OPT states that "(t)he solution should accurately track, update and report bus and student activities in near real time with voice communication capabilities." Can the district specify what it means by "voice communication capabilities" and how this would be used in the system?</p> <p>A: Voice communication capabilities refer to integrated features allowing real-time audio communication between drivers, dispatch, and other relevant staff. This functionality would be used to address immediate concerns, provide updates, and ensure efficient coordination during transportation operations</p>	No		Potential Gap (See Q263)		Initial Clarification: Defines voice comms requirement. (Note: Q263 later states this is NOT required).
690	183	<p>Q: Page 19, Section 4b NYC DOE OPT states that "the system shall implement color coding to highlight route deviations, with severity indicators based on the magnitude of deviation from the planned route." Can NYC DOE OPT confirm if this is part of the current routing solution attributes. As well, can the district outline the current criteria or thresholds for measuring the severity of route deviations.</p> <p>A: Currently shapes are used to identify students ambulatory codes or medical alert codes. Color coding is only used to differentiate the routes and schools on the map.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf			Contextual/Clarification: Describes current visuals (shapes/colors). Confirms new requirement for deviation color-coding/severity thresholds (RFP-S3.2.4b) is net new, thresholds TBD.
691	184	<p>Q: Page 20, paragraph 2 & Page 51, Section 32 "All components of the solution (including internal and external interfaces) must be testable by independent testing teams." Can NYC DOE OPT further outline expectations with being provided "test tools". Primarily, at what point in the implementation would these be expected? Do these "test tools" need to maintain district-based information or are demonstrative test environments satisfactory? Would a soft rollout of certain modules satisfy this requirement?</p> <p>A: NYC DOE OPT requires all components of the GPS solution, including interfaces, to be testable by independent testing teams. Test tools should be provided during the testing phase. A soft rollout of certain modules is acceptable as long as it enables comprehensive testing.</p>	Yes	Appendix R - Testing Strategy.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Clarification: Sets expectation for test tool timing (testing phase) and accepts soft rollout approach (RFP-S3.2.14, S3.25.32.1).
692	185	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 4 NYC DOE OPT states that "the vendor must be able to offer next day repair for up to 30 vehicles, three-day appointment for projects up to 30 vehicles and maximum five-day appointments for projects greater than 30 vehicles." Can the district outline the current process that is followed for these requests and timeline for current repairs? Do these repair timelines exclude any initial diagnostic discussions</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Contextual Info: Describes current repair workflow (SBC reports via ServiceNow, pre-scheduling discussion for multi-unit).

		A: All repairs and installations are recorded by the school bus vendor in a basic NYC DOE OPT CRM module "Service Now". All operational issues are reported through this medium. Those issues that include multiple units for repair and install are usually discussed prior to the scheduling to ensure the alignment of all parties (bus vendor point of contact, vehicle and equipment availability, and location of service to be rendered).					
693	186	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 11 & 14 NYCPSC expects 99.99999% of continuous GPS service and full functionality, with minimal service disruptions. Can the district provide current service metrics and outline any current service-related challenges?</p> <p>A: Continuous Service Metrics are not available. Service related challenges have been identified on inter-connecting communication links, absence of change control and service restoration testing.</p>	No	N/A (Context Only)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Contextual Info: Lack of baseline availability metrics, known current challenges (comms links, change control, testing).
694	187	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 1 Can NYCPSC please outline the current ticketing system and fields that the vendor's ticketing system must integrate with?</p> <p>A: Current Ticketing system is Service Now Ticketing System , The integration will include: Reporting details: * School reporting from details *Name of Person Reporting Issue * Company Name/Location *Reach Number *Company code Issue Type: * School app *Driver app *Bus hardware * Phone hardware Identification Codes: * IMEI for phone * Driver Identification number * Vehicle number List is not inclusive of all fields but relevant details for expectations is for anything that is needed to positively explain the reason for the ticket and needed details about the problem and whom to speak with during repair/fix/install/process. Time elements must be captured on all transactions.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Fields); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Constraint/Clarification: Specifies ticketing system (ServiceNow) and required integration data fields (RFP-S3.5.1).
695	188	<p>Q: Page 23, section 6: NYC DOE OPT states that "students must have the ability to display a scannable code as their boarding/bus pass." Do RFID cards and readers that use radio frequency for student scanning and ridership meet this requirement? RFID card customization and additional integration with other district systems still being possible but not the mechanism used for registering scans.</p> <p>A: Yes, that's correct. We are open to various solutions. This will be new for NYC, and the solution must be flexible, scalable, and user-friendly.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Reiteration/Flexibility Point: Confirms openness on scanning tech (RFID OK) for RFP-S3.6.
696	189	<p>Q: Page 24, Section 1: Can NYCPSC outline the minimum goals for "biometric authentication integration" and what alternative tools for user authentication could satisfy the district goals?</p> <p>A: The minimum goals for "biometric authentication integration" likely include ensuring secure, efficient, and user-friendly access to systems while minimizing friction and enhancing adoption. Alternative tools for user authentication could include password-less methods like multi-factor authentication (MFA), hardware tokens, or behavioral biometrics, as deemed fit by vendors.</p>	Yes	Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (AuthN)			Clarification/Flexibility: Defines goals (secure, efficient, user-friendly) for biometrics (RFP-S3.7.1/2) and explicitly allows alternatives (MFA, tokens etc.).
697	190	<p>Q: Page 40, Section 6: Installation of GPS Equipment, during previous professional GPS</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle			Constraint/Clarification: Confirms vendor performs

		installations is there an assigned or designated authority at all install locations to oversee and provide final approvals? During professional GPS installations does the district consolidate vehicles to pre-identified locations? How many locations would the district maintain for professional installations? A: Vendors will be required to perform installations at locations of NYCPS' discretion. There are currently about 50 contractors in about 70 bus yards.		and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf		installs at contractor locations (~70 yards). No mention of dedicated DOE oversight authority at installs.
698	191	Q: Page 40, Section 6: Installation of GPS Equipment, does the district have readily available vehicle information? If so, what details (vin#, make, model, year etc.) does this information contain and in what format is this information readily available? Does the district expect to install on any white fleet vehicles? A: Please see associated tabs in this document.	No	N/A (Reference unclear)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational Resource: Response unclear ("associated tabs"? Likely means Attachment C or similar provided elsewhere). Vehicle details needed.
699	192	Q: Page 40, Section 6: What is the organizational breakdown of fleet management staff? How many employees (i.e. mechanics) would be expected to self-install GPS equipment in the future? A: Mechanics are hired by the individual bus companies directly and the number of mechanics needed for them would depend on the number of routes they operate, so we do not have that data available to us. NYCPS can confirm that we have about 50 vendors servicing our routes. Some vendors do not have mechanics and a complicated installation may call for the vendor to bring the bus to a designated mechanic.	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf		Contextual Info: Clarifies mechanic responsibility (SBCs hire them). Impacts potential self-install models.
700	193	Q: Page 48, Section 21.1.d: NYC DOE OPT states that "The solution must have failure rates less than 10 failures per calendar year." What is the definition of a "failure"? A: An event that disrupts daily operations.	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Reliability); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf		Definition: Clarifies "failure" for reliability NFR S3.25.21.d.
701	194	Q: Page 18, section 3.1.3: NYC DOE OPT states that "The system should provide automated updates". Is there a format or type of method in which these messages should be received? I.e. SMS, email, Push Notification, other. A: That solution will be presented to OPT by the awarded vendor.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf		Flexibility Point: Vendor defines automated update mechanism/format (RFP-S3.1.3 related).
702	195	Q: Page 20, paragraph 13: NYC DOE OPT states that "GPS is to have an SBC Vendor certification". What is the process in which to obtain SBC vendor certification, and who is the responsible party to manage and maintain this certification? A: The awarded vendor will track the distribution and management of devices to School Bus Companies and	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System		Process Clarification: Defines vendor role in device tracking/sharing data with DOE (relates to RFP-S3.2.13 'certification').

		that information will need to be shared with NYC DOE electronically.		Architecture.pdf (Data Sharing)			
703	196	Q: Page 20, paragraph 20: NYC DOE OPT states that vendors "Must be able to indicate that an individual student's ridership should not be tracked if a parent/caregiver informs NYCPS that they wish their student to not participate." What is the current process to manage this type of request? A: NYCPS is currently not tracking ridership. A process will need to be proposed and developed to accomplish this.	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf			Clarification: Confirms opt-out process (RFP-S3.2.20) is TBD/part of solution design as ridership is new.
704	197	Q: Page 23, section 3.6.2: NYC DOE OPT states that "Sign up functionality providing two separate levels of access, one for parents/caregivers, and one for students." What are the differences in "levels of access" between parents/caregivers and students (e.g., view-only for students, full control for parents/caregivers)? A: Students will only have read only access for their own transportation data. Caregivers will have access to see all of their children who take the bus, as well as submit reports, make requests, etc.	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Permissions); Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf			Clarification: Defines Parent (R/W, reports, requests) vs Student (RO own data) permissions for RFP-S3.6.2.
705	198	Q: Page 23, section 3.6.9: NYC DOE OPT states that "Parents/caregivers and students must have the ability to provide feedback" Is there an expectation that this feedback be sent to the operation or the vendor? If to the operation, what is the expected communication vector? If to the vendor, what is the expected action taken/communication to operation per feedback? A: Parent/ caregivers and students must be able to provide feedback to the vendor through the app. The vendor will respond to the ticket and provide OPT with reporting.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Feedback Workflow); Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf (Support Process); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Process Clarification: Defines workflow for user feedback handling (To Vendor via app; Vendor responds & reports to OPT) for RFP-S3.6.9.
706	199	Q: . Page 23, section 3.6.11: NYC DOE OPT states that applications "Must include options for multi-language selection." Is there a defined list of languages expected? Is the same language support expected as defined in page 25, section 3.7.12? A: See Page 24, Section 3.7, Item 12	No	N/A (Reference)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Reference: Points back to Q8/Q12 for language list (9 DOE languages).
707	200 & 201	Q200: Page 24, section 3.7.3: NYC DOE OPT states that "The system shall implement an intelligent driver monitoring and analysis platform..." What specific device sensors (e.g., GPS, accelerometer, gyroscope) and vehicle integration methods (e.g., OBD-II, CAN bus) are expected to provide telemetry data, and are these standardized across all vehicles or dependent on make/model? Q201: Page 24, section 3.7.4: NYC DOE OPT states that "The system shall process and analyze the behavioral parameters..." Are there specific thresholds or benchmarks for "safe" vs. "unsafe" driving patterns (e.g., maximum acceptable braking force, cornering speed limits), or is the vendor expected to define	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf			Clarification/Context: Narrows scope of driver behavior analysis required by vendor solution itself (RFP-S3.7.3/4) if GeoTab data is used/integrated. Implies vendor does not need to define thresholds if using GeoTab.

		<p>these? How should the system prioritize or weigh different behavioral parameters?</p> <p>A: Geotab GPS devices are installed on every bus. The example of GeoTab is used to describe a Quality standard for ensuring devices are built for industrial use, placed onboard a vehicle in line with NYDMV regulations and in a practical location. Geotab is providing data for vehicle location and telematic information. The solution sought after in this RFP is more Vehicle, Route, and ridership centric. (which is a service presently not being used from Geotab).</p>				
665	152	<p>Q: Page 14, paragraph 3 NYC DOE indicates that the routing "system and processing environment currently uses internally built and commercial software to produce, edit, and communicate School Bus route information to bus contractors, schools, and parents". Can NYC DOE OPT identify all commercial or "homegrown" systems presently in use by NYCPSC and OPT, and indicate which systems, and for what purpose, the successful bidder will be required to integrate with?</p> <p>A: The successful bidder would not need to provide a solution for a direct integration with existing NYCPSC systems.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf		Clarification/Constraint: States *no direct integration* needed with existing *routing* systems (implies replacement). Conflicts slightly with other integration answers (e.g., Q158, Q170-172, Q176). Assume routing replaced, other integrations still needed. **Requires validation.**
666	153	<p>Q: Page 11, Section 1.1 Can NYC DOE identify all contractors that support all modes of student transportation for NYC DOE OPT by name and address, and provide the exact street address for all locations/depots where contractor busses are parked and/or maintained?</p> <p>A: https://www.schools.nyc.gov/school-life/transportation/bus-companies-for-school-age-children</p>	No	N/A (External Resource)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational Resource: Link for SBC list.
667	154	<p>Q: Page 12, paragraphs 3 and A; page 13 paragraph B Can NYC DOE OPT identify the names and addresses of all schools to which each of the three different categories of NYC students (Centralized Stop-to-School Busing-General Education, Curb-to-School Busing-Specialized Education/Kindergarten through Grade 12, and Curb-to-School-Pre- K/EI) are transported?</p> <p>A: https://schoolsearch.schools.nyc/</p>	No	N/A (External Resource)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational Resource: Link for school search.
668	155	<p>Q: Page 14, last paragraph Is the successful bidder consolidating all routing functions, including special education students requiring curb-to-school transportation? If so, any known key challenges in migrating from FoxPro and Mapinfo to the new modern routing platform?</p> <p>A: Yes, the successful bidder is consolidating all routing functions, including special education curb-to-school transportation. Key challenges in migrating from FoxPro and Mapinfo include compatibility issues, scalability constraints, and adapting legacy data to modern systems.</p>	Yes	Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf; Appendix O.2.2 - Project and Change - Risk Management Methodology.pdf		Confirmation/Context: Confirms unified routing scope and identifies specific migration risks from MapInfo/FoxPro.
669	156	<p>Q: Page 15, paragraph 2 NYC DOE OPT page 16 of RFP R1804 indicates that the present GPS device on their busses provides bus and student</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf;		Contextual Info: Name (SOC) and nature (COTS+Custom) of

		location reporting service via a GPS administration console by OPT Routers, Customer Service Center (CRS), Fleet and Safety Group, and contracted vendors. Can OPT identify the console by vendor name, and system/version name (Commercial off the Shelf or Custom Developed)? A: The GPS administration console used by NYC DOE OPT is referred to as the School Operations Console (SOC). It includes both Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) components and custom-developed features, designed to provide real-time and historical data on bus routes and ridership.		Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			existing admin console being replaced.
670	157	Q: Page 16, paragraph H Will the successful bidder be required to interact with NYC DIIT, or will NYC DOE OPT act as the conduit for any interaction? A: The vendor will be expected to interact with NYCPSC as a whole to successfully implement the solution outlined in their proposal.	Yes	Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf; Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf			Clarification: Defines stakeholder interaction model (direct with NYCPSC entities, not just OPT via DIIT).
671	158, 170, 171, 176	Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about required integrations) Can NYC DOE OPT identify all OPT systems into which the successful bidder will be expected to integrate...? / Can DOE identify the relevant NYCPSC administrative systems...? / Can NYC DOE OPT delineate the existing systems applications...? A: Special Education (SE), General Education (GE), and Pre-K/Early Intervention (EI) routing, ridership monitoring, and personnel management through employee systems. More details will be shared with the winning vendor. / The relevant NYCPSC OPT and NYC Department of Health applications, systems, and data networks include platforms for student enrollment, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), non-public school data, and health data systems. Specific details about these systems will be provided by NYCPSC during the project. / NYC DOE OPT requires the successful bidder's solution to integrate with existing applications such as student enrollment systems, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), transportation management platforms, and health data networks. Specific details about these systems would need to be provided by NYC DOE OPT during the project.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf			Context/Clarification: Lists categories of systems needing integration (Enrollment, IEP, Health, Employee, etc.). Details post-award. See Q152 note regarding routing system replacement vs integration.
672	159	Q: Page 21, paragraph 1 NYC DOE OPT states "Vendor will provide methodologies for proof of quality verification for workmanship and performance metrics that meet OPT standards." What are the OPT standards? Is there an expected format or method of access required for proof of quality? A: OPT standards would require a GPS app to unify routing, ensuring compliance with NYSDOT and OPT guidelines. The app should centralize data, maintain organized digital records, and provide accessible proof of quality and performance metrics.	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix P.3 - Audit Framework.pdf; Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf			Clarification: Defines basis for OPT standards (NYSDOT/OPT guidelines) and expectation for accessible metrics/records as proof (RFP-S3.4.1).
673	160	Q: Page 21, paragraph 3 NYC DOE OPT states "There is an operational expectation that the GPS service will be continuous with minimal disruption or loss of service. For this purpose, a Quality Service Level of 99.99999% for the GPS integrated system function availability is	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (HA/Carrier Choice); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design			Clarification/Constraint: Interprets "eight nines" target (RFP-S3.4.3) as highest obtainable/Six Sigma, notes network limits factored in, adds

		<p>mandated by an SLA." Is this level of 99.99999% being met today? Does the district account for potential cellular network limitations?</p> <p>A: NYC DOE OPT expects the highest level of continuous GPS service obtainable (Six Sigma). All considerations of measurable loss of service will be factored into the Quality of service provided. Carrier selection for solution must be a premium service provider with ubiquitous service to minimize data loss opportunity.</p>		Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Availability); Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf			premium/ubiquitous carrier requirement.
674	161	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 5 NYC DOE OPT states "The vendor will provide a comprehensive post-mortem report with corrective actions to be taken to ensure the incident shall be avoided in the future. The report shall be produced within 48 hours of event resolution." Does this only apply to system wide outages?</p> <p>A: A comprehensive post-mortem report will be required with corrective action solution for any service impacting fault caused to NYC DOE OPT's ability to provide GPS service to Schools, Students, Students Parents , Student Guardians, and School Bus Companies utilizing NYC DOE OPT's vendor/provider product, Based on frequency of individual interruption or single interruption of mass effecting a singular or large group of users (an event requiring higher tier of escalation demand for resolution).</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix O.2.2 - Project and Change - Risk Management Methodology.pdf			Clarification: Defines trigger criteria for post-mortems (RFP-S3.4.5) based on service impact, frequency, severity, escalation level (not just system-wide outage).
675	162 & 163	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 2 NYC DOE OPT states "System should include analytic data for resolution that includes, elements of inter-department ticket transfers, complete report close out issue details i.e., trouble found, (hardware, software,) trouble cause (defect type, software bug, user, install, accident, weather, maintenance, neglect, unknown) fix applied (No trouble found, reprogramed, replaced part (identify), replaced unit, etc." What is your present daily ticket volume?</p> <p>A: NYC DOE OPT requirements for reported service problems directly related to the service provided by the GPS vendor to be managed by the vendor from receipt of the service issue of the problem to resolution, while keeping effected user(s) notified throughout the lifecycle of the problem. Data collection and reporting needs to be comprehensive to understand the source, cause, fix, and resolution times associated with the problem. The problem issue integration is to ensure NYC OPT DOE is tracking the vendor problem success in identifying problems, ensuring problems are resolved with the least amount of impact to service and provides data for analysis for future problem and problem handling time improvements. Current report rate data for daily reported problems are of insignificance as the selected product of choice is expected to have advantages in problem identification (pro-active repair and product maintenance advantages).</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf			Informational: Ticket volume not provided (deemed insignificant). Emphasizes vendor responsibility for managing/analyzing tickets and providing comprehensive data for analysis (RFP-S3.5).
676	164	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 3 NYC DOE OPT states "Every request must be given an appointment confirmation at the time of ticket entry." What is the purpose/function of an appointment confirmation? Can NYC DOE OPT define "appointment confirmation"?</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non			Clarification: Explains rationale and definition (commitment time/date) for ticket confirmation requirement (RFP-S3.5.3).

		A: The selected vendor is expected to be the first point of contact for Installation and service problem issues. At the time of service issue report to the Vendor, a service resolution time/date commitment will be provided to the reporting party in line with agreed service install or restoral SLA's. This will align service delivery expectations for the reporting party and work load prediction for the vendor. Appointment confirmation is a documented commitment by the vendor for when the pending work activity will be performed and notification to the reporting party as to when.	Functional Requirements.pdf			
677	165	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 5 NYC DOE OPT states "Must have the capability to create a project for sets of 8 or more tickets for contracted School Bus vendors in a Borough, for which the date for work completion would be expected within SLA negotiable based on work." Is the expectation that a Project Manager will be assigned to sets of 8 or more tickets and are those tickets related to a similar issue or are they random issues?</p> <p>A: This reference to 8 or more in a borough allows the GPS vendor to establish a work day calendar where 8 or more repairs and installations can be scheduled to more than one School Bus Company. Scheduled work can be assigned to a GPS vendor repair personnel or a GPS Vendor contractor to group multiple work activities in a borough for reduction of windshield time moving between multiple boroughs therefore increasing repair personnel productivity. There is an expectation that the GPS vendors will be supervise all work completion for Quality and safety assurance.</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf		Clarification: Explains rationale/use case (efficiency scheduling) for project ticketing feature (RFP-S3.5.5). Vendor supervises work.
678	166	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 6 NYC DOE OPT states "Must have a capability to include a description, comment, or other informative notation such as devices/vehicles and their components. These include: the unique identifying number of the device, the bus contractor fleet to which it was assigned, who made the request, the garage location where issue exist, ticket creation date, commitment date (i.e., time for ticket resolution), ticket closure date, request disposition, interim ticket status, and final ticket status for any ticket that would remain as part of the ticket history." What is request disposition?</p> <p>A: Disposition is the current states of a ticket.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Model); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf		Definition: Clarifies "disposition" = current status for RFP-S3.5.6.
679	167	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 10b NYC DOE OPT states "Present day: total pending, total pending future, pending active for the day, and must have the capability of viewing ticket details for each group and issuing and completing the day before." Is this specific to issues requiring intervention on behalf of the successful bidder's development team?</p> <p>A: The dashboard is intended as an overview of relevant data for actual performance real time, history of previous day's performance, and forecast for future days performance. There are variables such as school closures, half school days and shortened school days (due to weather or other factors). The purpose of this data is to establish predictable outcomes resulting from different factors allowing the management to make adjustments as required. This would not include the successful bidders ad hoc engagement.</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf		Clarification: Explains intended use (operational overview/prediction) and scope (excludes ad-hoc dev issues) of the ticketing dashboard (RFP-S3.5.10).

680	168	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 15 NYC DOE OPT states "Must record each trouble call event in Trouble Ticket History as a status that is retrievable for analysis with trouble defect and cause." Can OPT define/describe a "trouble call event"?</p> <p>A: Trouble Call event is any operational event failure that was reported as a problem and recorded as a defect and is fixable by the intervention of another Agency, NYC DOE department, or an external vendor contracted to NYC DOE OPT. (examples: Device software issue with Tablet is the problem, sent to IT group to repair is a transfer, up dated software remotely is the fix, vendor did not put tablet on power as instructed is the cause. - fix duration 24:00 HRs. This is a methodical tracking of a trouble ticket (a.k.a. problem) to identify where the problem was directed to repair, and the intermediate steps taken with history is recorded for analysis.</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Model)			Definition/Clarification: Explains "trouble call event" and expected tracking detail (fix path, cause, duration) for RFP-S3.5.15.
681	169	<p>Q: Page 24, paragraph 3 Does NYC DOE OPT presently have/use a driver monitoring and analysis platform to assess and evaluate driver behavior patterns, in real-time or otherwise?</p> <p>A: Yes- Telematics details provided by Geotab GO9+ Examples: * Hard Stopping *Fast Acceleration *Hard Cornering *idling etc...</p>	Yes	Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf			Contextual Info: Confirms current driver behavior monitoring source (GeoTab) and data points, relevant to RFP-S3.7.3/4/5.
682	172	<p>Q: Page 32, paragraph d, iv: NYC DOE OPT indicates that the successful bidder's system will implement a data integration platform that processes and exports specified operation data elements to support NYCPs' payment processing requirements, according to NYCPs' requested formats. Can DOE identify the NYCPs payment processing system, and the NYCPs' requested formats that the successful bidder will be required to integrate with?</p> <p>A: The successful bidder would not need to provide solution for a direct integration with existing NYCPs systems. The successful bidder would need to provide data integration to meet NYCPs requirements for their existing system.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration - Outbound); Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf			Constraint/Clarification: Defines payment system interaction as data export to meet requirements, not direct API integration (RFP-S3.12.1.d.iv). Response seems slightly contradictory to intent, assume export means providing data in required format.
683	173	<p>Q: Page 32, paragraph a, ii Can NYC DOE OPT identify the attributes of stop management platform OPT 199, its' core functionality, and policy algorithm that the successful bidder will be required to integrate with? If being replaced, what are the transition requirements (data migration, user training) what support will OPT provide during this process?</p> <p>A: https://pwsblobprd.schools.nyc/prd-pws/docs/default-source/default-document-library/a-801-9-5-2000-final-remediated-wcag2-0.pdf?sfvrsn=cb0ffebd_84</p>	No	N/A (External Resource)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational Resource: Link provided likely contains Chancellor's Regs A-801 related to stop policies relevant to OPT199 functionality (RFP-S3.13.a.ii).
684	174	<p>Q: Page 41, 3.22.1 We need more information on "Cloning of Legacy system(s)" statement? Does that mean migration from the legacy system to the new routing solution?</p> <p>A: Yes, "Cloning of Legacy system(s)" refers to migrating data and functionalities from the legacy system to the new routing solution, ensuring continuity and compatibility during the transition.</p>	Yes	Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf			Clarification: Defines "cloning" term used in RFP-S3.22.1.1 as data/functionality migration.

685	175 & 98	<p>Q175: Page 44, paragraph 9, 1 NYC DOE OPT indicates that the successful bidder's solution must be interoperable with (the) messaging collaboration platform currently used by NYC agencies for all notifications/messages for targeted audiences. Can NYC DOE OPT identify the messaging collaboration platform that the successful bidder will be required to integrate with?</p> <p>Q98: Page 44, Scope of Services section 3.25 Item 9 references the requirement to integrate with a "messaging collaboration platform currently in use by NYC agencies." Can you please provide details about the specific "messaging collaboration platform"...?</p> <p>A175: Sendgrid & EverBridge. A98: The Messaging Platform is Everbridge.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf			New Constraint: Specifies messaging platforms (SendGrid AND Everbridge) for integration required by RFP-S3.25.9.1.
686	177 & 178	<p>Q177: Page 15, paragraph 2 The OPT tracks GPS devices, history, and life cycle attributes in an inventory system. The contracted bus vendors are responsible for informing the OPT of any malfunction or loss. Can NYC DOE OPT identify and provide details on this inventory and tracking system? Is this information integrated into any other systems?</p> <p>Q178: What are the current processes for reporting on this information?</p> <p>A: GPS Inventory is tracked utilizing data provided by the GPS vendor and inventory updates for on and off equipment provided by school bus companies. GPS issues are identified through DOE routine practice of monitoring GPS vendor reports for non-working problematic GPS system issues. There is no current integration of these reports.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Contextual Info: Describes current manual/disconnected inventory process. Opportunity for improvement with new system.
687	179	<p>Q: Page 15, paragraph 5: The GPS device is installed in an "undisclosed portion of the bus". Can NYC DOE OPT provide additional details on the current installation placement or the general criteria/policies considered when installing any and all previous GPS devices, primarily tablets and mounts?</p> <p>A: 1. Ram -Mounts are installed by drilling 4 holes into the buses dashboard . 2. Rubber molly inserts are put onto the holes . 3. The mount is placed on the dashboard over the 4 drill holes where the mollies were inserted . 4.Screws are inserted in the 4 holes on the mount which go directly into the 4 holes in the dashboard where the rubber mollies expand similar to a wall anchor . 5. The usb charging cable is run to the main power source in the fuse box and an empty fuse location is designated for the charging cable -Phone Charger 6. Rubber tips are glued onto the x grip on the ram mount.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Contextual Info: Specific details on current hardware install (mounts, power). Still doesn't address "undisclosed" placement for primary GPS (GeoTab).
688	181	<p>Q: Page 18, paragraph 4 Does NYC DOE OPT expect the tablet GPS solution to update and adjust based on live traffic conditions day to day?</p> <p>A: Yes</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Routing Engine)			Confirmation: Reaffirms dynamic adjustment for traffic requirement.

689	182	<p>Q: Page 18, Section 3.1 NYC DOE OPT states that "(t)he solution should accurately track, update and report bus and student activities in near real time with voice communication capabilities." Can the district specify what it means by "voice communication capabilities" and how this would be used in the system?</p> <p>A: Voice communication capabilities refer to integrated features allowing real-time audio communication between drivers, dispatch, and other relevant staff. This functionality would be used to address immediate concerns, provide updates, and ensure efficient coordination during transportation operations</p>	No	Potential Gap (See Q263)		Initial Clarification: Defines voice comms requirement. (Note: Q263 later states this is NOT required). Mark as gap.
690	183	<p>Q: Page 19, Section 4b NYC DOE OPT states that "the system shall implement color coding to highlight route deviations, with severity indicators based on the magnitude of deviation from the planned route." Can NYC DOE OPT confirm if this is part of the current routing solution attributes. As well, can the district outline the current criteria or thresholds for measuring the severity of route deviations.</p> <p>A: Currently shapes are used to identify students ambulatory codes or medical alert codes. Color coding is only used to differentiate the routes and schools on the map.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf		Contextual/Clarification: Describes current visuals (shapes/colors). Confirms new requirement for deviation color-coding/severity thresholds (RFP-S3.2.4b) is not new; thresholds TBD by vendor/DOE.
691	184	<p>Q: Page 20, paragraph 2 & Page 51, Section 32 "All components of the solution (including internal and external interfaces) must be testable by independent testing teams." Can NYC DOE OPT further outline expectations with being provided "test tools". Primarily, at what point in the implementation would these be expected? Do these "test tools" need to maintain district-based information or are demonstrative test environments satisfactory? Would a soft rollout of certain modules satisfy this requirement?</p> <p>A: NYC DOE OPT requires all components of the GPS solution, including interfaces, to be testable by independent testing teams. Test tools should be provided during the testing phase. A soft rollout of certain modules is acceptable as long as it enables comprehensive testing.</p>	Yes	Appendix R - Testing Strategy.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf		Clarification: Sets expectation for test tool timing (testing phase) and accepts soft rollout approach (RFP-S3.2.14, S3.25.32.1). Test environments not specified as needing district data vs demo data here.
692	185	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 4 NYC DOE OPT states that "the vendor must be able to offer next day repair for up to 30 vehicles, three-day appointment for projects up to 30 vehicles and maximum five-day appointments for projects greater than 30 vehicles." Can the district outline the current process that is followed for these requests and timeline for current repairs? Do these repair timelines exclude any initial diagnostic discussions</p> <p>A: All repairs and installations are recorded by the school bus vendor in a basic NYC DOE OPT CRM module "Service Now". All operational issues are reported through this medium. Those issues that include multiple units for repair and install are usually discussed prior to the scheduling to ensure the alignment of all parties (bus vendor point of contact, vehicle and equipment availability, and location of service to be rendered).</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf		Contextual Info: Describes current repair workflow (SBC reports via ServiceNow, pre-scheduling discussion). Diagnostic time impact on SLA start unclear.

693	186	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 11 & 14 NYCPS expects 99.99999% of continuous GPS service and full functionality, with minimal service disruptions. Can the district provide current service metrics and outline any current service-related challenges?</p> <p>A: Continuous Service Metrics are not available. Service related challenges have been identified on inter-connecting communication links, absence of change control and service restoration testing.</p>	No	N/A (Context Only)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Contextual Info: Lack of baseline availability metrics, known current challenges (comms links, change control, testing). Vendor cannot assume current state meets target.
694	187	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 1 Can NYCPS please outline the current ticketing system and fields that the vendor's ticketing system must integrate with?</p> <p>A: Current Ticketing system is Service Now Ticketing System , The integration will include: Reporting details: * School reporting from details *Name of Person Reporting Issue * Company Name/Location *Reach Number *Company code Issue Type: * School app *Driver app *Bus hardware * Phone hardware Identification Codes: * IMEI for phone * Driver Identification number * Vehicle number List is not inclusive of all fields but relevant details for expectations is for anything that is needed to positively explain the reason for the ticket and needed details about the problem and whom to speak with during repair/fix/install/process. Time elements must be captured on all transactions.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Fields); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Constraint/Clarification: Specifies ticketing system (ServiceNow) and required integration data fields (RFP-S3.5.1). List indicative, not exhaustive. Time capture crucial.
695	188	<p>Q: Page 23, section 6: NYC DOE OPT states that "students must have the ability to display a scannable code as their boarding/bus pass." Do RFID cards and readers that use radio frequency for student scanning and ridership meet this requirement? RFID card customization and additional integration with other district systems still being possible but not the mechanism used for registering scans.</p> <p>A: Yes, that's correct. We are open to various solutions. This will be new for NYC, and the solution must be flexible, scalable, and user-friendly.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Reiteration/Flexibility Point: Confirms openness on scanning tech (RFID OK) for RFP-S3.6.6.
696	189	<p>Q: Page 24, Section 1: Can NYCPS outline the minimum goals for "biometric authentication integration" and what alternative tools for user authentication could satisfy the district goals?</p> <p>A: The minimum goals for "biometric authentication integration" likely include ensuring secure, efficient, and user-friendly access to systems while minimizing friction and enhancing adoption. Alternative tools for user authentication could include password-less methods like multi-factor authentication (MFA), hardware tokens, or behavioral biometrics, as deemed fit by vendors.</p>	Yes	Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (AuthN)			Clarification/Flexibility: Defines goals (secure, efficient, user-friendly) for biometrics (RFP-S3.7.1/2), explicitly allows alternatives (MFA, tokens etc.).

697	190	<p>Q: Page 40, Section 6: Installation of GPS Equipment, during previous professional GPS installations is there an assigned or designated authority at all install locations to oversee and provide final approvals? During professional GPS installations does the district consolidate vehicles to pre-identified locations? How many locations would the district maintain for professional installations?</p> <p>A: Vendors will be required to perform installations at locations of NYCPS' discretion. There are currently about 50 contractors in about 70 bus yards.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Constraint/Clarification: Confirms vendor performs installs at contractor locations (~70 yards). No mention of dedicated DOE oversight at installs.
698	191	<p>Q: Page 40, Section 6: Installation of GPS Equipment, does the district have readily available vehicle information? If so, what details (vin#, make, model, year etc.) does this information contain and in what format is this information readily available? Does the district expect to install on any white fleet vehicles?</p> <p>A: Please see associated tabs in this document.</p>	No	N/A (Reference unclear)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational Resource: Response points to unclear source ("associated tabs"?). Vehicle details needed, possibly in Attachment C per Q44/Q113. White fleet install question unanswered.
699	192	<p>Q: Page 40, Section 6: What is the organizational breakdown of fleet management staff? How many employees (i.e. mechanics) would be expected to self-install GPS equipment in the future?</p> <p>A: Mechanics are hired by the individual bus companies directly and the number of mechanics needed for them would depend on the number of routes they operate, so we do not have that data available to us. NYCPS can confirm that we have about 50 vendors servicing our routes. Some vendors do not have mechanics and a complicated installation may call for the vendor to bring the bus to a designated mechanic.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf			Contextual Info: Clarifies mechanic responsibility (SBCs hire them). Impacts potential self-install models.
700	193	<p>Q: Page 48, Section 21.1.d: NYC DOE OPT states that "The solution must have failure rates less than 10 failures per calendar year." What is the definition of a "failure"?</p> <p>A: An event that disrupts daily operations.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Reliability); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Definition: Clarifies "failure" for reliability NFR S3.25.21.d (disrupts daily ops).
701	194	<p>Q: Page 18, section 3.1.3: NYC DOE OPT states that "The system should provide automated updates". Is there a format or type of method in which these messages should be received? I.e. SMS, email, Push Notification, other.</p> <p>A: That solution will be presented to OPT by the awarded vendor.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf			Flexibility Point: Vendor defines automated update mechanism/format (relates to RFP-S3.1.3).
702	195	<p>Q: Page 20, paragraph 13: NYC DOE OPT states that "GPS is to have an SBC Vendor certification". What is the process in which to obtain SBC vendor certification, and who is the responsible party to manage and maintain this certification?</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf			Process Clarification: Defines vendor role in device tracking/sharing data with DOE (relates to RFP-S3.2.13 'certification' intent).

		A: The awarded vendor will track the distribution and management of devices to School Bus Companies and that information will need to be shared with NYC DOE electronically.		Management.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Sharing)			
703	196	Q: Page 20, paragraph 20: NYC DOE OPT states that vendors "Must be able to indicate that an individual student's ridership should not be tracked if a parent/caregiver informs NYCPS that they wish their student to not participate." What is the current process to manage this type of request? A: NYCPS is currently not tracking ridership. A process will need to be proposed and developed to accomplish this.	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf			Clarification: Confirms opt-out process (RFP-S3.2.20) is TBD/part of solution design as ridership tracking is new.
704	197	Q: Page 23, section 3.6.2: NYC DOE OPT states that "Sign up functionality providing two separate levels of access, one for parents/caregivers, and one for students." What are the differences in "levels of access" between parents/caregivers and students (e.g., view-only for students, full control for parents/caregivers)? A: Students will only have read only access for their own transportation data. Caregivers will have access to see all of their children who take the bus, as well as submit reports, make requests, etc.	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Permissions); Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf			Clarification: Defines Parent (R/W, reports, requests) vs Student (Read Only own data) permissions for RFP-S3.6.2.
705	198	Q: Page 23, section 3.6.9: NYC DOE OPT states that "Parents/caregivers and students must have the ability to provide feedback" Is there an expectation that this feedback be sent to the operation or the vendor? If to the operation, what is the expected communication vector? If to the vendor, what is the expected action taken/communication to operation per feedback? A: Parent/ caregivers and students must be able to provide feedback to the vendor through the app. The vendor will respond to the ticket and provide OPT with reporting.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Feedback Workflow); Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf (Support Process); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Process Clarification: Defines workflow for user feedback handling (To Vendor via app; Vendor responds & reports to OPT) for RFP-S3.6.9.
706	199	Q: . Page 23, section 3.6.11: NYC DOE OPT states that applications "Must include options for multi-language selection." Is there a defined list of languages expected? Is the same language support expected as defined in page 25, section 3.7.12? A: See Page 24, Section 3.7, Item 12	No	N/A (Reference)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Reference: Points back to Q8/Q12 answer which references Q8 (9 DOE languages).
707	200 & 201	Q200: Page 24, section 3.7.3: NYC DOE OPT states that "The system shall implement an intelligent driver monitoring and analysis platform..." What specific device sensors (e.g., GPS, accelerometer, gyroscope) and vehicle integration methods (e.g., OBD-II, CAN bus) are expected to provide telemetry data, and are these standardized across all vehicles or dependent on make/model? Q201: Page 24, section 3.7.4: NYC DOE OPT states that "The system shall process and analyze the behavioral parameters..." Are there specific thresholds or benchmarks for "safe" vs. "unsafe" driving patterns (e.g., maximum	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf			Clarification/Context: Narrows scope of driver behavior analysis required by vendor solution itself (RFP-S3.7.3/4) if GeoTab data is used/integrated. Implies vendor does not need to define thresholds if using existing GeoTab data stream.

		acceptable braking force, cornering speed limits), or is the vendor expected to define these? How should the system prioritize or weigh different behavioral parameters?				
		A: Geotab GPS devices are installed on every bus. The example of GeoTab is used to describe a Quality standard for ensuring devices are built for industrial use, placed onboard a vehicle in line with NYDMV regulations and in a practical location. Geotab is providing data for vehicle location and telematic information. The solution sought after in this RFP is more Vehicle, Route, and ridership centric. (which is a service presently not being used from Geotab).				

665	152	Q: Page 14, paragraph 3 NYC DOE indicates that the routing "system and processing environment currently uses internally built and commercial software to produce, edit, and communicate School Bus route information to bus contractors, schools, and parents". Can NYC DOE OPT identify all commercial or "homegrown" systems presently in use by NYCPSC and OPT, and indicate which systems, and for what purpose, the successful bidder will be required to integrate with? A: The successful bidder would not need to provide a solution for a direct integration with existing NYCPSC systems.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf		Clarification/Constraint: States *no direct integration* needed with existing *routing* systems (implies replacement). Conflicts slightly with other integration answers (e.g., Q158, Q170-172, Q176). Assume routing replaced, other integrations still needed. **Requires validation.**
666	153	Q: Page 11, Section 1.1 Can NYC DOE identify all contractors that support all modes of student transportation for NYC DOE OPT by name and address, and provide the exact street address for all locations/depots where contractor busses are parked and/or maintained? A: https://www.schools.nyc.gov/school-life/transportation/bus-companies-for-school-age-children	No	N/A (External Resource)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational Resource: Link for SBC list.
667	154	Q: Page 12, paragraphs 3 and A; page 13 paragraph B Can NYC DOE OPT identify the names and addresses of all schools to which each of the three different categories of NYC students (Centralized Stop-to-School Busing-General Education, Curb-to-School Busing-Specialized Education/Kindergarten through Grade 12, and Curb-to-School-Pre- K/EI) are transported? A: https://schoolsearch.schools.nyc/	No	N/A (External Resource)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational Resource: Link for school search.
668	155	Q: Page 14, last paragraph Is the successful bidder consolidating all routing functions, including special education students requiring curb-to-school transportation? If so, any known key challenges in migrating from FoxPro and Mapinfo to the new modern routing platform? A: Yes, the successful bidder is consolidating all routing functions, including special education curb-to-school transportation. Key challenges in migrating from FoxPro and Mapinfo include compatibility issues, scalability constraints, and adapting legacy data to modern systems.	Yes	Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf; Appendix O.2.2 - Project and Change - Risk Management Methodology.pdf		Confirmation/Context: Confirms unified routing scope and identifies specific migration risks from MapInfo/FoxPro.

669	156	<p>Q: Page 15, paragraph 2 NYC DOE OPT page 16 of RFP R1804 indicates that the present GPS device on their busses provides bus and student location reporting service via a GPS administration console by OPT Routers, Customer Service Center (CRS), Fleet and Safety Group, and contracted vendors. Can OPT identify the console by vendor name, and system/version name (Commercial off the Shelf or Custom Developed)?</p> <p>A: The GPS administration console used by NYC DOE OPT is referred to as the School Operations Console (SOC). It includes both Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) components and custom-developed features, designed to provide real-time and historical data on bus routes and ridership.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Contextual Info: Name (SOC) and nature (COTS+Custom) of existing admin console being replaced.
670	157	<p>Q: Page 16, paragraph H Will the successful bidder be required to interact with NYC DIIT, or will NYC DOE OPT act as the conduit for any interaction?</p> <p>A: The vendor will be expected to interact with NYCPS as a whole to successfully implement the solution outlined in their proposal.</p>	Yes	Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf; Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf			Clarification: Defines stakeholder interaction model (direct with NYCPS entities, not just OPT via DIIT).
671	158, 170, 171, 176	<p>Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about required integrations) Can NYC DOE OPT identify all OPT systems into which the successful bidder will be expected to integrate...? / Can DOE identify the relevant NYCPS administrative systems...? / Can NYC DOE OPT delineate the existing systems applications...?</p> <p>A: Special Education (SE), General Education (GE), and Pre-K/Early Intervention (EI) routing, ridership monitoring, and personnel management through employee systems. More details will be shared with the winning vendor. / The relevant NYCPS OPT and NYC Department of Health applications, systems, and data networks include platforms for student enrollment, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), non-public school data, and health data systems. Specific details about these systems will be provided by NYCPS during the project. / NYC DOE OPT requires the successful bidder's solution to integrate with existing applications such as student enrollment systems, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), transportation management platforms, and health data networks. Specific details about these systems would need to be provided by NYC DOE OPT during the project.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf			Context/Clarification: Lists categories of systems needing integration (Enrollment, IEP, Health, Employee, etc.). Details post-award. See Q152 note regarding routing system replacement vs integration.
672	159	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 1 NYC DOE OPT states "Vendor will provide methodologies for proof of quality verification for workmanship and performance metrics that meet OPT standards." What are the OPT standards? Is there an expected format or method of access required for proof of quality?</p> <p>A: OPT standards would require a GPS app to unify routing, ensuring compliance with NYSDOT and OPT guidelines. The app should centralize data, maintain organized digital records, and provide accessible proof of quality and performance metrics.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix P.3 - Audit Framework.pdf; Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf			Clarification: Defines basis for OPT standards (NYSDOT/OPT guidelines) and expectation for accessible metrics/records as proof (RFP-S3.4.1).
673	160	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 3 NYC DOE OPT states "There is an operational expectation that the GPS service will be continuous with minimal</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf			Clarification/Constraint: Interprets "eight nines" target (RFP-S3.4.3) as

		<p>disruption or loss of service. For this purpose, a Quality Service Level of 99.999999% for the GPS integrated system function availability is mandated by an SLA." Is this level of 99.99999% being met today? Does the district account for potential cellular network limitations?</p> <p>A: NYC DOE OPT expects the highest level of continuous GPS service obtainable (Six Sigma). All considerations of measurable loss of service will be factored into the Quality of service provided. Carrier selection for solution must be a premium service provider with ubiquitous service to minimize data loss opportunity.</p>		(HA/Carrier Choice); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Availability); Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf		highest obtainable/Six Sigma, notes network limits factored in, adds premium/ubiquitous carrier requirement.
674	161	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 5 NYC DOE OPT states "The vendor will provide a comprehensive post-mortem report with corrective actions to be taken to ensure the incident shall be avoided in the future. The report shall be produced within 48 hours of event resolution." Does this only apply to system wide outages?</p> <p>A: A comprehensive post-mortem report will be required with corrective action solution for any service impacting fault caused to NYC DOE OPT's ability to provide GPS service to Schools, Students, Students Parents , Student Guardians, and School Bus Companies utilizing NYC DOE OPT's vendor/provider product, Based on frequency of individual interruption or single interruption of mass effecting a singular or large group of users (an event requiring higher tier of escalation demand for resolution).</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix O.2.2 - Project and Change - Risk Management Methodology.pdf		Clarification: Defines trigger criteria for post-mortems (RFP-S3.4.5) based on service impact, frequency, severity, escalation level (not just system-wide outage).
675	162 & 163	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 2 NYC DOE OPT states "System should include analytic data for resolution that includes, elements of inter-department ticket transfers, complete report close out issue details i.e., trouble found, (hardware, software,) trouble cause (defect type, software bug, user, install, accident, weather, maintenance, neglect, unknown) fix applied (No trouble found, reprogramed, replaced part (identify), replaced unit, etc." What is your present daily ticket volume?</p> <p>A: NYC DOE OPT requirements for reported service problems directly related to the service provided by the GPS vendor to be managed by the vendor from receipt of the service issue of the problem to resolution, while keeping effected user(s) notified throughout the lifecycle of the problem. Data collection and reporting needs to be comprehensive to understand the source, cause, fix, and resolution times associated with the problem. The problem issue integration is to ensure NYC OPT DOE is tracking the vendor problem success in identifying problems, ensuring problems are resolved with the least amount of impact to service and provides data for analysis for future problem and problem handling time improvements. Current report rate data for daily reported problems are of insignificance as the selected product of choice is expected to have advantages in problem identification (pro-active repair and product maintenance advantages).</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf		Informational: Ticket volume not provided (deemed insignificant). Emphasizes vendor responsibility for managing/analyzing tickets and providing comprehensive data for analysis (RFP-S3.5).
676	164	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 3 NYC DOE OPT states "Every request must be given an appointment confirmation at the time of ticket entry." What is the purpose/function of an appointment</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf;		Clarification: Explains rationale and definition (commitment time/date)

		confirmation? Can NYC DOE OPT define "appointment confirmation"? A: The selected vendor is expected to be the first point of contact for Installation and service problem issues. At the time of service issue report to the Vendor, a service resolution time/date commitment will be provided to the reporting party in line with agreed service install or restoral SLA's. This will align service delivery expectations for the reporting party and work load prediction for the vendor. Appointment confirmation is a documented commitment by the vendor for when the pending work activity will be performed and notification to the reporting party as to when.		Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			for ticket confirmation requirement (RFP-S3.5.3).
677	165	Q: Page 22, paragraph 5 NYC DOE OPT states "Must have the capability to create a project for sets of 8 or more tickets for contracted School Bus vendors in a Borough, for which the date for work completion would be expected within SLA negotiable based on work." Is the expectation that a Project Manager will be assigned to sets of 8 or more tickets and are those tickets related to a similar issue or are they random issues? A: This reference to 8 or more in a borough allows the GPS vendor to establish a work day calendar where 8 or more repairs and installations can be scheduled to more than one School Bus Company. Scheduled work can be assigned to a GPS vendor repair personnel or a GPS Vendor contractor to group multiple work activities in a borough for reduction of windshield time moving between multiple boroughs therefore increasing repair personnel productivity. There is an expectation that the GPS vendors will be supervise all work completion for Quality and safety assurance.	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Clarification: Explains rationale/use case (efficiency scheduling) for project ticketing feature (RFP-S3.5). Vendor supervises work.
678	166	Q: Page 22, paragraph 6 NYC DOE OPT states "Must have a capability to include a description, comment, or other informative notation such as devices/vehicles and their components. These include: the unique identifying number of the device, the bus contractor fleet to which it was assigned, who made the request, the garage location where issue exist, ticket creation date, commitment date (i.e., time for ticket resolution), ticket closure date, request disposition, interim ticket status, and final ticket status for any ticket that would remain as part of the ticket history." What is request disposition? A: Disposition is the current states of a ticket.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Model); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Definition: Clarifies "disposition" = current status for RFP-S3.5.6.
679	167	Q: Page 22, paragraph 10b NYC DOE OPT states "Present day: total pending, total pending future, pending active for the day, and must have the capability of viewing ticket details for each group and issuing and completing the day before." Is this specific to issues requiring intervention on behalf of the successful bidder's development team? A: The dashboard is intended as an overview of relevant data for actual performance real time, history of previous day's performance, and forecast for future days performance. There are variables such as school closures, half school days and shortened school days (due to weather or other factors). The purpose of this data is to establish predictable outcomes resulting from different factors allowing the management to make	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf			Clarification: Explains intended use (operational overview/prediction) and scope (excludes ad-hoc dev issues) of the ticketing dashboard (RFP-S3.5.10).

		adjustments as required. This would not include the successful bidders ad hoc engagement.				
680	168	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 15 NYC DOE OPT states "Must record each trouble call event in Trouble Ticket History as a status that is retrievable for analysis with trouble defect and cause." Can OPT define/describe a "trouble call event"?</p> <p>A: Trouble Call event is any operational event failure that was reported as a problem and recorded as a defect and is fixable by the intervention of another Agency, NYC DOE department, or an external vendor contracted to NYC DOE OPT. (examples: Device software issue with Tablet is the problem, sent to IT group to repair is a transfer, up dated software remotely is the fix, vendor did not put tablet on power as instructed is the cause. - fix duration 24:00 HRs. This is a methodical tracking of a trouble ticket (a.k.a. problem) to identify where the problem was directed to repair, and the intermediate steps taken with history is recorded for analysis.</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Model)		Definition/Clarification: Explains "trouble call event" and expected tracking detail (fix path, cause, duration) for RFP-S3.5.15.
681	169	<p>Q: Page 24, paragraph 3 Does NYC DOE OPT presently have/use a driver monitoring and analysis platform to assess and evaluate driver behavior patterns, in real-time or otherwise?</p> <p>A: Yes- Telematics details provided by Geotab GO9+ Examples: * Hard Stopping *Fast Acceleration *Hard Cornering *idling etc...</p>	Yes	Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf		Contextual Info: Confirms current driver behavior monitoring source (GeoTab) and data points, relevant to RFP-S3.7.3/4/5.
682	172	<p>Q: Page 32, paragraph d, iv: NYC DOE OPT indicates that the successful bidder's system will implement a data integration platform that processes and exports specified operation data elements to support NYCPSC payment processing requirements, according to NYCPSC requested formats. Can DOE identify the NYCPSC payment processing system, and the NYCPSC requested formats that the successful bidder will be required to integrate with?</p> <p>A: The successful bidder would not need to provide solution for a direct integration with existing NYCPSC systems. The successful bidder would need to provide data integration to meet NYCPSC requirements for their existing system.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration - Outbound); Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf		Constraint/Clarification: Defines payment system interaction as data export to meet requirements, not direct API integration (RFP-S3.12.1.d.iv). Assume "provide data integration" means "provide data export".
683	173	<p>Q: Page 32, paragraph a, ii Can NYC DOE OPT identify the attributes of stop management platform OPT 199, its' core functionality, and policy algorithm that the successful bidder will be required to integrate with? If being replaced, what are the transition requirements (data migration, user training) what support will OPT provide during this process?</p> <p>A: https://pwsblobprd.schools.nyc/prd-pws/docs/default-source/default-document-library/a-801-9-5-2000-final-remediated-wcag2-0.pdf?sfvrsn=cb0ffebd_84</p>	No	N/A (External Resource)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational Resource: Link provided likely contains Chancellor's Regs A-801 related to stop policies relevant to OPT199 functionality (RFP-S3.13.a.ii).
684	174	<p>Q: Page 41, 3.22.1 We need more information on "Cloning of Legacy system(s)" statement? Does that mean migration from the legacy system to the new routing solution?</p> <p>A: Yes, "Cloning of Legacy system(s)" refers to migrating data and functionalities from the legacy system to the new routing solution, ensuring continuity and compatibility during the transition.</p>	Yes	Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf		Clarification: Defines "cloning" term used in RFP-S3.22.1.1 as data/functionality migration.

685	175 & 98	<p>Q175: Page 44, paragraph 9, 1 NYC DOE OPT indicates that the successful bidder's solution must be interoperable with (the) messaging collaboration platform currently used by NYC agencies for all notifications/messages for targeted audiences. Can NYC DOE OPT identify the messaging collaboration platform that the successful bidder will be required to integrate with?</p> <p>Q98: Page 44, Scope of Services section 3.25 Item 9 references the requirement to integrate with a "messaging collaboration platform currently in use by NYC agencies." Can you please provide details about the specific "messaging collaboration platform"...?</p> <p>A175: Sendgrid & EverBridge. A98: The Messaging Platform is Everbridge.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf			New Constraint: Specifies messaging platforms (SendGrid AND Everbridge) for integration required by RFP-S3.25.9.1.
686	177 & 178	<p>Q177: Page 15, paragraph 2 The OPT tracks GPS devices, history, and life cycle attributes in an inventory system. The contracted bus vendors are responsible for informing the OPT of any malfunction or loss. Can NYC DOE OPT identify and provide details on this inventory and tracking system? Is this information integrated into any other systems?</p> <p>Q178: What are the current processes for reporting on this information?</p> <p>A: GPS Inventory is tracked utilizing data provided by the GPS vendor and inventory updates for on and off equipment provided by school bus companies. GPS issues are identified through DOE routine practice of monitoring GPS vendor reports for non-working problematic GPS system issues. There is no current integration of these reports.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Contextual Info: Describes current manual/disconnected inventory process. Opportunity for improvement with new system.
687	179	<p>Q: Page 15, paragraph 5: The GPS device is installed in an "undisclosed portion of the bus". Can NYC DOE OPT provide additional details on the current installation placement or the general criteria/policies considered when installing any and all previous GPS devices, primarily tablets and mounts?</p> <p>A: 1. Ram -Mounts are installed by drilling 4 holes into the buses dashboard . 2. Rubber molly inserts are put onto the holes . 3. The mount is placed on the dashboard over the 4 drill holes where the mollies were inserted . 4.Screws are inserted in the 4 holes on the mount which go directly into the 4 holes in the dashboard where the rubber mollies expand similar to a wall anchor . 5. The usb charging cable is run to the main power source in the fuse box and an empty fuse location is designated for the charging cable -Phone Charger 6. Rubber tips are glued onto the x grip on the ram mount.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Contextual Info: Specific details on current hardware install (mounts, power). Still doesn't address "undisclosed" placement for primary GPS (GeoTab).
688	181	<p>Q: Page 18, paragraph 4 Does NYC DOE OPT expect the tablet GPS solution to update and adjust based on live traffic conditions day to day?</p> <p>A: Yes</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Routing Engine)			Confirmation: Reaffirms dynamic adjustment for traffic requirement.

689	182	<p>Q: Page 18, Section 3.1 NYC DOE OPT states that "(t)he solution should accurately track, update and report bus and student activities in near real time with voice communication capabilities." Can the district specify what it means by "voice communication capabilities" and how this would be used in the system?</p> <p>A: Voice communication capabilities refer to integrated features allowing real-time audio communication between drivers, dispatch, and other relevant staff. This functionality would be used to address immediate concerns, provide updates, and ensure efficient coordination during transportation operations</p>	No	Potential Gap (See Q263)		Initial Clarification: Defines voice comms requirement. (Note: Q263 later states this is NOT required). Mark as gap.
690	183	<p>Q: Page 19, Section 4b NYC DOE OPT states that "the system shall implement color coding to highlight route deviations, with severity indicators based on the magnitude of deviation from the planned route." Can NYC DOE OPT confirm if this is part of the current routing solution attributes. As well, can the district outline the current criteria or thresholds for measuring the severity of route deviations.</p> <p>A: Currently shapes are used to identify students ambulatory codes or medical alert codes. Color coding is only used to differentiate the routes and schools on the map.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf		Contextual/Clarification: Describes current visuals (shapes/colors). Confirms new requirement for deviation color-coding/severity thresholds (RFP-S3.2.4b) is not new; thresholds TBD by vendor/DOE.
691	184	<p>Q: Page 20, paragraph 2 & Page 51, Section 32 "All components of the solution (including internal and external interfaces) must be testable by independent testing teams." Can NYC DOE OPT further outline expectations with being provided "test tools". Primarily, at what point in the implementation would these be expected? Do these "test tools" need to maintain district-based information or are demonstrative test environments satisfactory? Would a soft rollout of certain modules satisfy this requirement?</p> <p>A: NYC DOE OPT requires all components of the GPS solution, including interfaces, to be testable by independent testing teams. Test tools should be provided during the testing phase. A soft rollout of certain modules is acceptable as long as it enables comprehensive testing.</p>	Yes	Appendix R - Testing Strategy.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf		Clarification: Sets expectation for test tool timing (testing phase) and accepts soft rollout approach (RFP-S3.2.14, S3.25.32.1). Test env data type not specified.
692	185	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 4 NYC DOE OPT states that "the vendor must be able to offer next day repair for up to 30 vehicles, three-day appointment for projects up to 30 vehicles and maximum five-day appointments for projects greater than 30 vehicles." Can the district outline the current process that is followed for these requests and timeline for current repairs? Do these repair timelines exclude any initial diagnostic discussions</p> <p>A: All repairs and installations are recorded by the school bus vendor in a basic NYC DOE OPT CRM module "Service Now". All operational issues are reported through this medium. Those issues that include multiple units for repair and install are usually discussed prior to the scheduling to ensure the alignment of all parties (bus vendor point of contact, vehicle and equipment availability, and location of service to be rendered).</p>	Yes	Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf		Contextual Info: Describes current repair workflow (SBC reports via ServiceNow, pre-scheduling discussion). Diagnostic time impact on SLA unclear.

693	186	<p>Q: Page 21, paragraph 11 & 14 NYCPS expects 99.99999% of continuous GPS service and full functionality, with minimal service disruptions. Can the district provide current service metrics and outline any current service-related challenges?</p> <p>A: Continuous Service Metrics are not available. Service related challenges have been identified on inter-connecting communication links, absence of change control and service restoration testing.</p>	No	N/A (Context Only)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Contextual Info: Lack of baseline availability metrics, known current challenges (comms links, change control, testing). Implies vendor cannot assume current state meets target.
694	187	<p>Q: Page 22, paragraph 1 Can NYCPS please outline the current ticketing system and fields that the vendor's ticketing system must integrate with?</p> <p>A: Current Ticketing system is Service Now Ticketing System , The integration will include: Reporting details: * School reporting from details *Name of Person Reporting Issue * Company Name/Location *Reach Number *Company code Issue Type: * School app *Driver app *Bus hardware * Phone hardware Identification Codes: * IMEI for phone * Driver Identification number * Vehicle number List is not inclusive of all fields but relevant details for expectations is for anything that is needed to positively explain the reason for the ticket and needed details about the problem and whom to speak with during repair/fix/install/process. Time elements must be captured on all transactions.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Fields); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Constraint/Clarification: Specifies ticketing system (ServiceNow) and required integration data fields (RFP-S3.5.1). List indicative, not exhaustive. Time capture crucial.
695	188	<p>Q: Page 23, section 6: NYC DOE OPT states that "students must have the ability to display a scannable code as their boarding/bus pass." Do RFID cards and readers that use radio frequency for student scanning and ridership meet this requirement? RFID card customization and additional integration with other district systems still being possible but not the mechanism used for registering scans.</p> <p>A: Yes, that's correct. We are open to various solutions. This will be new for NYC, and the solution must be flexible, scalable, and user-friendly.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Reiteration/Flexibility Point: Confirms openness on scanning tech (RFID OK) for RFP-S3.6.6.
696	189	<p>Q: Page 24, Section 1: Can NYCPS outline the minimum goals for "biometric authentication integration" and what alternative tools for user authentication could satisfy the district goals?</p> <p>A: The minimum goals for "biometric authentication integration" likely include ensuring secure, efficient, and user-friendly access to systems while minimizing friction and enhancing adoption. Alternative tools for user authentication could include password-less methods like multi-factor authentication (MFA), hardware tokens, or behavioral biometrics, as deemed fit by vendors.</p>	Yes	Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (AuthN)			Clarification/Flexibility: Defines goals (secure, efficient, user-friendly) for biometrics (RFP-S3.7.1/2) and explicitly allows alternatives (MFA, tokens etc.).

697	190	<p>Q: Page 40, Section 6: Installation of GPS Equipment, during previous professional GPS installations is there an assigned or designated authority at all install locations to oversee and provide final approvals? During professional GPS installations does the district consolidate vehicles to pre-identified locations? How many locations would the district maintain for professional installations?</p> <p>A: Vendors will be required to perform installations at locations of NYCPS' discretion. There are currently about 50 contractors in about 70 bus yards.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Constraint/Clarification: Confirms vendor performs installs at contractor locations (~70 yards). No DOE oversight mentioned at install locations.
698	191	<p>Q: Page 40, Section 6: Installation of GPS Equipment, does the district have readily available vehicle information? If so, what details (vin#, make, model, year etc.) does this information contain and in what format is this information readily available? Does the district expect to install on any white fleet vehicles?</p> <p>A: Please see associated tabs in this document.</p>	No	N/A (Reference unclear)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational Resource: Response points to unclear source ("associated tabs"?). Vehicle details needed (possibly Att C). White fleet question unanswered. **Potential Gap.**
699	192	<p>Q: Page 40, Section 6: What is the organizational breakdown of fleet management staff? How many employees (i.e. mechanics) would be expected to self-install GPS equipment in the future?</p> <p>A: Mechanics are hired by the individual bus companies directly and the number of mechanics needed for them would depend on the number of routes they operate, so we do not have that data available to us. NYCPS can confirm that we have about 50 vendors servicing our routes. Some vendors do not have mechanics and a complicated installation may call for the vendor to bring the bus to a designated mechanic.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf			Contextual Info: Clarifies mechanic responsibility (SBCs hire them). Impacts potential self-install models or vendor install scope.
700	193	<p>Q: Page 48, Section 21.1.d: NYC DOE OPT states that "The solution must have failure rates less than 10 failures per calendar year." What is the definition of a "failure"?</p> <p>A: An event that disrupts daily operations.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Reliability); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Definition: Clarifies "failure" for reliability NFR S3.25.21.d (disrupts daily ops).
701	194	<p>Q: Page 18, section 3.1.3: NYC DOE OPT states that "The system should provide automated updates". Is there a format or type of method in which these messages should be received? I.e. SMS, email, Push Notification, other.</p> <p>A: That solution will be presented to OPT by the awarded vendor.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf			Flexibility Point: Vendor defines automated update mechanism/format (relates to RFP-S3.1.3 requirement for near real-time notification system).
702	195	<p>Q: Page 20, paragraph 13: NYC DOE OPT states that "GPS is to have an SBC Vendor certification". What is the process in which to obtain SBC vendor certification, and who is the responsible party to manage and maintain this certification?</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf			Process Clarification: Defines vendor role in device tracking/sharing data with DOE, substituting for formal

		A: The awarded vendor will track the distribution and management of devices to School Bus Companies and that information will need to be shared with NYC DOE electronically.		Management.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Sharing)			'certification' process implied by RFP-S3.2.13.	
703	196	Q: Page 20, paragraph 20: NYC DOE OPT states that vendors "Must be able to indicate that an individual student's ridership should not be tracked if a parent/caregiver informs NYCPS that they wish their student to not participate." What is the current process to manage this type of request? A: NYCPS is currently not tracking ridership. A process will need to be proposed and developed to accomplish this.	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix S.1 - Data Governance and compliance controls.pdf			Clarification: Confirms opt-out process (RFP-S3.2.20) is TBD/part of solution design as ridership tracking is new. Process needs proposal.	
704	197	Q: Page 23, section 3.6.2: NYC DOE OPT states that "Sign up functionality providing two separate levels of access, one for parents/caregivers, and one for students." What are the differences in "levels of access" between parents/caregivers and students (e.g., view-only for students, full control for parents/caregivers)? A: Students will only have read only access for their own transportation data. Caregivers will have access to see all of their children who take the bus, as well as submit reports, make requests, etc.	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Permissions); Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf			Clarification: Defines Parent (R/W, reports, requests) vs Student (RO own data) permissions for RFP-S3.6.2.	
705	198	Q: Page 23, section 3.6.9: NYC DOE OPT states that "Parents/caregivers and students must have the ability to provide feedback" Is there an expectation that this feedback be sent to the operation or the vendor? If to the operation, what is the expected communication vector? If to the vendor, what is the expected action taken/communication to operation per feedback? A: Parent/ caregivers and students must be able to provide feedback to the vendor through the app. The vendor will respond to the ticket and provide OPT with reporting.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Feedback Workflow); Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf (Support Process); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Process Clarification: Defines workflow for user feedback handling (To Vendor via app; Vendor responds & reports to OPT) for RFP-S3.6.9.	
706	199	Q: . Page 23, section 3.6.11: NYC DOE OPT states that applications "Must include options for multi-language selection." Is there a defined list of languages expected? Is the same language support expected as defined in page 25, section 3.7.12? A: See Page 24, Section 3.7, Item 12	No	N/A (Reference)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Reference: Points back to Q8 response which specifies 9 DOE languages.	
707	200 & 201	Q200: Page 24, section 3.7.3: NYC DOE OPT states that "The system shall implement an intelligent driver monitoring and analysis platform..." What specific device sensors (e.g., GPS, accelerometer, gyroscope) and vehicle integration methods (e.g., OBD-II, CAN bus) are expected to provide telemetry data, and are these standardized across all vehicles or dependent on make/model? Q201: Page 24, section 3.7.4: NYC DOE OPT states that "The system shall process and analyze the behavioral parameters..." Are there specific thresholds or benchmarks for "safe" vs. "unsafe" driving patterns (e.g., maximum	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf			Clarification/Context: Narrows scope of driver behavior analysis required by vendor solution itself (RFP-S3.7.3/4) if GeoTab data is used/integrated. Implies vendor does not need to define thresholds if using existing GeoTab data stream.	

		<p>acceptable braking force, cornering speed limits), or is the vendor expected to define these? How should the system prioritize or weigh different behavioral parameters?</p> <p>A: Geotab GPS devices are installed on every bus. The example of GeoTab is used to describe a Quality standard for ensuring devices are built for industrial use, placed onboard a vehicle in line with NYDMV regulations and in a practical location. Geotab is providing data for vehicle location and telematic information. The solution sought after in this RFP is more Vehicle, Route, and ridership centric. (which is a service presently not being used from Geotab).</p>				
708	202	<p>Q: Page 24, section 3.7.8: NYC DOE OPT states that "Two-way communication ability" is a requirement. What are the expected communication channels for two-way communication (e.g., in-app messaging, voice calls, push notification, SMS, email)?</p> <p>A: In app communication is a must, however OPT is open to other channels.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Communication Features); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf		Constraint/Flexibility: Mandates in-app comms for RFP-S3.7.8, allows vendor to propose others.
709	203	<p>Q: Page 25, section 3.8.3.c and 3.8.3.d: NYC DOE OPT states that applications will "Capture the actual time a student boards the bus, noting estimated time and tracking the difference." How should the system display, report or flag the differences? What actions should the system take (e.g. notify system users, log for reporting, etc.)? What is the expected behavior if the student does not board the bus?</p> <p>A: The NYCPS requires to be informed of when the student boarded, exited the bus or didn't take the bus. OPT is open to solutions to address this requirement.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Ridership Logic/UI/Alerting)		Clarification/Flexibility: Confirms core data need (board/exit/absence status) for RFP-S3.8.3.c/d, allows vendor approach for handling derived info/alerts flags.
710	204	<p>Q: Page 26, section 3.9.7: NYC DOE OPT states that the application must have the "Ability to report issues or problems to and accept replies from OPT Administrative module" What type of "issues or problems" are expected? Is there a list of predefined categories or templates? What is the expected process for administrators to report issues (e.g. in app form, screenshots, etc.)?</p> <p>A: Users should have the ability to report a problem with student/ transportation data and software issues using the app. There are no predefined categories or reporting requirements. (ex. app not working, driver not able to log in, bus delayed, student not displaying in app, etc.)</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf		Clarification: Defines scope for school admin issue reporting (data & software issues); no predefined categories (RFP-S3.9.7).
711	205	<p>Q: Page 26, section 3.9.8: "Must have troubleshooting and self-help options (multi-language)". Language needs are referenced on page 42 (3.25.1b) under non-functional requirements. Is the same language support expected as defined in page 25, section 3.7.12?</p> <p>A: Yes</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Accessibility)		Confirmation: Consistent language support expectation (9 DOE languages) for RFP-S3.9.8.

712	206	<p>Q: Page 27, section 3.10.19: "Display route association status (i.e., not active, route activated)" What defines a "route activated" vs "not active" status?</p> <p>A: An Active route is in operation and should be indicated as such. An inactive route exists but is currently not in use.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Model); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Definition: Clarifies route status terminology for RFP-S3.10.19.
713	207	<p>Q: Page 28, section 3.10.40: "Search engine that provides statistical performance history data for driver associated route completion". What specific data is expected in statistical performance reports for driver associated routes?</p> <p>A: Statistical reports should include, but not be limited to: start/end times of routes, ridership, distance traveled, route traveled, driver subscription, vehicle association and vehicle operator. NYCP looks forward to receiving proposals with extensive reporting capabilities that will help us improve our overall operation.</p>	Yes	Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Clarification/Expectation: Details required driver performance metrics for RFP-S3.10.40, sets expectation for comprehensive reporting.
714	208	<p>Q: Page 28, section 3.10.43: "Must have the capability to override this functionality in the other modules" What does "override this functionality in the other modules" mean? Is this override limited to certain roles/permissions?</p> <p>A: Software capability should allow selected users within OPT to override systems functionality.</p>	Yes	Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf (Permissions); Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Admin Features); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Clarification: Defines scope/intent of admin override capability (selected OPT users) for RFP-S3.10.43.
715	209	<p>Q: Page 30, section 3.12.1.a.ii: "Must design the solution to be able to automatically assign an itinerary type for each trip" What specific criteria or rules should the system use to automatically assign itinerary types and is it configurable?</p> <p>A: Awarded vendor will receive itinerary type requirements.</p>	No	N/A (Post-Award Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Details for itinerary type assignment rules (RFP-S3.12.1.a.ii) are post-award.
716	210	<p>Q: Page 30, section 3.12.1.a.iv: "Must be capable of integrating existing Field Trip application or assign Field Trips based on current routes that are available." What is the existing field trip application and what API's or data formats are available for this integration? What specific "business rules" must be built into the Field Trip routing logic and how are these rules managed?</p> <p>A: Field trip application is a web based system in SQL. Currently schools can book trips based on available routes in the system.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration/Replacement Strategy); Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Constraint/Clarification: Identifies legacy field trip app (SQL based), implies no API impacting integration approach (RFP-S3.12.1.a.iv). Business rules not detailed.
717	211	<p>Q: Page 30, section 3.12.1.a.viii: "Must have the ability for contracted vendors to view routes and suggest changes to headcounts and stop times" What is the expected process for contracted vendors to suggest changes? Who approves these changes?</p> <p>A: The Exec. Director of Transit and Borough Directors can approve suggested changes.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Workflow); Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf			Informational: Identifies specific roles (Exec Dir Transit, Borough Dirs) for vendor suggestion approval workflow (RFP-S3.12.1.a.viii).
718	212	<p>Q: Page 30, section 3.12.1.a.x: "Must have the ability to adjust the routes...without deviating from OPT scheduling/sequencing". What does</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Routing Engine Goals); Appendix			Contextual Info: Defines primary objective (on-time arrival) for dynamic

		this mean in practice and how should the system balance this with dynamic adjustments? A: The goal is for all routes to arrive to school on time.		M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			routing adjustments (RFP-S3.12.1.a.x). Implies schedule/sequence adherence is secondary if it causes lateness.
719	213	Q: Page 30, section 3.12.1.a.xi: "Must be able to configure notifications according to the routing workflow" What specific routing workflow events should trigger notifications (e.g., route changes, delays), and who should receive these (e.g. SBCs, schools)? A: All items noted here are correct.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Notification Service); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Confirmation: Reaffirms notification scope includes route changes, delays, targeting SBCs, schools, etc. for RFP-S3.12.1.a.xvi.
720	214	Q: Page 33, section 3.13.a.viii: "while ensuring OPT policies and regulations are built into the stop management solution." What specific OPT policies and regulations must be built into the solution for changing existing stop locations (e.g. distance between stops, approvals, safety considerations) and how should these be enforced? A: This is driven by Chancellor's regulations. NYCPS will prescribe our routing requirements and how they are to be performed.	No	N/A (Post-Award Info/External Ref)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Policy source (Chancellor's Regs), details TBD post-award for RFP-S3.13.a.viii.
721	215	Q: Page 33, section 3.13.a.x: "Must have the ability to send a notification to schools and parents/caregivers about new, changed, or deleted stops" What specific information should be included in the notification about the affected stops? (Address, dates, students)? What are the expected notification channels for schools (email, SMS, in-app)? A: Schools and parents should be notified of changes to a route via emails/parent app.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Notification Channels); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf			Clarification: Specifies channels (email/parent app) for stop change notifications (RFP-S3.13.a.x). Content details not specified.
722	216	Q: Page 34, section 3.13.b.xviii: "Must be able to flag stops for deactivation when it detects that the stop is not being used." What criteria defines a stop as "not being used" (student association, no riders within X days). Are there retention requirements for deactivated stops? A: Stops should be removed from a route if there no students assigned or the vendor reports that a stop is not being utilized.	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Stop Mgmt Logic)			Clarification: Defines triggers for stop deactivation (no students assigned OR vendor reports unused) for RFP-S3.13.b.xvii/xviii. Retention not addressed.
723	217	Q: Page 35, section 3.14.a.iii: "Must be capable of integrating session times from an existing Session Time Application". What is the "existing Session Time Application" referenced and what APIs, or data formats are available for integrating? What is the expected frequency of updates to the existing Session Time Application? A: Session time app is a SQL based application, there is no API. A system will need to be developed to import session times into the new routing system.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Constraint/Clarification: Reconfirms legacy Session Time app details (SQL, no API) and import requirement (RFP-S3.14.a.iii). Frequency not addressed.
724	218	Q: Page 35, section 3.15.a.xviii: "Must have the ability to restore a previous version of a route or use an archived version of a route in case of emergency." How should the system restore	Yes	Appendix Q.1 - Business Continuity Plan And Operational Excellence.pdf; Appendix			Clarification: Confirms mechanism for route restore (RFP-S3.15.a.xviii) is standard

		previous route versions (e.g. version history, rollback options, date) and what qualifies as an emergency for restoration? A: Data should be backed up and restored if needed.	M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Backup/Restore)			backup/restore. Definition of 'emergency' not provided.
725	219	Q: Page 35, section 3.15.b.i: "Must be able to auto-create/auto-optimize routes in the most efficient manner based on configurable parameters" What specific "configurable parameters" should the system use (e.g. distance, time, capacity) and who defines or adjusts the defined parameters? A: Routing operations based on capacity, distance and time.	Yes Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Routing Engine); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Clarification: Specifies key optimization parameters (capacity, distance, time) for RFP-S3.15.b.i. Who adjusts TBD.
726	220	Q: Page 38, section 3.17.a.i: "External applications must be allowed to consume snapshots of routing information from a given date" What specific routing information must external applications consume and how should these external applications access these snapshots? A: The Service Now System and route changes in the system.	Yes Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration - Outbound); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Clarification/Constraint: Identifies specific consumers (ServiceNow) and data (route changes) for snapshot export (RFP-S3.17.a.i). Access method TBD.
727	221 & 222	Q221: Page 39, section 3.19.3: "Mountable in accordance with NYDMV School Bus Safety Regulations" What specific NYDMV School Bus Safety Regulations apply to mounting devices, and will these regulations be provided for compliance verification? Q222: Page 40, section 3.19.6 and 7: "Installation within the guidelines of the vehicle manufacture, NYCPS specifications, and NYDMV Vehicle safety guidelines". What specific NYCPS specifications and NYDMV Vehicle Safety Guidelines apply to GPS installation and maintenance, and will these be provided for reference? A: Any aftermarket installation cannot obstruct the drivers line of site and must be in accordance with Department of Transportation.	Yes Appendix P.3 - Audit Framework.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Clarification: Provides high-level guideline (driver line of sight, DOT regs) for mounting/install compliance (RFP-S3.19). Specific regs not provided here.
728	223	Q: Page 40, section 3.19.15: "If a device cannot transmit data - there must be a method by which the data can be downloaded" What specific data must be stored and downloadable if a device cannot transmit (e.g. GPS, student scans)? A: As a contingency, we expect the vendors to make the data available for download. No data should be lost.	Yes Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (Offline Mode); Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf			Confirmation/Constraint: Reaffirms expectation for offline data download with no data loss (RFP-S3.19.15). Specific data types not enumerated here but implied to be all critical operational data.
729	224	Q: Page 40, section 3.19.11: "To ensure consistent device functioning, the vendor must commit to replacing up to 20% of the devices annually on an as-needed basis." How should the vendor track and report device replacements to ensure compliance with the 20% requirement? A: Hardware replenishment is contract negotiable. For what is included in the contract, vendor should be tracking which devices were replaced, the reason for replacement, when it was initially deployed vs. replaced, etc.	Yes Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf (Contract/Reporting)			Clarification/Process: Defines tracking/reporting needs (reason, dates etc.) for device replacement (RFP-S3.19.11). Exact % negotiable in contract.

730	225	<p>Q: . Page 40, section 3.20.1: "Scanning capability for reading student IDs based on various mechanisms, such as Barcode, QR code, RFID, etc. delivered to the School Bus contracted vendors." What specific ID formats (Barcode, QR, RFID) is currently in use by NYCPS students? Are student ID's provided by NYCPS, or must the vendor supply them?</p> <p>A: NYCPS provides transportation to public, charter and non-public school. There is no central policy governing IDs and they are not mandatory. They are handled at the school level.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Reiteration: Confirms lack of standard ID impacts vendor solution for RFP-S3.20.1. Vendor needs to propose ID mechanism/provision if required by their scanning solution.
731	226	<p>Q: Page 41, section 3.22.1: "full time project management on site is required throughout the transition and implementation completion." Will full time onsite project management be required during initial planning phases or begin a specified start point? If the implementation team consists of two project managers (software routing PM and hardware/GPS system PM) will both be required onsite for the entire project duration or just during their respective project milestones?</p> <p>A: Yes, we expect Project Managers and technical team members to be available at OPT office during the project duration.</p>	Yes	Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Constraint: Confirms expectation for on-site availability of PMs/Tech team throughout project (RFP-S3.22.1). Doesn't explicitly address multiple PMs.
732	227	<p>Q: Page 41, section 3.23.1: "Products, processes, methods and procedures are to be trained to a large population...school administrators, parents/caregivers and students." What, if any, are the expectations for training the NYCPS external community (i.e. parents and students)?</p> <p>A: Initial training needs to be conducted by vendor along with change management documentation, to be followed by train-the-trainer model.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf			Reiteration: Confirms training approach (Vendor Initial + TTT) applies broadly, including external community (RFP-S3.23).
733	228	<p>Q: Page 41, section 3.23.2: "Training should be done in a way that there is a 99.99% participation rate..." Please outline expectations for the vendor's role in ensuring participation. If the selected vendor assists in tracking attendance, will concerns with district employee attendance be managed and addressed and held accountable by the district?</p> <p>A: Vendors, schools and operational units will be responsible for ensuring all necessary participants attend training. Our expectation is that the vendor selected must be able to train all stakeholders which includes a large mass.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf; Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf			Clarification: Defines shared responsibility (Vendor, Schools, Ops) for training attendance/participation (RFP-S3.23.2).

734	229	<p>Q: Page 42, section 3.25.2.a: "NYCPS' technical team should be trained to perform enhancement, customization and configuration activities with no support or minimum support from the proposer." What level of customization and configuration activities is expected for NYCPS's technical team to perform independently?</p> <p>A: NYCPS's technical team is expected to independently perform activities such as system enhancements, basic customizations, and configurations to adapt the solution to evolving operational needs, with minimal reliance on the proposer for support.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Adaptability)			Clarification: Defines level of expected NYCPS self-sufficiency (enhancements, basic customizations, configs) for RFP-S3.25.2.a.
735	230	<p>Q: Page 44, section 3.25.9.1: "Solution must be able to interoperate with messaging collaboration platform currently used by NYC agencies for all notifications/messages for targeted audience". What is the "messaging collaboration platform" currently used by NYC agencies and is there documentation available for this integration?</p> <p>A: Everbridge is used as a collaborative messaging platform.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf			Confirmation: Specifies messaging platform (Everbridge) for RFP-S3.25.9.1. Note Q175 also mentioned SendGrid.
736	231	<p>Q: Page 46, section 3.25.17.1: "The proposer must design the solution to be Interoperable with existing and future NYC systems." What specific NYCPS systems (beyond NYCPS, Student Profile, and School Finder) must the solution interoperate with, and will there be specs provided for each?</p> <p>A: Beyond NYCPS, Student Profile, and School Finder, the solution may need to interoperate with systems like transportation, attendance, and data management platforms. Specifications for each system will likely be provided during the project.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Clarification: Provides examples of systems needing interoperation (transport, attendance, data mgmt) for RFP-S3.25.17.1. Specs post-award.
737	232	<p>Q: Page 47, section 3.25.18.5: "The proposer must provide a system capability to wipe out all data from mobile devices as soon as it is discovered that device is missing or lost or retired from service". Who determines if a device is lost, stolen or retired? What documentation/communication requirements are there when wiping device?</p> <p>A: Requirement to remove service from device is determined by notification from NYC DOE OPT or is a normal function in broken unrepairable device replacement.</p>	Yes	Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix Q.1 - Business Continuity Plan And Operational Excellence.pdf			Process Clarification: Defines triggers for remote device wipe (OPT notification, broken device replacement) for RFP-S3.25.18.5. Comms TBD.

738	233	<p>Q: Page 47, section 3.25.18.6: "The proposer must provide a system capability to wipe out all data from mobile devices as soon as it is discovered that incorrect authorized username and/or password are used to access the solution for 10 times consecutively." What defines "10 consecutive incorrect login attempts" (e.g. same device, same user)? What documentation/communication requirements are there when wiping device?</p> <p>A: "10 consecutive incorrect login attempts" refers to failed login attempts by the same user on the same device. Documentation and communication requirements for wiping the device will be outlined by OPT in collaboration with the awarded vendor.</p>	Yes	Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Clarification: Defines scope for automated wipe trigger (same user, same device) for RFP-S3.25.18.6. Comms TBD.
739	234	<p>Q: Page 48, section 3.25.22.1: "We will also evaluate the architecture and interoperability of existing systems to determine if they may be used in some capacity as part of our solution". What existing NYCPS systems should be evaluated for potential reuse, and will access or documentation be provided for this evaluation?</p> <p>A: Awarded vendor shall be provided with the access to existing NYCPS OPT systems for the evaluation.</p>	No	N/A (Post-Award Process)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Confirms post-award access for system evaluation (RFP-S3.25.22.1). Specific systems TBD.
740	235	<p>Q: Page 48, section 3.25.24.2: "to perform security testing of the solution with advance notice less or equal than 15 days. Every release of the software needs to go through security testing before deployment so that solution stays secured to protect Personally Identifiable Information managed by NYCPS". What is the process for coordinating security testing with these OTI, NYC3, DIIT and other related city agencies and what happens if issues are found post deployment?</p> <p>A: All relevant information would be provided to a successful bidder.</p>	No	N/A (Post-Award Process)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Process details for coordinating external security testing (RFP-S3.25.24.2) are post-award.
741	236	<p>Q: Page 49, section 3.25.26.1: "These documents must ensure alignment with NYCPS' operational standards, meet the industry's best practices, and support the timely resolution of customer issues while maintaining high service quality." What are the NYCPS' operational standards?</p> <p>A: All NYCPS OPT processes align with NYC Local Laws and Chancellor Regulations. More detailed SOPs will be provided to the selected vendor. https://www.schools.nyc.gov/about-us/policies/chancellors-regulations</p>	No	N/A (External Ref/Post-Award Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational Resource/Process: Points to source of operational standards (Laws, Regs) for RFP-S3.25.26.1. Detailed SOPs post-award.
742	237	<p>Q: Page 49, section 3.25.26.2: "The data consumed and generated by the Vendor shall be available for NYCPS operations daily without any lag and in NYCPS Administrative Systems." What data specifically and in what format?</p> <p>A: The required data includes routing, ridership, and performance metrics, provided in a standardized digital format compatible with NYCPS Administrative Systems.</p>	Yes	Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Model/Export)			Clarification: Specifies data categories (routing, ridership, performance metrics) needed by NYCPS in standard format (RFP-S3.25.26.2).
743	238	<p>Q: Page 49, section 3.25.26.3: "Data should flow in real-time or near- real-time (within 10</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf;			Clarification: High-level description of integration

		seconds of generation or update) in accordance with the operational requirements of NYCPS data integration." What are the operational requirements of NYCPS data integration? A: NYCPS data integration requires seamless real-time or near-real-time data flow, ensuring compatibility with existing systems and adherence to performance and security standards.		Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFRs)			quality requirements (seamless, compatible, performant, secure) for RFP-S3.25.26.3.	
744	239	Q: Page 51, section 3.25.32.1: "All components of the solution (including internal and external interfaces) must be testable by independent testing teams in testing environments". Will NYCPS provided systems and integrations be included in this non-production testing requirement for testing purposes? A: Yes	Yes	Appendix R - Testing Strategy.pdf; Appendix N.2.2 - DevOps Technical Implementation.pdf (Environments)			Confirmation: Non-prod testing scope (RFP-S3.25.32.1) includes integrated NYCPS systems.	
745	240	Q: Page 51, section 3.25.32.2.: "The proposer needs to submit complete documentation (including but not limited to testing plans and results) to show that a thorough testing process has been followed during execution of the contract" How frequently must testing documentation be submitted (e.g. per release, quarterly, annually) and what is the process for NYCPS to review/approve? A: The documentation shall be produced and submitted per release. The process for approval is meeting the benchmarks, in agreement with business stakeholders (e.g., Penetration testing, unit testing, integration testing, regression testing, load and performance testing, and any other relevant testing) along with release notes, and production validation documents.	Yes	Appendix R - Testing Strategy.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf (Deliverables/Process); Appendix N.1.2 - SDLC Technical Specifications.pdf			Clarification/Process: Defines timing (per release) and approval criteria (meeting benchmarks, stakeholder agreement, supporting docs) for test documentation (RFP-S3.25.32.2).	
746	241	Q: Page 52, section 3.26.2: Location and On-Site Requirements, "when onsite presence is required it will take place at the following locations (or where needed)." When training the large population of drivers and attendants, does the district utilize specified training locations? If so, approximately how many trainings locations would drivers be distributed amongst? A: The district does not utilize specific training locations, the location of the trainings for bus companies in particular will be determined by the bus company themselves. Some companies have classrooms for trainings on site while others may rent out specific locations for training purposes.	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf			Contextual Info: Clarifies training locations determined by SBCs, impacting delivery logistics (RFP-S3.23).	
747	242	Q: Which company currently holds the contract for this project? A: VIA TRANSPORTATION, INC.	No	N/A (Context Only)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Contextual Info: Identifies incumbent vendor.	
748	243 & 276	Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about budget) What is the allocated budget for this project? / What is the anticipated budget...? A: NYCPS does not provide this information for competitive procurements.	No	N/A (Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Budget figure unavailable. Vendor must price based on scope.	
749	244	Q: Could you provide the attendee list from the pre-bid meeting? A: Yes. Pre proposal conference attendee list containing contact information of vendors that filled	No	N/A (Resource Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational Resource: Confirms pre-bid attendee list available.	

		out the attendance survey during the pre proposal conference is available for download via the Vendor Portal.					
750	247	<p>Q: What are the specifications for the student IDs (e.g., RFID, barcode)?</p> <p>A: We are looking for the vendor to provide a solution.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Reiteration: Vendor proposes student ID tech spec (RFP-S3.20.1).
708	202	<p>Q: Page 24, section 3.7.8: NYC DOE OPT states that "Two-way communication ability" is a requirement. What are the expected communication channels for two-way communication (e.g., in-app messaging, voice calls, push notification, SMS, email)?</p> <p>A: In app communication is a must, however OPT is open to other channels.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Communication Features); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf			Constraint/Flexibility: Mandates in-app comms for RFP-S3.7.8, allows vendor to propose others.
709	203	<p>Q: Page 25, section 3.8.3.c and 3.8.3.d: NYC DOE OPT states that applications will "Capture the actual time a student boards the bus, noting estimated time and tracking the difference." How should the system display, report or flag the differences? What actions should the system take (e.g. notify system users, log for reporting, etc.)? What is the expected behavior if the student does not board the bus?</p> <p>A: The NYCPSC requires to be informed of when the student boarded, exited the bus or didn't take the bus. OPT is open to solutions to address this requirement.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Ridership Logic/UI/Alerting)			Clarification/Flexibility: Confirms core data need (board/exit/absence status) for RFP-S3.8.3.c/d, allows vendor approach for handling derived info/alerts flags.
710	204	<p>Q: Page 26, section 3.9.7: NYC DOE OPT states that the application must have the "Ability to report issues or problems to and accept replies from OPT Administrative module" What type of "issues or problems" are expected? Is there a list of predefined categories or templates? What is the expected process for administrators to report issues (e.g. in app form, screenshots, etc.)?</p> <p>A: Users should have the ability to report a problem with student/ transportation data and software issues using the app. There are no predefined categories or reporting requirements. (ex. app not working, driver not able to log in, bus delayed, student not displaying in app, etc.)</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Clarification: Defines scope for school admin issue reporting (data & software issues); no predefined categories (RFP-S3.9.7).
711	205	<p>Q: Page 26, section 3.9.8: "Must have troubleshooting and self-help options (multi-language)". Language needs are referenced on page 42 (3.25.1b) under non-functional requirements. Is the same language support expected as defined in page 25, section 3.7.12?</p> <p>A: Yes</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Accessibility); Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf			Confirmation: Consistent language support expectation (9 DOE languages) for RFP-S3.9.8.
712	206	<p>Q: Page 27, section 3.10.19: "Display route association status (i.e., not active, route</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Model); Appendix M.2 -			Definition: Clarifies route status terminology for RFP-S3.10.19.

		activated)" What defines a "route activated" vs "not active" status? A: An Active route is in operation and should be indicated as such. An inactive route exists but is currently not in use.		Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			
713	207	Q: Page 28, section 3.10.40: "Search engine that provides statistical performance history data for driver associated route completion". What specific data is expected in statistical performance reports for driver associated routes? A: Statistical reports should include, but not be limited to: start/end times of routes, ridership, distance traveled, route traveled, driver subscription, vehicle association and vehicle operator. NYCP looks forward to receiving proposals with extensive reporting capabilities that will help us improve our overall operation.	Yes	Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Clarification/Expectation: Details required driver performance metrics for RFP-S3.10.40, sets expectation for comprehensive reporting.
714	208	Q: Page 28, section 3.10.43: "Must have the capability to override this functionality in the other modules" What does "override this functionality in the other modules" mean? Is this override limited to certain roles/permissions? A: Software capability should allow selected users within OPT to override systems functionality.	Yes	Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf (Permissions); Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Admin Features); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Clarification: Defines scope/intent of admin override capability (selected OPT users) for RFP-S3.10.43.
715	209	Q: Page 30, section 3.12.1.a.ii: "Must design the solution to be able to automatically assign an itinerary type for each trip" What specific criteria or rules should the system use to automatically assign itinerary types and is it configurable? A: Awarded vendor will receive itinerary type requirements.	No	N/A (Post-Award Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Details for itinerary type assignment rules (RFP-S3.12.1.a.ii) are post-award.
716	210	Q: Page 30, section 3.12.1.a.iv: "Must be capable of integrating existing Field Trip application or assign Field Trips based on current routes that are available." What is the existing field trip application and what API's or data formats are available for this integration? What specific "business rules" must be built into the Field Trip routing logic and how are these rules managed? A: Field trip application is a web based system in SQL. Currently schools can book trips based on available routes in the system.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration/Replacement Strategy); Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Constraint/Clarification: Identifies legacy field trip app (SQL based), implies no API impacting integration approach (RFP-S3.12.1.a.iv). Business rules not detailed.
717	211	Q: Page 30, section 3.12.1.a.viii: "Must have the ability for contracted vendors to view routes and suggest changes to headcounts and stop times" What is the expected process for contracted vendors to suggest changes? Who approves these changes? A: The Exec. Director of Transit and Borough Directors can approve suggested changes.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Workflow); Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf			Informational: Identifies specific roles (Exec Dir Transit, Borough Dirs) for vendor suggestion approval workflow (RFP-S3.12.1.a.viii).
718	212	Q: Page 30, section 3.12.1.a.x: "Must have the ability to adjust the routes...without deviating from OPT scheduling/sequencing". What does this mean in practice and how should the	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Routing Engine Goals); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non			Contextual Info: Defines primary objective (on-time arrival) for dynamic routing adjustments (RFP-S3.12.1.a.x). Implies

		system balance this with dynamic adjustments? A: The goal is for all routes to arrive to school on time.		Functional Requirements.pdf			schedule/sequence adherence is secondary if it causes lateness.
719	213	Q: Page 30, section 3.12.1.a.xi: "Must be able to configure notifications according to the routing workflow" What specific routing workflow events should trigger notifications (e.g., route changes, delays), and who should receive these (e.g. SBCs, schools)? A: All items noted here are correct.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Notification Service); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Confirmation: Reaffirms notification scope includes route changes, delays, targeting SBCs, schools, etc. for RFP-S3.12.1.a.xvi.
720	214	Q: Page 33, section 3.13.a.viii: "while ensuring OPT policies and regulations are built into the stop management solution." What specific OPT policies and regulations must be built into the solution for changing existing stop locations (e.g. distance between stops, approvals, safety considerations) and how should these be enforced? A: This is driven by Chancellor's regulations. NYCPS will prescribe our routing requirements and how they are to be performed.	No	N/A (Post-Award Info/External Ref)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Policy source (Chancellor's Regs), details TBD post-award for RFP-S3.13.a.viii.
721	215	Q: Page 33, section 3.13.a.x: "Must have the ability to send a notification to schools and parents/caregivers about new, changed, or deleted stops" What specific information should be included in the notification about the affected stops? (Address, dates, students)? What are the expected notification channels for schools (email, SMS, in-app)? A: Schools and parents should be notified of changes to a route via emails/parent app.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Notification Channels); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf			Clarification: Specifies channels (email/parent app) for stop change notifications (RFP-S3.13.a.x). Content details not specified.
722	216	Q: Page 34, section 3.13.b.xviii: "Must be able to flag stops for deactivation when it detects that the stop is not being used." What criteria defines a stop as "not being used" (student association, no riders within X days). Are there retention requirements for deactivated stops? A: Stops should be removed from a route if there no students assigned or the vendor reports that a stop is not being utilized.	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Stop Mgmt Logic)			Clarification: Defines triggers for stop deactivation (no students assigned OR vendor reports unused) for RFP-S3.13.b.xvii/xviii. Retention not addressed.
723	217	Q: Page 35, section 3.14.a.iii: "Must be capable of integrating session times from an existing Session Time Application". What is the "existing Session Time Application" referenced and what APIs, or data formats are available for integrating? What is the expected frequency of updates to the existing Session Time Application? A: Session time app is a SQL based application, there is no API. A system will need to be developed to import session times into the new routing system.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Constraint/Clarification: Reconfirms legacy Session Time app details (SQL, no API) and import requirement (RFP-S3.14.a.iii). Frequency not addressed.
724	218	Q: Page 35, section 3.15.a.xviii: "Must have the ability to restore a previous version of a route or use an archived version of a route in case of emergency." How should the system restore previous route versions (e.g. version history,	Yes	Appendix Q.1 - Business Continuity Plan And Operational Excellence.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System			Clarification: Confirms mechanism for route restore (RFP-S3.15.a.xviii) is standard backup/restore. Definition

		rollback options, date) and what qualifies as an emergency for restoration? A: Data should be backed up and restored if needed.	Yes	Architecture.pdf (Backup/Restore)			of 'emergency' not provided.
725	219	Q: Page 35, section 3.15.b.i: "Must be able to auto-create/auto-optimize routes in the most efficient manner based on configurable parameters" What specific "configurable parameters" should the system use (e.g. distance, time, capacity) and who defines or adjusts the defined parameters? A: Routing operations based on capacity, distance and time.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Routing Engine); Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Clarification: Specifies key optimization parameters (capacity, distance, time) for RFP-S3.15.b.i. Who adjusts TBD.
726	220	Q: Page 38, section 3.17.a.i: "External applications must be allowed to consume snapshots of routing information from a given date" What specific routing information must external applications consume and how should these external applications access these snapshots? A: The Service Now System and route changes in the system.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration - Outbound); Appendix Q.2 - Observability and Monitoring Strategy.pdf			Clarification/Constraint: Identifies specific consumers (ServiceNow) and data (route changes) for snapshot export (RFP-S3.17.a.i). Access method TBD.
727	221 & 222	Q221: Page 39, section 3.19.3: "Mountable in accordance with NYDMV School Bus Safety Regulations" What specific NYDMV School Bus Safety Regulations apply to mounting devices, and will these regulations be provided for compliance verification? Q222: Page 40, section 3.19.6 and 7: "installation within the guidelines of the vehicle manufacture, NYCPS specifications, and NYDMV Vehicle safety guidelines". What specific NYCPS specifications and NYDMV Vehicle Safety Guidelines apply to GPS installation and maintenance, and will these be provided for reference? A: Any aftermarket installation cannot obstruct the drivers line of site and must be in accordance with Department of Transportation.	Yes	Appendix P.3 - Audit Framework.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Clarification: Provides high-level guideline (driver line of sight, DOT regs) for mounting/install compliance (RFP-S3.19). Specific regs not provided here.
728	223	Q: Page 40, section 3.19.15: "If a device cannot transmit data - there must be a method by which the data can be downloaded" What specific data must be stored and downloadable if a device cannot transmit (e.g. GPS, student scans)? A: As a contingency, we expect the vendors to make the data available for download. No data should be lost.	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (Offline Mode); Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf			Confirmation/Constraint: Reaffirms expectation for offline data download with no data loss (RFP-S3.19.15). Specific data types not enumerated here but implied to be all critical operational data.
729	224	Q: Page 40, section 3.19.11: "To ensure consistent device functioning, the vendor must commit to replacing up to 20% of the devices annually on an as-needed basis." How should the vendor track and report device replacements to ensure compliance with the 20% requirement? A: Hardware replenishment is contract negotiable. For what is included in the contract, vendor should be tracking which devices were replaced, the reason for replacement, when it was initially deployed vs. replaced, etc.	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf (Contract/Reporting)			Clarification/Process: Defines tracking/reporting needs (reason, dates etc.) for device replacement (RFP-S3.19.11). Exact % negotiable in contract.
730	225	Q: . Page 40, section 3.20.1: "Scanning capability for reading student IDs based on	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and			Reiteration: Confirms lack of standard ID impacts

		<p>various mechanisms, such as Barcode, QR code, RFID, etc. delivered to the School Bus contracted vendors.” What specific ID formats (Barcode, QR, RFID) is currently in use by NYCPS students? Are student ID’s provided by NYCPS, or must the vendor supply them?</p> <p>A: NYCPS provides transportation to public, charter and non-public school. There is no central policy governing IDs and they are not mandatory. They are handled at the school level.</p>	Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf		vendor solution for RFP-S3.20.1. Vendor needs to propose ID mechanism/provision if required by their scanning solution.
731	226	<p>Q: Page 41, section 3.22.1: “full time project management on site is required throughout the transition and implementation completion.” Will full time onsite project management be required during initial planning phases or begin a specified start point? If the implementation team consists of two project managers (software routing PM and hardware/GPS system PM) will both be required onsite for the entire project duration or just during their respective project milestones?</p> <p>A: Yes, we expect Project Managers and technical team members to be available at OPT office during the project duration.</p>	Yes	Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf	Constraint: Confirms expectation for on-site availability of PMs/Tech team throughout project (RFP-S3.22.1). Doesn't explicitly address multiple PMs scenario.
732	227	<p>Q: Page 41, section 3.23.1: “Products, processes, methods and procedures are to be trained to a large population...school administrators, parents/caregivers and students.” What, if any, are the expectations for training the NYCPS external community (i.e. parents and students)?</p> <p>A: Initial training needs to be conducted by vendor along with change management documentation, to be followed by train-the-trainer model.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf	Reiteration: Confirms training approach (Vendor Initial + TTT) applies broadly, including external community (RFP-S3.23).
733	228	<p>Q: Page 41, section 3.23.2: “Training should be done in a way that there is a 99.99% participation rate...” Please outline expectations for the vendor’s role in ensuring participation. If the selected vendor assists in tracking attendance, will concerns with district employee attendance be managed and addressed and held accountable by the district?</p> <p>A: Vendors, schools and operational units will be responsible for ensuring all necessary participants attend training. Our expectation is that the vendor selected must be able to train all stakeholders which includes a large mass.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf; Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf	Clarification: Defines shared responsibility (Vendor, Schools, Ops) for training attendance/participation (RFP-S3.23.2). Vendor must be capable of training large numbers.
734	229	<p>Q: Page 42, section 3.25.2.a: “NYCPS’ technical team should be trained to perform enhancement, customization and configuration activities with no support or minimum support from the proposer.” What level of customization and configuration activities is expected for NYCPS’s technical team to perform independently?</p> <p>A: NYCPS’s technical team is expected to independently perform activities such as system enhancements, basic customizations, and configurations to adapt the solution to evolving operational needs, with minimal reliance on the proposer for support.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFR Adaptability)	Clarification: Defines level of expected NYCPS self-sufficiency (enhancements, basic customizations, configs) for RFP-S3.25.2.a.

735	230	<p>Q: Page 44, section 3.25.9.1: "Solution must be able to interoperate with messaging collaboration platform currently used by NYC agencies for all notifications/messages for targeted audience". What is the "messaging collaboration platform" currently used by NYC agencies and is there documentation available for this integration?</p> <p>A: Everbridge is used as a collaborative messaging platform.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration); Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf			Confirmation: Specifies messaging platform (Everbridge) for RFP-S3.25.9.1. Note Q175 also mentioned SendGrid. Assume Everbridge is primary.
736	231	<p>Q: Page 46, section 3.25.17.1: "The proposer must design the solution to be Interoperable with existing and future NYC systems." What specific NYCPs systems (beyond NYCPs, Student Profile, and School Finder) must the solution interoperate with, and will there be specs provided for each?</p> <p>A: Beyond NYCPs, Student Profile, and School Finder, the solution may need to interoperate with systems like transportation, attendance, and data management platforms. Specifications for each system will likely be provided during the project.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy); Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf			Clarification: Provides examples of systems needing interoperation (transport, attendance, data mgmt) for RFP-S3.25.17.1. Specs post-award.
737	232	<p>Q: Page 47, section 3.25.18.5: "The proposer must provide a system capability to wipe out all data from mobile devices as soon as it is discovered that device is missing or lost or retired from service". Who determines if a device is lost, stolen or retired? What documentation/communication requirements are there when wiping device?</p> <p>A: Requirement to remove service from device is determined by notification from NYC DOE OPT or is a normal function in broken unrepairable device replacement.</p>	Yes	Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix Q.1 - Business Continuity Plan And Operational Excellence.pdf			Process Clarification: Defines triggers for remote device wipe (OPT notification, broken device replacement) for RFP-S3.25.18.5. Comms TBD.
738	233	<p>Q: Page 47, section 3.25.18.6: "The proposer must provide a system capability to wipe out all data from mobile devices as soon as it is discovered that incorrect authorized username and/or password are used to access the solution for 10 times consecutively." What defines "10 consecutive incorrect login attempts" (e.g. same device, same user)? What documentation/communication requirements are there when wiping device?</p> <p>A: "10 consecutive incorrect login attempts" refers to failed login attempts by the same user on the same device. Documentation and communication requirements for wiping the device will be outlined by OPT in collaboration with the awarded vendor.</p>	Yes	Appendix P.1 - Security Strategy.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Clarification: Defines scope for automated wipe trigger (same user, same device) for RFP-S3.25.18.6. Comms TBD.
739	234	<p>Q: Page 48, section 3.25.22.1: "We will also evaluate the architecture and interoperability of existing systems to determine if they may be used in some capacity as part of our solution". What existing NYCPs systems should be evaluated for potential reuse, and will access or documentation be provided for this evaluation?</p> <p>A: Awarded vendor shall be provided with the access to existing NYCPs OPT systems for the evaluation.</p>	No	N/A (Post-Award Process)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Confirms post-award access for system evaluation (RFP-S3.25.22.1). Specific systems TBD.
740	235	<p>Q: Page 48, section 3.25.24.2: "to perform security testing of the solution with advance notice less or equal than 15 days. Every release</p>	No	N/A (Post-Award Process)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Process details for coordinating external security testing

		<p>of the software needs to go through security testing before deployment so that solution stays secured to protect Personally Identifiable Information managed by NYCPS". What is the process for coordinating security testing with these OTI, NYC3, DIIT and other related city agencies and what happens if issues are found post deployment?</p> <p>A: All relevant information would be provided to a successful bidder.</p>			(RFP-S3.25.24.2) are post-award.	
741	236	<p>Q: Page 49, section 3.25.26.1: "These documents must ensure alignment with NYCPS' operational standards, meet the industry's best practices, and support the timely resolution of customer issues while maintaining high service quality." What are the NYCPS' operational standards?</p> <p>A: All NYCPS OPT processes align with NYC Local Laws and Chancellor Regulations. More detailed SOPs will be provided to the selected vendor. https://www.schools.nyc.gov/about-us/policies/chancellors-regulations</p>	No	N/A (External Ref/Post-Award Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational Resource/Process: Points to source of operational standards (Laws, Regs) for RFP-S3.25.26.1. Detailed SOPs post-award. Link provided.
742	237	<p>Q: Page 49, section 3.25.26.2: "The data consumed and generated by the Vendor shall be available for NYCPS operations daily without any lag and in NYCPS Administrative Systems." What data specifically and in what format?</p> <p>A: The required data includes routing, ridership, and performance metrics, provided in a standardized digital format compatible with NYCPS Administrative Systems.</p>	Yes	Appendix S.3 - Data Engineering and Analytics Capabilities.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Data Model/Export)		Clarification: Specifies data categories (routing, ridership, performance metrics) needed by NYCPS in standard format (RFP-S3.25.26.2).
743	238	<p>Q: Page 49, section 3.25.26.3: "Data should flow in real-time or near- real-time (within 10 seconds of generation or update) in accordance with the operational requirements of NYCPS data integration." What are the operational requirements of NYCPS data integration?</p> <p>A: NYCPS data integration requires seamless real-time or near-real-time data flow, ensuring compatibility with existing systems and adherence to performance and security standards.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf (NFRs)		Clarification: High-level description of integration quality requirements (seamless, compatible, performant, secure) for RFP-S3.25.26.3.
744	239	<p>Q: Page 51, section 3.25.32.1: "All components of the solution (including internal and external interfaces) must be testable by independent testing teams in testing environments". Will NYCPS provided systems and integrations be included in this non-production testing requirement for testing purposes?</p> <p>A: Yes</p>	Yes	Appendix R - Testing Strategy.pdf; Appendix N.2.2 - DevOps Technical Implementation.pdf (Environments)		Confirmation: Non-prod testing scope (RFP-S3.25.32.1) includes integrated NYCPS systems.
745	240	<p>Q: Page 51, section 3.25.32.2.: "The proposer needs to submit complete documentation (including but not limited to testing plans and results) to show that a thorough testing process has been followed during execution of the contract" How frequently must testing documentation be submitted (e.g. per release, quarterly, annually) and what is the process for NYCPS to review/approve?</p> <p>A: The documentation shall be produced and submitted per release. The process for approval is meeting the benchmarks, in agreement with business</p>	Yes	Appendix R - Testing Strategy.pdf; Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf (Deliverables/Process); Appendix N.1.2 - SDLC Technical Specifications.pdf; Appendix X.2 - Communications and Status Reporting Strategy.pdf		Clarification/Process: Defines timing (per release) and approval criteria (meeting benchmarks, stakeholder agreement, supporting docs) for test documentation (RFP-S3.25.32.2).

		stakeholders (e.g., Penetration testing, unit testing, integration testing, regression testing, load and performance testing, and any other relevant testing) along with release notes, and production validation documents.					
746	241	<p>Q: Page 52, section 3.26.2: Location and On-Site Requirements, "when onsite presence is required it will take place at the following locations (or where needed)." When training the large population of drivers and attendants, does the district utilize specified training locations? If so, approximately how many trainings locations would drivers be distributed amongst?</p> <p>A: The district does not utilize specific training locations, the location of the trainings for bus companies in particular will be determined by the bus company themselves. Some companies have classrooms for trainings on site while others may rent out specific locations for training purposes.</p>	Yes	Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf			Contextual Info: Clarifies training locations determined by SBCs, impacting delivery logistics (RFP-S3.23).
747	242	<p>Q: Which company currently holds the contract for this project?</p> <p>A: VIA TRANSPORTATION, INC.</p>	No	N/A (Context Only)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Contextual Info: Identifies incumbent vendor.
748	243 & 276	<p>Q: (Paraphrased Summary of multiple questions asking about budget) What is the allocated budget for this project? / What is the anticipated budget...?</p> <p>A: NYCPS does not provide this information for competitive procurements.</p>	No	N/A (Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Budget figure unavailable. Vendor must price based on scope.
749	244	<p>Q: Could you provide the attendee list from the pre-bid meeting?</p> <p>A: Yes. Pre proposal conference attendee list containing contact information of vendors that filled out the attendance survey during the pre proposal conference is available for download via the Vendor Portal.</p>	No	N/A (Resource Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational Resource: Confirms pre-bid attendee list available.
750	247	<p>Q: What are the specifications for the student IDs (e.g., RFID, barcode)?</p> <p>A: We are looking for the vendor to provide a solution.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Reiteration: Vendor proposes student ID tech spec (RFP-S3.20.1).
751	249	<p>Q: Will all contractors be required to use the solution that is selected during this rfp? Or will this become an option for several GPS solutions that contractors can choose from?</p> <p>A: All school bus contractors are obligated to use the proposed solution.</p>	Yes	Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix T.2 - User Transition and Solution Cutover Plan.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf			Constraint: Mandatory adoption of selected solution by all contractors.
752	250	<p>Q: Will the winner of this RFP replace existing GPS solutions or will this only be an option for new buses?</p> <p>A: As stated in the RFP, the awardee has an option of using the existing infrastructure or present their own solution.</p>	Yes	Appendix O.1.1 - Project Execution Roadmap.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Clarification: Confirms replacement of existing *software* solutions is scope, hardware reuse/replacement is vendor option.

753	251	<p>Q: Are AI enabled cameras desired as part of this rfp? Is it desirable to have a plug-and-play camera solution in the future?</p> <p>A: We are not looking for AI cameras at this point in time.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Scope Clarification: Excludes AI cameras for now. Plug-and-play future not addressed.
754	252	<p>Q: Can the NYCDOE post a link in an addendum for vendor access to the recording of the Pre-Proposal Conference of Thursday, March 13, 2025?</p> <p>A: The DOE did not record the pre proposal conference.</p>	No	N/A (Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Pre-proposal meeting recording unavailable.
755	253	<p>Q: On Page 16-17 In SECTION. 2 MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS, subsection 2.4, the RFP states: "Proposer(s) must have and provide evidence of at least a minimum of five million dollars (\$5 MM) in annual revenue. Examples of financial statements that may be included but are not limited to: balance sheets, income statements and statements of earnings." Proposer considers such statements to be extremely sensitive, and would like them to be held in the strictest confidence. Therefore, would the NYCDOE allow for an alternative delivery method for financial statements separate from the main body of the response, such as in a separate e-mail attachment to DCPSSubmissions@schools.nyc.gov?</p> <p>A: There are no alternative delivery methods for submitting required proposal documents.</p>	No	N/A (Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Constraint: Confirms adherence to standard proposal submission process required for financials (RFP-S2.4).
756	254	<p>Q: For the following expenses, does DOE pay the provider directly or do we add these costs to the RFP cost? Cellular services (Verizon, AT&T etc) Hosting (ie AWS) Equipment like Tablets & phones (ie Apple) Other similar 3rd party service costs</p> <p>A: These should be part of your bid pricing based on your solution.</p>	Yes	Appendix Y.1 - Budget Management.pdf; Appendix Y.2 - FinOps Strategy.pdf (if applicable)			Constraint: Requires all operational costs (cellular, hosting, equipment, 3rd party) included in bid price.
757	255 & 256	<p>Q255: Please explain reference 1 to Uber in 3.27 - "Define communication protocols to ensure timely and transparent updates to Uber in the event of an incident"</p> <p>Q256: Please explain reference 2 to Uber in 3.27 - "Change Management: Define processes for maintaining and updating the Business Continuity Plan in the event of changes in business operations, technological advancements, or contract amendments. The plan must be kept current and aligned with any changes in Uber's operational needs or the vendor's service delivery model"</p> <p>A: Please read Uber as OPT.</p>	No	N/A (RFP Document Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Correction: Clarifies "Uber" typo in RFP Section 3.27 should be "OPT".

758	257	<p>Q: Section 4.3.3 Cannot find the table referenced here - Proposers must provide a separate program plan for each component proposed. The supplied proposal form (Appendix E1) includes a table that you must use to indicate the components you are proposing.</p> <p>A: The table in Appendix E1 relates to Minimum Qualifications. The Program Plan (Appendix E2) is where you should indicate components you are proposing.</p>	No	N/A (Proposal Structure Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Clarification: Explains structure/purpose of Appendices E1 (Min Quals table) vs E2 (Program Plan indicating components) for RFP-S4.3.3.
759	258	<p>Q: Section 4.5.1.4.1 Reads - Ten percent (10%) of the "total technical points" earned in the evaluation of the proposal. The evaluation criteria scoring table does not define specifically "total technical points". Can you explain how it will be calculated?</p> <p>A: Technical points refers to the points from all evaluation criteria, excluding price (program plan, demonstrated effectiveness, and organizational capacity).</p>	No	N/A (Evaluation Criteria Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Clarifies scoring definition for MWBE preference (RFP-S5.1.4.1 error, likely means S1.3 ref?).
760	259	<p>Q: Section 4.2.4 Can we request references from DOE personnel on existing on-going projects?</p> <p>A: No.</p>	No	N/A (Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Constraint on obtaining references from DOE personnel.
761	260	<p>Q: How should we offer optional modules and how will it affect the total estimated price for evaluation? For example - Camera equipment</p> <p>A: You can add pricing for your solution on the pricing sheet.</p>	No	N/A (Proposal Pricing Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Clarifies how to handle optional pricing (use pricing sheet Appendix F). Impact on evaluation unclear.
762	261	<p>Q: We assume that bus vendor is responsible for equipment loss, stolen, broken or misused</p> <p>A: Hardware replenishment is contract negotiable.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf (Contract Terms); Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf			Informational/Contractual: Clarifies liability aspect for hardware loss/damage is contract negotiable.
763	262	<p>Q: For student on-boarding Is RFID required or is NFC an option, in addition to barcode or QR code? Do you have existing RFID student cards or this is a future plan?</p> <p>A: No RFID cards currently in use because it was prohibitively expensive. It is not required in addition to a bar code or QR code. We are open to solutions.</p>	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Reiteration/Flexibility: Confirms options for ID tech (NFC OK), no existing RFID (RFP-S3.20.1).
764	263	<p>Q: Do you require voice communication between OPT staff and drivers?</p> <p>A: No</p>	Yes	Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf			Scope Reduction: Explicitly excludes voice comms feature, overriding Q182.
765	264	<p>Q: Can we get existing equipment inventory</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System			Contextual Data: Provides scale figures (~10k

		A: Please see Q#1 for existing Equipment Inventory in use. Scope of what equipment inventory is required is approximately 10,000 vehicles, 13,000 active Drivers, for 9,000 + routes, for 400 dispatchers.	Architecture.pdf; Appendix T.1 - User Onboarding and Training Strategy.pdf; Appendix Y.1 - Budget Management.pdf		vehicles, ~13k drivers, ~9k routes, ~400 dispatchers). Refers to Q1 for existing equip. Note Driver count differs from Q126/Q41 (~9k vs 13k) - use higher for planning?	
766	265	Q: Can you explain on-bus vs off-bus equipment? Does it mean every bus will have 2 devices? A: NYCPs is open to any solution type - whether it be a permanent on the bus solution or a mobile solution. In addition, the devices listed in Question 1 are available for integration. Vendors are encouraged to be creative in providing a solution that satisfies the needs listed in this RFP.	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf	Reiteration: Flexibility Point on hardware deployment model (RFP-S3.19). Does not imply two devices needed per bus.	
767	266	Q: Who owns the tablets ? Can DOE Buy the tablets from Apple directly? (saves sales tax) A: NYC DOE OPT owns all hardware products recommended as part of this GPS implementation. The awardee is expected to provide the proposed solution and all associated software and hardware.	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix Y.1 - Budget Management.pdf	Constraint/Clarification: Vendor procures hardware, OPT owns it. DOE cannot buy directly.	
768	268	Q: What's the schedule of payments throughout the project lifecycle? Software and customization Hardware , installation etc Other A: Payments will be rendered as work is completed, on a net 30 basis.	Yes	Appendix Y.1 - Budget Management.pdf	Informational/Contractual: Payment schedule (Net 30 on work completion).	
769	269	Q: Which integrations are required? DOE internals External A: NYCPs internal and external systems require integration.	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf (Integration Strategy)	Reiteration: Confirms broad integration need (internal & external). See specific systems named elsewhere (Q158, Q170 etc.)	
770	270	Q: Can you explain your High,Medium and None notes next to each software requirement? A: High Priority: These requirements are critical functionalities for the business operations. These have including but not limited to direct impact on critical processes, admin/user workflows that compose MVP. Medium Priority: These requirements enhance system functionalities and user experience, however not critical for business operations. These requirements can be including but not limited to provide additional functionality that improves user workflow, improve operational efficiency of existing processes, deferred until after high priority items are addressed, and etc. Low Priority: These requirements are desirable features that provide incremental value but not critical to core functionalities. These requirements including but not limited to have limited immediate business impact, offer potential future enhancements, and are "nice to have" functionalities.	No	N/A (RFP Interpretation Key)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Definition: Key to understanding RFP requirement priorities (High=MVP/Critical, Med=Enhancement, Low=Nice-to-have). Should inform prioritization.

771	271	<p>Q: How does Appendix F, G correlate (Explain G please)</p> <p>A: Appendix G itemizes the costs associated with delivering the services. The costs on Appendix G are allocated to the respective services/deliverables to derive the line-item unit prices on Appendix F. The annual contract amount for each year on Appendix G must be the same as Appendix F.</p>	No	N/A (Proposal Pricing Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Explains relationship between pricing appendices (G details costs for F prices).
772	273	<p>Q: NYC Minimum qualification 2.3 If a company has an extensive proven record of providing on-site service to NYC entities and contacts, and their HQ office address is within a couple of miles of NYC - does that satisfy this minimum requirement? If not, is it acceptable to have a commitment to establish a local office upon award?</p> <p>A: OPT would need to evaluate response times, and the vendor would need to clarify what qualifies as "a couple of miles outside NYC." Yes, a commitment to establish a local office would be acceptable, but the details can be discussed after the award. It would likely have to be established quickly, or the vendor could subcontract to a partner within NYC.</p>	Yes	Appendix X.1 - Team Structure and Processes.pdf; Appendix U.1 - Vendor and Third Party Management.pdf			Clarification: Provides options/nuance for fulfilling local presence requirement S2.3 (Nearby HQ maybe OK if response times met, commitment OK but needs quick action/partnering).
773	275	<p>Q: Section 7.3 PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE Questions received within seventy-two (72) hours of the scheduled pre-proposal conference shall be answered in the published Questions & Answers (Q&A) document. Does this mean 72 hours prior to the pre-proposal conference, or that questions may be submitted up to 72 hours following the pre-proposal conference?</p> <p>A: Questions submitted immediately following release of the solicitation may be answered during the pre proposal conference. Questions submitted within 72 hours of the conference will only be answered via the published Q&A document.</p>	No	N/A (RFP Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: RFP Q&A process timing detail relative to conference.
774	277	<p>Q: Pre Proposal Conference Is the vision that this is a mobile app?</p> <p>A: Driver/ Caregiver/Student apps are mobile first with the availability of a desktop version.</p>	Yes	Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf; Appendix M.2 - Solution Design Functional and Non Functional Requirements.pdf			Clarification: Confirms platform strategy for key user apps (mobile-first + desktop).
775	278	<p>Q: Pre Proposal Conference Is it possible to have an opportunity for the general contractors to meet with the subcontractors?</p> <p>A: The DOE does not facilitate such meetings. Refer to the attendee list from the pre proposal conference for possible partnerships/subcontracting opportunities.</p>	No	N/A (Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: DOE doesn't facilitate partnering meetings.
776	279	<p>Q: Pre Proposal Conference Do signed subcontractor agreements need to be submitted with the proposals for any subs included in the prime's proposal?</p>	No	N/A (Proposal Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)		Informational: Clarifies proposal submission detail (signed sub agreements

		A: Signed subcontractor agreements are not required by the Office of Supplier Diversity (OSD) for the MWBE subcontractors identified on the Schedule B form at the time of the proposal submission. However, proposers should carefully review the RFP document for any general requirements related to subcontractors documented in the solicitation.				not needed for MWBEs at submission).
777	280	Q: Pre Proposal Conference Is there a current vendor providing these services? A: Yes.	No	N/A (Context Only)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Confirmation: Reiteration of Q242 context (Incumbent exists).
778	281	Q: Pre Proposal Conference If my memory serves, there is reference to "innovation" (proposers encouraged to provide innovative solutions). Is there a place in the primary evaluation criteria where a proposer would receive credit or acknowledgement for truly innovative aspects of the solution? A: All RFPs will be evaluated based on the criteria outlined in the solicitation. NYCPS seeks the most up to date, cost effective and efficient solution to the RFP.	No	N/A (Evaluation Criteria Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Reiteration: Confirms evaluation approach for innovation (within standard criteria).
779	282	Q: Pre Proposal Conference Will we get a copy of the attendee list for today's/this pre-bid meeting? A: Yes. The list of attendees is available for download.	No	N/A (Resource Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Reiteration: Confirms resource availability (attendee list).
780	283 & 284	Q283: Pre Proposal Conference Is this the correct form for MWBE subcontracting? [link omitted] Q284: Pre Proposal Conference Will the DOE circulate a list of MWBE Companies that are interested in subcontracting for this RFP? A: Yes, the DOE facilitates MWBE subcontracting opportunities... [describes webpage] ... For more information please refer to https://infohub.nyced.org/in-our-schools/working-with-the-doe/contracts-and-purchasing/open-doe-solicitations/notice-of-mwbe-subcontracting-opportunity ... Also, refer to Article I (page 79) of the solicitation document for additional information.	No	N/A (External Resource)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational Resource: Points to MWBE resources/webpage.
781	285	Q: Pre Proposal Conference Please confirm whether or not the current telematics devices that are in place are in scope for this RFP or must be integrated with as part of this RFP? A: NYCPS is open to any solution type - whether it be a permanent on the bus solution or a mobile solution. In addition, the devices listed in Question 1 are available for integration. Vendors are encouraged to be creative in providing a solution that satisfies the needs listed in this RFP.	Yes	Appendix U.2 - Hardware Lifecycle and Logistics Management.pdf; Appendix M.1 - System Architecture.pdf		Reiteration: Flexibility Point on hardware/integration. Telematics device (GeoTab) integration is optional.
782	286	Q: Pre Proposal Conference At the beginning the district asked to be informed of anything that could be considered anti-competitive.... with all of the major transportation RFPs on the	No	N/A (RFP Process Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Reiteration: Status of deadline request.

		<p>street right now, some vendors might chose to not bid NYC's and chose to bid others, or they might not put in their most competitive bid, because of the lack of time to be able to respond. We would like to request a 30 day extension to the submission deadline of April 3rd.</p> <p>A: NYCPSC will consider adjusting the due date of this proposal. Please continue to look for amendments to this RFP in the event the deadline is changed.</p>				
783	287, 288, 289	<p>Q287: Pre Proposal Conference Do I understand correctly that the MWBE 30% is a requirement and not a goal. If not able to meet this requirement, we must submit a waiver, correct?</p> <p>Q288: Pre Proposal Conference If an organization isn't M/WBE certified and you fill out a waiver and are approved, can your organization still submit a proposal?</p> <p>Q289: Pre Proposal Conference Just to confirm - to meet the M/WBE requirements - we would need to subcontract with a Black American Owned Firm (10%) a Hispanic owned firm (10%) and then one other undefined M/WBE</p> <p>A: Yes, the 30% MWBE subcontracting goal is a requirement... must agree to meet the 30% subcontracting goal unless they receive an approved waiver... Yes, an organization that is not MWBE certified can still submit a proposal if they request and receive a waiver... The 30% MWBE Participation Goal is divided into three subcategories: • 10% for Black American-Owned Firms • 10% for Hispanic American-Owned Firms • 10% for Unspecified... If a prime vendor is a New York City-certified MWBE, they may self-fulfill up to 10%... responsible for subcontracting the remaining 20%... Only NYC/NYS certified MWBE firms count...</p>	No	N/A (Compliance Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational/Compliance: Detailed explanation of MWBE requirement (30% mandatory unless waived), waiver process, subcategories, self-fulfillment rule.
784	290	<p>Q: Pre Proposal Conference If signed up on the attendee list, will NYCDOE distribute this slide presentation to all?</p> <p>A: Yes, the slide presentation is available for download via the Vendor Portal.</p>	No	N/A (Resource Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Informational Resource: Confirms presentation slides available.
785	291	<p>Q: Pre Proposal Conference Can NYCDOE outline what equipment is currently installed for GPS, tablets, and student ridership equipment.</p> <p>A: See response to Q#1.</p>	No	N/A (Reference)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Reference: Points back to Q1 answer for current equipment.
786	293	<p>Q: Our company is considering a response to RFP # R1804 (Transportation Management System). In our review process we noticed that a number of the appendices (one of which requires response/signature) reference a different RFP# (RFP# R1465 "Automated Substitute Teacher and Paraprofessional Placement System"). This other RFP is referenced in at least the following appendices: •Appendix E1 (headers</p>	No	N/A (RFP Document Info)	Identified Gap (Informational)	Correction: Confirms RFP appendix corrections (E1, J updated; L OK).

starting on page 6) •Appendix J (cover page and headers) •Appendix L (cover page and headers)

A: Appendices E1 and J have been updated and are available for download via the Vendor Portal. There are no changes required for Appendix L.