



Solicitation Addendum

Solicitation Number:	RFQ-41-DIT-1189645431
Solicitation Description:	CGIA Ortholmagery
Solicitation Opening Date: Time:	10/03/2024 2:00PM EST.
Addendum Number:	2
Addendum Date:	09/18/2024
Contract Specialist or Purchasing Agent:	Belinda Edwards belinda.edwards@nc.gov (919) 754-6647

1. Return one properly executed copy of this addendum with bid response or prior to the Bid Opening Date/Time listed above.
2. Please see questions below received about the solicitation and the State's response to those questions.
3. The following are changes to the originally posted RFP Lite where the name was changed to Request for Qualification.
4. The bid submission date has changed from 09/26/2024 at 2:00pm to **10/03/2024 at 2:00pm**, (MS Teams Link provided below for the virtual meeting.)

No.	Section	Vendor Question	State's response
1.	2.5 (Evaluation Criteria for Qualification)	Item 2 states (How will the Vendor address the project scope Sections 5.1-5.4) - where is Sections 5.1-5.4?	<p>RFQ-41-DIT-1189645431-Addendum1.pdf was posted in eVP to acknowledge the Correct Bid Document published in Ariba Sourcing Tool. Please review this RFQ in its entirety before submitting the bid solicitation document.</p> <p>Item 2 should have read: " How well the Vendor's qualifications conforms with the solicitation specifications in Section 3.4 of the RFQ."</p>

2.	3.5 (Security Specifications)	3.5.1: which "solutions" are expected in this contract, that would need to be hosted? Our understand that all products and deliverables of this request will be submitted to CGIA, and vendor is not being requested to host any of the deliverable. Does vendor need to respond to this request with a VRAR, even when no data is being hosted?	No, the vendor is not expected to host any solutions and the VRAR is not required. Section will be removed and reserved in this Addendum.
3.	3.6 (Enterprise Architecture Specifications)	This request does not seem to be applicable to the required products of this solicitation. It is our understanding that a 'solution' or a software solution are not part of the deliverables, do we need to respond to this request?	No, this project does not involve a solution or application. This Section 3.6 has been removed and reserved. No response required.

The remainder of this space left blank intentionally

Questions and Answers (Continued from above)

No.	Section	Vendor Question	State's response
4.	Addendum	The addendum refers to a RFQ file name that does not match the one found in ARIBA - Please confirm the correct RFQ document file name to use in our response.	RFQ-41-DIT-1189645431-Addendum 1.pdf was posted in eVP to acknowledge the Correct Bid Document published in Ariba Sourcing Tool. Please review this RFQ in its entirety before submitting the bid solicitation document.
5.	RFP Document , Page 7 (Submission Format and Content)	On page 7 of the RFP under "Submission Format and Content", it notes that proposals are limited to 15 pages total exclusive of the cover sheet. In the table below that, the RFP notes each section's various page limitations including 15 pages allotted for the Evaluation Criteria section alone. Can the State clarify which page limitations we are to stick to?	RFQ-41-DIT-1189645431-Addendum 1.pdf was posted in eVP to acknowledge the Correct Bid Document published in Ariba Sourcing Tool. Please review this RFQ in its entirety before submitting the bid solicitation document. The submission format and content section was incorrectly removed from the RFQ solicitation document. Format and content should follow the table and section in This Addendum.
6.	RFP Document , Page 4 (Anticipated Qualification Schedule)	On page 4 of the RFP there is a Microsoft Team's Meeting link included, but no additional details on when the meeting will be held or what it's for. Is this for the Pre-Proposal Meeting? If so, what date and time will this be held?	RFQ-41-DIT-1189645431-Addendum 1.pdf was posted in eVP to acknowledge the Correct Bid Document published in Ariba Sourcing Tool. Please review this RFQ in its entirety before submitting the bid solicitation document.
7.	RFP Document , Page 7 (Requirements Table)	Under Section 7 of the Proposal Requirements table on page 7, it notes to include Attachments Numbers 1, 2 and 3 under that section. Attachments 1, 2 and 3 are not provided in the RFP. Can the State provide those Attachments or clarify that they are to be omitted from our submission?	RFQ-41-DIT-1189645431-Addendum 1.pdf was posted in eVP to acknowledge the Correct Bid Document published in Ariba Sourcing Tool. Please review this RFQ in its entirety before submitting the bid solicitation document. This Addendum clarifies requirements for submission.

Questions and Answers (Continued from above)

No.	Section	Vendor Question	State's response
10.	General Question	<p>Does this mean that a complete copy of RFQ (all 33 pages) must be posted with the Vendor submittal. In this regard, are sections such as the following examples to be completed and provided within this submitted RFQ, or rather as separately prepared, indexed and named response documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.13 POINTS OF CONTACT pages 9 & 10 (yellow highlighted parts of the table) • 3.2 VENDOR UTILIZATION OF WORKERS OUTSIDE OF U.S. page 11, Check Box (yellow highlighted): Will work...outside the United States? • 5.0 HISTORICALLY UNDERUTILIZED BUSINESSES, page 21, , Check Box (yellow highlighted): Is Vendor... Underutilized Business? 	<p>Please review this RFQ in its entirety before submitting the complete bid solicitation document.</p>

Questions and Answers (Continued from above)

No.	Section	Vendor Question	State's response
11.	General Question	<p>a. Sections that require "technical description and associated discussion" by outline such as:</p> <p>Section 3.4 REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SPECIFIC TO THIS SOLICITATION, pages (12-18) as well as responses to the RFQ:</p> <p>3.5 SECURITY SPECIFICATIONS, and</p> <p>3.6 ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE SPECIFICATIONS, etc.</p> <p>Should these Vendor responses be included as extended added text within the Vendor supplied copy of the RFQ, or should these Section (and any/all others that require description and discussion) be provided as separate submitted document(s) that have been indexed and named according to the RFQ numbered outline sections?</p> <p>b. Should each Vendor technical discussion response (see examples above) be preceded by the entire RFQ Section Number and request language (re-typed) or will the Section number alone from the RFQ outline be sufficient to define/designate the Vendor text, charts, Table, etc. responses?</p>	<p>Section 3.4 response should be included in vendor proposal following the Submission Format and Content Section that has been added in this Addendum.</p> <p>Sections 3.5 and 3.6 are unnecessary as this is not an application or software and has been removed and reserved per this Addendum.</p> <p>The submission format and content section was incorrectly removed from the RFQ solicitation document. Format and content should follow the table and section in This Addendum.</p>

Questions and Answers (Continued from above)

No.	Section	Vendor Question	State's response
		<p>c. Is there a page limit to the overall submittal and minimum font size, particularly for lengthy detailed response Sections such as 3.4 (RFQ pages 13 through 18), 3.5 and 3.6 referenced above?</p> <p>d. Should a cover letter with short summary be included with the Vendor's Submittal and then the response continue into the indexed RFQ Sections?</p>	<p>The submission format and content section was incorrectly removed from the RFQ solicitation document. Format and content should follow the table and section in This Addendum.</p>
12.	General Question	<p>All Prior year RFQs for this NC Ortho program as well as the "original" posted Request for this years' submittal (document: "RFP-41-DIT-1189645431-CGIA OrthoImagery.pdf") have included a very specific numbered outline and format for Vendors to submit their Qualification documents, exhibits, proof of licensure, resumes, project organization charts, Sub-Contractor qualifications with letters of Commitment, etc. for each year of submittal for the NC Ortho Program. This historical outline for Vendor Statement of Qualifications is included in document "RFP-41-DIT-1189645431-CGIA OrthoImagery.pdf" as section entitled: Submission Format and Content, pages 7 through top of page 9. However, this detailed submittal of Vendor Qualifications relative directly to the tasks and deliverables of the NC Ortho Program is not included within the subsequent posted "RFQ-41-DIT-1189645431-Request for Qualification of Orthoimagery Services FINAL.pdf" document. We recognize that the posted Addendum 1.pdf replaces the original posted RFP...solicitation document with the subsequent posted RFQ...solicitation document.</p>	<p>The submission format and content section was incorrectly removed from the RFQ solicitation document. Format and content should follow the table and section in This Addendum.</p>

Questions and Answers (Continued from above)

No.	Section	Vendor Question	State's response
		<p>“Is this historical detailed submittal of the Vendors “Qualifications” referenced above (RFP...pages 7 through top of page 9) not to be included as a required element of this years’ submittal? If not “required”, then are we permitted to attach these historical program Qualification documents (indexed and organized per the outline) as an APPENDIX or separate ATTACHMENT in order to provide the Vendor Qualifications that are most specific and applicable to this Program’s primary purpose of photogrammetric compilation and delivery of 4-band digital orthoimagery from new Vendor acquired aerial photography (as summarized in RFQ section: 1.0 INTENT, USE, DURATION AND SCOPE, top of page 4 of the RFQ).?”</p>	
13.	<p>Section 3.5 (Security Specifications), Section 3.5.1 Solutions Not Hosted on State Infrastructure, Page 18</p>	<p>: Section 3.5 SECURITY SPECIFICATIONS, 3.5.1 SOLUTIONS NOT HOSTED ON STATE INFRASTRUCTURE, page 18.</p> <p>First paragraph, first sentence: “The 911 Board Statewide Orthoimagery Program will be required to receive and securely manage data that is classified as Low Risk, Statewide Critical.” (note: the bold italicized term Low Risk is not bold italicized in the RFQ, but is bold italicized herein for emphasis).</p> <p>Next, paragraph from RFQ Section 3.5, bottom page 18 and top of page 19: “To comply with the State’s Security Standards and Policies, State agencies are required to perform annual security/risk assessments on their information systems using NIST 800-53 controls.</p> <p>This requirement additionally applies to all Vendor-provided, agencymanaged Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS), Platform as a</p>	<p>No, the vendor is not expected to host any solutions and the VRAR is not required. Section has been removed per This Addendum.</p> <p>No, this project does not involve a solution or application. Section 3.6 has been removed and reserved per This Addendum. No response required.</p>

Service (PaaS), and Software as a Service (SaaS) solutions which will handle data classified as Medium Risk (Restricted) or High Risk (Highly Restricted) data. (note: the bold italicized terms Medium Risk (Restricted) or High Risk (Highly Restricted) are not bold italicized in the RFQ, but are bold italicized herein for emphasis).

- (a) Vendors shall provide a completed Vendor Readiness Assessment Report Non-State Hosted Solutions ("VRAR") at offer submission. This report is located at the following website:

<https://it.nc.gov/documents/vendor-readiness-assessment-report>

"In consideration that the orthoimagery data and associated reports of the NC Ortho program are classified as Low Risk , and the referenced Section 3.5 VRAR report is stated as directly applicable only to Medium Risk (Restricted) or High Risk (Highly Restricted) data, then is it necessary or appropriate to require Photogrammetric Vendors to submit this data systems VRAR in-depth Report for this State classified application of Low-Risk orthoimagery data submission?"

Further, as stated, the VRAR Report is applicable to the State's or a Vendor's data systems where the Vendor is providing one of a combination of: "managed Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS), Platform as a Service (PaaS), and Software as a Service (SaaS) solutions".

Again, is this VRAR Report applicable or appropriate to the photogrammetry Vendor's role within the NC Ortho Program; in that, the photogrammetry Vendor is acquiring aerial imagery and processing (to ortho), then delivering that final orthoimagery data to the State. All such Low

Risk data is stored temporarily “strictly in-house” by the Vendor solely to complete the ortho processing tasks. Then the final approved Low Risk fully Quality Controlled data is delivered to the State as a final product to be stored and managed by the State agency. It does not appear from this workflow of orthoimagery processing that the photogrammetric Vendor performs tasks or is directly responsible for a “managed Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS), Platform as a Service (PaaS), and Software as a Service (SaaS) solution”.

These “system” platform and functions are pertinent at a much later date (well after total completion and State approval of the Vendor’s orthoimagery data development contract) when the State Agency posts and supports the Low Risk orthoimagery data onto the Public-display NcOneMap platform.

“Once again, in consideration of this Low Risk data development orthoimagery processing (strictly with Vendor non-public display, nonpublic access in-house systems), then is it necessary or appropriate to require Photogrammetric Vendors to submit this data systems VRAR in-depth Report for this Low-Risk application?”

Note: The NC Ortho orthoimagery workflow does involve one public display Program; being, the IN-SITE VOICE platform for orthoimagery Quality Control; however, this platform for interim display of the Low Risk orthoimagery data is managed and supported by the State under a contract with a completely separate Vendor, with no relationship to the photogrammetry Vendors responding to this RFQ, other than photogrammetry Vendors supplying the Low Risk orthoimagery data to the IN-SITE VOICE Vendor’s platform. One

		<p>other posting of Low Risk orthoimagery data does occur within the overall QC workflow; being task 3.8 wherein the photogrammetry Vendors provide a temporary strictly within-project, non-public Open Geospatial Consortium Web Map (OGC WMS version 1.3 specification) that has preliminary orthoimagery Study Area-wide (again Low 4 Risk orthoimagery) for the internal use of State and Vendor staff to assess radiometry match among Vendor individual Study Areas. This entire application and all of the data is terminated after the State's review and comments, which usually lasts only 2 to 3 weeks. Within the past 12 years of the program, to our knowledge, there has been no need for network connection between the photogrammetry Vendor's internal computer systems and those of the State, nor has there been any requirement for the photogrammetry Vendors to develop, manage or support any public-access, public-available data display platform or system in behalf of, or representing any State agency.</p>	
<p>14.</p>	<p>Section 2.15 (Evaluation Criteria for Qualification)- Item 2, Page 10</p>	<p>Absolute and relative comparison of the Vendor's specialized or appropriate expertise in the type of project.</p> <p>How will the Vendor address the project scope Sections 5.1-5.4?"</p> <p>This likely refers to "Section 5. SCOPE OF WORK" from the "historical" prior year NC Ortho Program RFQ.</p> <p>Within this years' RFQ (RFQ-41-DIT-1189645431- Request for Qualification of Orthoimagery Services FINAL.pdf" document) is the intent that Section 3.4 REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SPECIFIC TO THIS SOLICITATION, pages 12 through 18, be the Vendor's replacement section for the prior Scope of Work (Sections 5.1-5.4) technical discussion?</p>	<p>The evaluation criteria have been corrected in This Addendum.</p>

Questions and Answers (Continued from above)

No.	Section	Vendor Question	State's response
15.	General Question	<p>The retracted RFP document originally issued by DIT-CGIA, "RFP-41-DIT-1189645431-CGIA Ortholmagery.pdf", included a concise outline for Vendor proposal structure, which was the same structure as past DIT-CGIA RFQ's. In the reissued DIT-CGIA RFQ, "RFQ-41-DIT-1189645431- Request for Qualification of Ortholmagery Services FINAL.pdf", this concise outline has been omitted.</p> <p>"Does DIT expect consistent proposal structure from all responding Vendors?"</p> <p>"If yes, can DIT clarify or provide proposal structure guidelines?"</p> <p>"If no, as a responding Vendor, do we use our own discretion for how we structure or organize our qualifications proposal?"</p>	<p>The submission format and content section was incorrectly removed from the RFQ solicitation document. Format and content should follow the table and section in This Addendum.</p>
16.	Anticipated Qualification Schedule, Pages 4-5	<p>If DIT-CGIA response to Section 2.1 Vendor questions is posted on Ariba September 17th, this leaves only 7 working days for proposal preparation, this is not adequate time to prepare an appropriate response, especially considering we expect a significant number of questions being submitted by responding Vendors.</p> <p>"Being that RFQ was released just prior to a Holiday weekend, requires detailed technical responses for Sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6, and DIT-CGIA response to Section 2.1 Vendor questions isn't scheduled until September 17th, would DIT-CGIA consider extending the Vendor Submittal Opening Deadline?"</p>	<p>The Anticipated Qualification Schedule table has been updated to reflect a one-week extension for submission by responding vendors. Please see This Addendum.</p>

Questions and Answers (Continued from above)

No.	Section	Vendor Question	State's response
17.	Section 2.3 (Offer Submittal), Page 6	<p>OFFER SUBMITTAL.</p> <p>Vendor must include all the pages of this solicitation in their response</p> <p>“This would imply that all 33 pages of the RFQ be included within a Vendor’s qualifications proposal, is this correct?”</p> <p>If yes, similar to an addendum posted by DIT, should all 33 pages of the RFQ be included as a proposal addendum?”</p> <p>“If yes, should the RFQ addendum be amended for the following?”</p> <p>a) EXECUTION (RFQ Page 1)</p> <p>b) 2.13 POINTS OF CONTACT (RFQ Pages 9 &10)</p> <p>c) 3.2 VENDOR UTILIZATION OF WORKERS OUTSIDE OF U.S. (RFQ Page 11)</p> <p>d) 5.0 HISTORICALLY UNDERUTILIZED BUSINESSES (RFQ Page 21)</p> <p>Or... Should the RFQ be separated into sections as part of the Vendor qualifications proposal, with Vendor responses for each section dividing the sections of the RFQ document?”</p>	

Questions and Answers (Continued from above)

No.	Section	Vendor Question	State's response
18.	Section 2.3 (Offer Submittal), Page 6	<p>Previous DIT-CGIA RFQ qualification responses were based on a very structured format, limited to 37 pages for Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4. There were no page limits for supporting information Sections 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8. RFQ-41-DIT-1189645431 does not define a similar structured format for qualifications response.</p> <p>“We’re assuming there is no page limit or formatting requirements for a Vendor qualifications proposal, is this correct?”</p>	<p>The submission format and content section was incorrectly removed from the RFQ solicitation document. Format and content should follow the table and section in This Addendum.</p>
19	Section 2.15 (Evaluation Criteria for Qualification), Page 10	<p>Absolute and relative comparison of the Vendor's specialized or appropriate expertise in the type of project. (How well the Vendor addresses the project scope Sections 5.1-5.4).</p> <p>As an incumbent Vendor, we recognize this obviously refers to Section 5.0, Scope of Work, specified in previous DIT-CGIA RFQs. This SOW is not included or defined in the same manner within RFQ-41-DIT-1189645431. Incoming Vendors, with no previous program experience, would not recognize or be familiar with this Project Scope of Work, Sections 5.1-5.4.</p> <p>“Is the Vendor Response to Section 3.4, REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SPECIFIC TO THIS SOLICITATION, pages 12 through 18, going to be evaluated as Evaluation Criteria Item-2?”</p>	<p>This statement should have read: “How well the Vendor’s qualifications conforms with the solicitation specifications in Section 3.4 of the RFQ.” The evaluation criteria has been updated in This Addendum.</p>

Questions and Answers (Continued from above)

No.	Section	Vendor Question	State's response
19.	Section 3.5.1 (Solutions NOT Hosted on State Infrastructure), Page 18	<p>The 911 Board Statewide Orthoimagery Program will be required to receive and securely manage data that is classified as Low Risk, Statewide Critical.</p> <p>“Being the RFQ clearly states the Orthoimage Program Data is “Low Risk”, and the VRAR report requirement is for “Medium or High Risk” classified data, is a responding Vendor required to submit an in-depth VRAR Report for this “Low Risk” classified project?”</p>	<p>No, the vendor is not expected to host any solutions and the VRAR is not required. Section has been removed per This Addendum.</p>
20.	Section 3.5.1 (Solutions NOT Hosted on State Infrastructure), Page 18-19	<p>This requirement additionally applies to all Vendor-provided, agency-managed Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS), Platform as a Service (PaaS), and Software as a Service (SaaS) solutions which will handle data classified as Medium Risk (Restricted) or High Risk (Highly Restricted) data.</p> <p>“Being that RFQ Section 3.0 SPECIFICATIONS does not include any IaaS, PaaS or SaaS requirements, is a responding Vendor required to submit an in-depth VRAR Report?”</p>	<p>No, the vendor is not expected to host any solutions and the VRAR is not required. Section has been removed per This Addendum.</p>
21.	Section 2.1 (Vendor Questions), Page 6	<p>Upon review of the RFQ documents, Vendors may have questions to clarify or interpret the RFQ in order to submit the best bid possible. To accommodate the Bid Questions process, Vendors shall submit any such questions by the “Submit Written Questions” date and time provided in the RFQ SCHEDULE Section above, unless modified by Addendum.</p> <p>“The words “bid”, “bids” or “bidding”, are used throughout the RFQ approximately 18 times, these words aren’t typically used in a Request for Qualifications document.”</p>	<p>This document is a Request for Qualifications. The term bid is synonymous with the term proposal and does not connote cost.</p>

Questions and Answers (Continued from above)

No.	Section	Vendor Question	State's response
22.	Section 3.6 (Enterprise Architecture Specifications, Enterprise, Services and Standards), Pages 19-21	<p>Section 3.4, REQUIREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS SPECIFIC TO THIS SOLICITATION, does not require Enterprise Services, neither have the past 2012 through 2024 DIT-CGIA Orthoimage Projects. DIT-CGIA has taken delivery of the final product for each project, 2012 through 2024, with no requirements for hosting data, software applications or connectivity to our internal network.</p> <p>“Considering the Scope of Work is considered professional Photogrammetry and Surveying services, can DIT clarify why detailed technical responses are required for Section 3.6, 3.6.1 through 3.6.8?”</p>	<p>No, this project does not involve a solution or application. Section 3.6 has been removed and reserved per This Addendum. No response required.</p>
23.	Attachment: A (References), Page 33	<p>“Can we provide three (3) completed DIT-CGIA projects as customer references?”</p> <p>“Does DIT-CGIA prefer we provide three (3) different customer references?”</p> <p>“Can we provide more than three (3) customer references?”</p>	<p>DIT-CGIA projects can be used as a reference, but each of the three references should be from different references. In the proposal response, past history on the DIT-CGIA projects and other repeat projects can be outlined separate from the three references required by the references attachment.</p>

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR ADDENDUM TO RFQL ORTHOIMAGERY

The following are changes to the originally posted RFP Lite where the name was changed to Request for Qualification.

1.0 INTENT, USE, DURATION AND SCOPE

Anticipated Qualification Schedule

The Agency Procurement Agent will make every effort to adhere to the following schedule:

Action	Responsibility	Date
Request for Qualification Issued	Agency	8/30/24
Written Questions Deadline	Potential Vendors	9/12/24 (2:00PM EST)
Agency's Response to Written Questions of Qualification Addendum Issued	Agency	9/17/24 (2:00PM EST)
Vendor Submittal Opening Deadline	Vendor(s)	10/3/24 (2:00PM EST)
Qualification Evaluation	Agency	10/24/24
Qualification Announcement	Agency	10/25/24
Protest Deadline	Responding Vendors	15 days after award
State to Issue Scopes of Work for 2025 Project to subset of pre-qualified vendors	Agency	10/25/24
Cost proposal call with selected vendors	Agency and selected Vendors	10/30/24
Technical cost proposals due	Selected Vendors	11/19/24
Negotiations with Finalists (if necessary)	Agency designees and selected Vendor(s)	11/25/24
2025 Statewide Project Kickoff (tentative)	Agency and selected Vendors	1/9/25

2.3. OFFER SUBMITTAL

Due Date: **October 3, 2024**
 Time: 2:00PM Eastern Time

(Please see the MS Teams Link Below for This Meeting)

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 259 504 342 995

Passcode: bzccPd

Dial in by phone

[+1 984-204-1487,,737022536#](#) United States, Raleigh

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 737 022 536#

Join on a video conferencing device

Tenant key: ncgov@m.webex.com

Video ID: 116 372 661 1

[More info](#)

For organizers: [Meeting options](#) | [Reset dial-in PIN](#)

Submission Format and Content

All proposals are limited to fifteen (15) pages exclusive of cover sheet and shall be typed using a font size 10 or larger on 8 ½" x 11" sheets, single spaced. Submittals containing more than 15 pages or that are improperly formatted will not be considered. Pages, sections, and paragraphs must be numbered for easy reference. The submittal shall be ordered and labeled per section as defined in Table 2:

Table 2:

Section	Requirements	Page Limit	Evaluation Weighting (%)
1	Letter of Interest	2	Required
2	Evaluation Criteria	15	100 %
3	Supporting Information and Exhibits	10	Required
4	Project Team Resumes	10	Required
5	Letters of Commitment/Certifications and Registrations		Required
6	Form SF 254		Required
7	Attachments and Addendums (Signed Bid Addendums, Execution of Letter of Qualifications)		Required

Table 2: Proposal Organization Format

Section 1 – Letter of Interest

The Letter of Interest should be addressed to Ms. Belinda Edwards. This letter is limited to two (2) pages and shall contain the following information:

1. Summation or overview of information contained in the Vendor’s proposal.
2. Listing of any civil or criminal indictments, guilty pleas, or convictions of offenses involving the Vendor or any principal within the past 5 years.
3. Statement regarding any possible conflict of interest on the part of the Vendors for this project.
4. Federal Tax Identification Number (FEID).
5. Date of registration and registration number with the North Carolina Secretary of State’s Office.
6. Date of license and license number of Professional Land Surveyors with the Board of Examiners for Engineers and Land Surveyors.
7. Vendor’s authorized officer, signature, date, Vendor’s name, address, telephone number, FAX number, and email address.
8. Vendor’s project contact person, signature, date, Vendor’s name, address, telephone number, FAX number, and email address.
9. Vendor’s authorized contracts negotiator, signature, date, Vendor’s name, address, telephone number, FAX number, and email address.

Section 2 – Evaluation Criteria

The Vendor shall prepare and submit a response to RFQL Section 3.4.

Section 3 – Supporting Information and Exhibits

The Vendor shall prepare and submit the following information:

- Listing of all affiliates and their legal addresses, including, but not limited to, subsidiaries, parent company, companies owned or controlled by the parent company, any company or firm having some mutual owners as the firm which does business with the firm and may or could be involved in any manner, shape, or form.
- Organizational chart of the proposed team for the project, including subcontractors.
- Maps and figures
- Overall summary of personnel to be assigned by discipline and professional registration.

Section 4 – Project Team Resumes

Provide resumes of key personnel to be used on the project and their anticipated role (include professional registration information, such as license numbers).

Section 5 – Letters of Commitment

Provide signed Letters of Commitment from the Prime and subcontractor(s).

Section 6 – Certifications and Registrations, Insurance

The Vendors must have the financial ability to undertake the work and assume the liability. The Vendor shall submit the following information:

- Certified documentation that the Surveyor in responsible charge of the work is a registered Professional Surveyor in the State of North Carolina in good standing with the North Carolina Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors.
- Certified documentation that prime and subcontractors providing professional services that are proposed to be performing land surveying are licensed in the State of North Carolina in good standing with the North Carolina Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors in accordance with North Carolina General Statute 89C.
- Certified documentation that the prime firm and any of its corporate subsidiaries to be used on the project, as well as all team members, are properly registered to do business in North Carolina with the Office of the Secretary of the State.
- The photogrammetric firm performing the work and the professional in responsible charge of the work must be licensed (firm and professional) in the State of North Carolina and must have good ethical and professional standing.
- It will be the responsibility of the prime Vendors to verify any corporate subsidiary is registered with North Carolina with the Office of the Secretary of the State prior to submitting a Letter of Interest.
- If necessary, the selected Vendors may be prepared to furnish proof of Professional Liability insurance coverage as well as provide evidence of General Liability as referenced in the Terms and Conditions.

Section 7 – Form SF 254

The Vendor shall submit Form SF254 as signed documentation for the Prime and each subcontractor(s). This document may be obtained at <https://ncdoa.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/documents/files/sf254-word.doc>

Section 8 – Bid Addendums

The Vendor shall submit signed RFQL Bid Addendum postings.

A. 2.15 EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR QUALIFICATION

Evaluation shall include best value, as the term is defined in N.C.G.S. § 143-135.9(a)(1), compliance with information technology project management policies as defined by N.C.G.S. §143B-1340, compliance with information technology security standards and policies, substantial conformity with the specifications, and other conditions set forth in the solicitation. The following Evaluation Criteria are listed in Order of Importance.

- 1) Absolute and relative comparison of the Vendor's successfully completed projects, past performance on similar projects, and available capacity.
- 2) Absolute and relative comparison of the Vendor's specialized or appropriate expertise in the type of project. (How well the Vendor addresses the project Specifications Sections 3.4)
- 3) Absolute and relative comparison of the Vendor's adequate equipment, product storage and capacity.
- 4) Absolute and relative comparison of the Vendor's technical specification approaches. (Techniques and approaches that meet the specific geographic regions of our projects).
- 5) Absolute and relative comparison of the Vendor's adherence to Section 3.2 Security Specifications.
- 6) Absolute and relative comparison of the Vendor's strength of references relevant or material to technology area(s) or Specifications (see Attachment A for submittal form) and Vendor Past Performance (The Vendor may be disqualified from any evaluation or award if the Vendor or any key personnel proposed, has previously failed to perform satisfactorily during the performance of any contract with the State, or violated rules or statutes applicable to public bidding in the State.)
- 7) Financial Stability.
- 8) Risks associated with Vendor's submittal including errata and exceptions to the State's Terms and Conditions contained in Section 7.0 – DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

3.5. SECURITY SPECIFICATIONS

3.5.1 SOLUTIONS NOT HOSTED ON STATE INFRASTRUCTURE

The 911 Board Statewide Orthoimagery Program will be required to receive and securely manage data that is classified as Low Risk, Statewide Critical. Refer to the North Carolina Statewide Data Classification and Handling policy for more information regarding data classification. The policy is located at the following website: <https://it.nc.gov/document/statewide-data-classification-and-handling-policy>.

To comply with the State's Security Standards and Policies, State agencies are required to perform annual security/risk assessments on their information systems using NIST 800-53 controls. This requirement additionally applies to all Vendor-provided, agency-managed Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS), Platform as a Service (PaaS), and Software as a Service (SaaS) solutions which will handle data classified as Medium Risk (Restricted) or High Risk (Highly Restricted) data.

(a) Upon request, Vendors shall provide a current independent 3rd party assessment report in accordance with the following subparagraphs (i)-(iii) prior to contract award. However, Vendors are encouraged to provide a current independent 3rd party assessment report in accordance with subparagraphs (i)-(iii) at the time of offer submission.

(i) Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP) certification, SOC 2 Type 2, ISO 27001, or HITRUST are the preferred assessment reports for any Vendor solutions which will handle data classified as Medium Risk (Restricted) or High Risk (Highly Restricted).

(ii) A Vendor that cannot provide a preferred independent 3rd party assessment report as described above may submit an alternative assessment, such as a SOC 2 Type 1 assessment report. The Vendor shall provide an explanation for submitting the alternative assessment report. If awarded this contract, a Vendor who submits an alternative assessment report shall submit one of the preferred assessment reports no later than 365 days of the Effective Date of the contract. Timely submission of this preferred assessment report shall be a material requirement of the contract.

(iii) An IaaS vendor cannot provide a certification or assessment report for a SaaS provider UNLESS permitted by the terms of a written agreement between the two vendors and the scope of the IaaS certification or assessment report clearly includes the SaaS solution.

(b) Additional Security Documentation. Prior to contract award, the State may in its discretion require the Vendor to provide additional security documentation, including but not limited to vulnerability assessment reports and penetration test reports. The awarded Vendor shall provide such additional security documentation upon request by the State during the term of the contract.

3.6 ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE SPECIFICATIONS-RESERVED (ENTIRE SECTION)

Failure to acknowledge receipt of this addendum may result in rejection of the response

Check ONE of the following options:

- A response was submitted prior to this Addendum. An updated response has been submitted to address the changes resulting from this Addendum.
- A response was submitted prior to this Addendum. **NO CHANGES** have resulted from this Addendum.
- A response was **not** submitted prior to this Addendum. **ANY CHANGES** resulting from this Addendum are included in our response.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME

Execute Addendum:

Offeror: _____

Authorized Signature: _____

Name and Titled (Typed): _____

Date: _____