December 3, 2025

SPOKANE TRANSIT AUTHORITY

ADDENDUM TO

RFP 2025-11109 – ENTERPRISE ASSET MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE AND IMPLEMENTATION SERVICES

AMENDMENT NO. 2

Amendment 2 consists of this cover page and one (1) attachment:

- Responses to Questions and Requests for Approved Equals, Clarifications, or Changes

The Proposal due date has been extended from December 12, 2025, to December 31, 2025. **Proposals are due no later than December 31, 2025, 4:00 PM PST.**

This Addendum is hereby made a part of the RFP document to the same extent as though it were originally included therein. All Proposers shall acknowledge receipt and understanding of this addendum by completing the information required on Attachment A, Proposal Response Form, and returning the signed page with their proposal on or before the proposal due date.

Jennifer Anderson Digitally signed by Jennifer Anderson Date: 2025.12.03 16:14:58 -08'00'

Jennifer Anderson
Procurement Coordinator

Question #	Document Section	Page Number	Question	STA Response
1	2.3.1	N/A	To ensure we fully align with your expectations, could you share more detail on the roles and responsibilities described in Section 2.3.1? We'd also appreciate clarification on whether users will primarily access the system through laptops, mobile devices, or a combination of both.	The roles and responsibilities in 2.3.1 are to provide the proposers with an idea of the total number of users. Of those total users, the percentages for mobile and desktop are provided in Section 2.3.1. Of these users, STA anticipates that about 10% of the users would be admin/super users.
2	N/A	N/A	To better understand your intended user experience, could you share how you see contractors engaging with the application? For example, will they use a separate portal, or will they have access similar to STA employees?	STA anticipates the contractors to use the same portal, but with access that is limited to certain assets and certain capabilities (e.g., entering work order information only).
3	N/A	N/A	In the event contractors will have the same system access as STA employees, could you clarify whether they're included in the total user numbers outlined in the RFP?	Contractors are included in the total user numbers outlined in the RFP.
4	Work Pln Mgmt 15, 17	N/A	To help us better understand your maintenance structure, could you share more detail on how A, B, and C-level preventive maintenance (PM) activities relate to one another, including any dependencies or business rules that apply?	Maintenance practices vary by asset types and the type of work being performed. Two examples might help clarify things: Example 1: If an asset requires a 6-month inspection, completing the current inspection work order would automatically trigger creation of the next PM work order, scheduled for six months from the date of completion. Example 2: buses may have inspection intervals at 6K, 12K, 24K, 36K miles, with different levels of criteria for each inspection. The resulting workflow alternates between the base inspection and the higher-level inspections as mileage progresses—for example: 6K, 12K, 6K, 24K, 6K, 36K, etc. STA also uses finite maintenance schedules (e.g., an engine overhaul performed at a specific point in the asset's lifecycle) and condition-based maintenance.
5	N/A	N/A	Could you please confirm whether STA currently uses VMRS coding, and if not, whether support for it is anticipated in future operations?	STA uses codes that include, but go beyond VMRS codes.
6	N/A	N/A	To better understand the overall solution landscape, could you share how STA plans to use the Procore application and how it fits within your current workflows?	We are implementing Procore primarily for construction project management. It will likely have a role in our capital budget planning, and in the future, may send new asset information to the EAM.

Question #	Document Section	Page Number	Question	STA Response
7	WR7	N/A	To ensure alignment with your mobile requirements, could you share whether you anticipate integrating with ESRI or another preferred mapping solution?	As mentioned in Section 2.9.5.1, STA anticipates a two-way interface with Esri ArcGIS (for both desktop and mobile tools).
8	AR27	N/A	To help us better understand the intended requirement, could you share more detail on the scope of asset templating specifically, whether it will focus mainly on the bus fleet or extend to additional asset categories?	The requirement applies to all assets listed in Section 2.2.1.
9	AR63	N/A	To help us align our approach, could you share an example of how asset hierarchies are currently structured (for a bus and a facility), or provide insight into the level of detail and complexity you envision?	STA uses a hierarchy structure with multiple levels of child assets, which is common in the transit industry. Hierarchy depth varies by asset class. STA will provide its hierarchy information to the selected vendor. A couple of examples follow: Vehicle → Major System (Engine, Transmission, HVAC, etc.) → Sub-system/Component (e.g., turbocharger, compressor, wheel hub, tire). Facility → Discipline/System (Shell, HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Interiors, etc.) → Sub-system/Component (e.g., Roof → roof membrane, hatches, drainage; HVAC → chiller, AHU, ductwork).
10	AR17	N/A	With relation to Building Information Model (BIM), will there be the need to integrate with BIM to support bringing asset data into the EAM solution or for visualization of BIM models?	STA does not anticipate integration with BIM.
11	MQ1	N/A	Regarding Mandatory Qualification MQ1, which requires production use of the proposed EAM software at "similarly sized or larger transit agencies in the US," could you please confirm if documented experience with "Aviation/Airport" agencies of comparable scale and complexity would be considered an acceptable equivalent for meeting this requirement?	No. The MQ1 stands as-is (specific to transit agencies).
12	N/A	N/A	Could STA clarify the decision-making process for key design approvals—will decisions be made centrally by the project sponsor or distributed across functional leads?	The selected vendor's Project Manager will work directly with STA's Project Manager to ensure clear decision-making protocols are documented in the Project Management Plan (Task 1).
13	N/A	N/A	Does STA expect formal stage-gate approvals during each implementation phase, or will approvals be iterative and rolling?	STA expects rolling approvals for all deliverables, following the DED and DAD process listed in the RFP.

Question #	Document Section	Page Number	Question	STA Response
14	N/A	N/A	How will cross-department conflicts in business process design be resolved during workshops?	Conflicts will be resolved in coordination with STA PM and vendor PM.
15	N/A	N/A	Can STA confirm the expected weekly availability of business SMEs during requirements validation and design workshops?	STA will allocate the right SMEs for the required amount of time for validation sessions, workshops and other activities, to be finalized and documented in the work plan with the selected vendor
16	N/A	N/A	Will STA assign a dedicated technical architect to work alongside the proposer's architects throughout the integration and data phases?	STA will allocate the right IT staff for the required amount of time, to be finalized and documented in the work plan with the selected vendor
17	N/A	N/A	Should the proposer plan for onsite presence during critical phases (design, mock conversions, UAT), or will STA allow a hybrid model?	STA will allow for a hybrid model for implementation, with proposers specifying their approach in Section E (Implementation Approach).
18	N/A	N/A	Does STA expect to consolidate duplicate assets or parts during data cleansing, or should the proposer migrate assets "as-is" before normalization?	STA expects the proposer to perform data cleansing, including identification and consolidation of duplicates, as part of the data conversion phase. This involves mapping, validation, and normalization to ensure data quality for the data planned to be migrated. As mentioned in Section 2.9.4.1, "STA plans to migrate list of assets, condition data, inflight work orders, material lists and material quantities into the new software. STA plans to leave its current EAM (Tyler EAM) in place for historical data retrieval/review."
19	N/A	N/A	Can STA specify whether asset/component warranty data is structured consistently in Tyler EAM, or will manual data collection be required?	STA will conduct data collection for warranty data as needed.
20	N/A	N/A	Will STA provide authoritative data owners for each data domain (assets, inventory, vendors, costs) to approve mapping and cleansing rules?	Yes.
21	N/A	N/A	Can STA clarify whether any of the legacy systems listed in the RFP are planned for replacement during the EAM implementation timeline?	No, none of the other systems are planned for replacement during the EAM implementation timeline.
22	N/A	N/A	Does STA anticipate requiring bi-directional sync with telematics data (Samsara, EV systems), or will ingestion be one-way only?	Please refer to Section 2.9.5.1.
23	N/A	N/A	For systems requiring real-time interactions, what is STA's tolerance for integration latency (seconds, minutes, or near-real-time)?	STA expects an integration latency of no more than 5 minutes, since the data is needed for operational awareness, not instant/real-time control. Vendors may propose something different based on their experience.

Question #	Document Section	Page Number	Question	STA Response
24	N/A	N/A	Will STA require a test environment for each integrated system, or should the proposer simulate external endpoints where unavailable?	STA requires a dedicated test environment for the EAM implementation, including simulations for external integrations where live endpoints are unavailable during testing.
25	N/A	N/A	Does STA require native mobile app functionality for inspections, work orders, and inventory, or is a browser-based mobile app acceptable?	STA requires native mobile app functionality. Please see software requirements worksheet included with the RFP.
26	N/A	N/A	Are there specific field workflows—such as inspections at BRT stations or after-hours emergency work—that must be optimized for mobile use?	Yes, workflows for field inspections (e.g., at BRT stations), work orders, and emergency/after-hours maintenance must be optimized for mobile use, including offline functionality and GPS integration.
27	N/A	N/A	Does STA plan to adopt RFID, NFC, or QR tagging for assets in the future, and should the proposer account for this capability?	STA has included requirements for multiple tagging protocols in the requirements (e.g., DAI6, AR105, WPM204).
28	N/A	N/A	Does STA currently perform any reliability-centered maintenance analysis (RCM), and should predictive maintenance be enabled for key asset classes?	Please refer to software requirements worksheet included with the RFP.
29	N/A	N/A	Are there any regulatory or compliance-driven maintenance reporting standards that the system must automatically support?	STA conducts FTA State of Good Repair (SGR) reporting and National Transit Database (NTD) reporting.
30	N/A	N/A	For UAT, does STA prefer end-to-end scenario bundles (e.g., from inspection defect to work closure), or individual functional test cases?	STA prefers end-to-end scenario bundles for UAT.
31	N/A	N/A	Should the proposer include automated testing tools for regression testing after upgrades, or is manual testing sufficient for STA?	Proposers can include any tools in their approach and proposal.
32	N/A	N/A	For cloud/SaaS hosting, does STA require FedRAMP, CJIS, SOC-2, or other specific security certifications?	For SaaS hosting, STA requires SOC 2 Type II compliance and adherence to STA's Cybersecurity Policy.
33	N/A	N/A	Does STA expect the proposer to provide continuous monitoring tools for performance, uptime, and integration health?	Yes, for hosted solutions, the proposer must provide continuous monitoring tools for performance, uptime per RFP requirements, and integration health, with dashboards accessible to STA.
34	N/A	N/A	Will STA require data residency guarantees within specific U.S. regions for security or compliance purposes?	Yes, STA requires data residency within the continental United States, with no storage outside the U.S. Specific regions are not mandated.
35	N/A	N/A	Can STA confirm whether AMS support should include proactive optimization recommendations, or only reactive ticket resolution?	Please refer to scope details in Section 2.9.11.1.

Question #	Document Section	Page Number	Question	STA Response
36	N/A	N/A	Will STA require quarterly system health assessments and enhancement roadmaps as part of the AMS engagement?	Please refer to scope details in Section 2.9.11.1.
37	N/A	N/A	May we request STA to consider extending the deadline for at least two weeks to allow sufficient time for review of responses to any questions that could influence the final response given the short window to the due date?	STA extends the due date to 4:00 PM PT, December 31, 2025.
38	N/A	N/A	Please confirm if proposer's subcontractors are required to have a State of Washington Business Licence.	If the subcontractor will be performing the work within the State of Washington, then yes, they are required to be registered to do business within the State of Washington
39	N/A	N/A	Can STA clarify whether the preferred EAM deployment model is Software as a Service (SaaS) hosted by the vendor, or whether on-premises or hybrid implementations will also be considered acceptable?	STA will consider SaaS (vendor-hosted), on-premises, or hybrid models; proposers must specify their approach and include pricing for the proposed model in Attachment C.
40	N/A	N/A	Please identify the current ERP, HR, and Finance platforms (if any) that the EAM system is expected to integrate with and specify whether API-based or file-based integrations are preferred.	Please refer to STA's response to Q5 in addendum 1.
41	N/A	N/A	Will STA require the selected vendor to perform data cleansing and historical data migration from legacy asset databases, or will STA provide a pre-validated dataset?	Please refer to STA's response to Q12 in addendum 1.
42	N/A	N/A	Does STA require the proposed solution to comply with specific security frameworks such as NIST 800-53, ISO 27001, or FedRAMP Moderate, and are there defined encryption standards for data at rest and in transit?	STA requires compliance with NIST Cybersecurity Framework and encryption standards (AES-256 at rest; TLS 1.3 in transit).
43	N/A	N/A	Can STA define the expected uptime guarantee and response/resolution times for critical incidents under the required Service Level Agreement (SLA)?	Please refer to technical requirements (e.g., TR201) and RFP section 3.4.
44	N/A	N/A	Please confirm the anticipated start date and the target go-live date for the EAM system implementation so that project phases and resource plans can be aligned.	STA anticipates a start of Q2 2026, and 12-18 months for implementation. Proposers must propose their timeline based on their implementation experience.
45	N/A	N/A	During the oral presentation/demonstration phase, will STA provide sample datasets or use cases to ensure consistent evaluation among vendors?	Yes.
46	N/A	N/A	Should vendors include software licensing costs, hosting fees, and support/maintenance costs in the base cost proposal, or will these be handled as separate contract components?	Vendors must include all costs (licensing, hosting, implementation, initial support) in the base price proposal via Attachment C worksheets for proposed models (SaaS or on-premises).

Question #	Document Section	Page Number	Question	STA Response
47	N/A	N/A	What is the expected support duration (e.g., one year post-go-live) included in the base contract, and will ongoing support be renewed annually through contract extensions?	As stated in the RFP: STA anticipates awarding a five (5) year Contract, with option to extend up to a total of ten (10) years. The selected Proposer shall provide production support of the EAM solution for one hundred twenty (120) days after go-live. (Section 2.9.10.1).
48	N/A	N/A	Will STA disclose or publish the percentage weighting of technical, cost, and presentation criteria before the submission deadline?	Please refer to RFP, page 67, 5.1.2 Evaluation Criteria.
49	N/A	N/A	Please confirm that Accounts Payable; Accounts Receivable; Taxation; and General Ledger will remain in Tyler ERP as the systems of record and that the EAM will post and consume costs via defined interfaces.	Yes.
50	N/A	N/A	The RFP identifies 245 named users. How many concurrent users (total users in the system) does STA anticipate during peak operational periods?	STA anticipates about 65 concurrent users.
51	N/A	N/A	Will any external contractors or partner agencies require system access?	Please refer to the response to Q3 in this addendum.
52	N/A	N/A	From the architectural diagram in the RFP, what data is referenced in the bi-directional integrations of Azure Active Directory/Entra ID and SharePoint?	Interface details are provided in Section 2.9.5.1 of the RFP.
53	N/A	N/A	Should asset locations and georeferenced data in EAM remain continuously aligned with STA's GIS environment?	Yes, please refer to interface details provided in Section 2.9.5.1 of the RFP.
54	N/A	N/A	Should user provisioning be handled through SCIM, security groups, or another structure? (Group-based provisioning seems most likely. Please confirm or clarify.)	User provisioning should be handled through integration with Azure Active Directory/Entra ID for two-way, real-time authentication and single sign-on (SSO), supporting group-based security groups; SCIM is not specified. Please refer to interface details provided in Section 2.9.5.1 of the RFP.
55	N/A	N/A	Approximately how many total assets exist in Tyler EAM by category?	Assets listed in Section 2.2.1 of the RFP, except the facilities, exist in Tyler EAM.
56	N/A	N/A	How many years of work order history should be migrated?	Please refer to RFP Section 2.9.4.1, which states: "STA plans to migrate list of assets, condition data, inflight work orders, material lists and material quantities into the new software. STA plans to leave its current EAM (Tyler EAM) in place for historical data retrieval/review."
57	N/A	N/A	How many supporting documents and attachments will be included?	STA currently has photos for parts and PO receipts in Tyler EAM.

Question #	Document Section	Page Number	Question	STA Response
58	N/A	N/A	Is there an estimated data volume for migration planning?	Please refer to RFP Section 2.9.4.1: "STA plans to migrate list of assets, condition data, inflight work orders, material lists and material quantities into the new software. STA plans to leave its current EAM (Tyler EAM) in place for historical data retrieval/review. The selected Proposer shall base their proposals on this high-level data conversion scope."
59	N/A	N/A	How many stores, depots, or inventory locations does STA operate?	STA currently has six (6) "warehouse" locations. We need future flexibility as we continue to expand our operations and will potentially need to house inventory at future sites.
60	N/A	N/A	Approximately how many active stock items (SKUs) does STA maintain?	About 6,600 active items.
61	N/A	N/A	Does STA use barcode labels today? If so, do you want to continue using the current tool to generate new barcodes?	No.
62	N/A	N/A	Should the proposal include hardware recommendations such as scanners or printers?	Yes.
63	N/A	N/A	What is the approximate distribution of work orders between preventive maintenance, corrective maintenance, inspections, and service requests?	STA will share this information with the selected vendor.
64	N/A	N/A	Are mobile inspections with photo or video capture required?	Yes.
65	N/A	N/A	Are there specific uptime or SLA requirements?	Please refer to technical requirements (e.g., TR201) and RFP section 3.4.
66	N/A	N/A	Would you rather have FedRAMP or SOC2?	Please refer to STA's response to Question 42.
67	N/A	N/A	Does STA require CJIS-compliant hosting or data storage for any subset of assets or users?	No.
68	N/A	N/A	Is STA open to using a workflow-centric platform like ServiceNow for EAM, or is the intent to adopt a purpose-built transit asset management system?	STA will review proposals from all vendors that meet the minimum qualifications outlined in the RFP and follow the evaluation criteria (Section 5.1).
69	N/A	N/A	How important is alignment with other transit agencies' standard EAM practices (Maximo, AssetWorks, Infor) when evaluating platforms?	STA will review proposals from all vendors that meet the minimum qualifications outlined in the RFP and follow the evaluation criteria (Section 5.1).
70	N/A	N/A	Is STA expecting advanced fleet maintenance capabilities (meter-based PMs, engine fault integrations, telematics ingestion) out-of-the-box?	STA will review proposals from all vendors that meet the minimum qualifications outlined in the RFP and follow the evaluation criteria (Section 5.1).
71	N/A	N/A	How mature are STA's preventative maintenance schedules today, and do they rely on odometer/engine hours/fault-code-based triggers?	STA mainly uses time-based and usage-based PM schedules, but uses fault codes as well.

Question #	Document Section	Page Number	Question	STA Response
72	N/A	N/A	Does STA require integrated planning for mechanics bays, labor scheduling, and maintenance campaigns/recalls?	Please see software requirements worksheet included with the RFP.
73	N/A	N/A	How real-time must integrations be with Samsara telematics, Vontas CAD/AVL, Trapeze OPS, and ArcGIS?	Please refer to STA's response to Q23 in this addendum.
74	N/A	N/A	Does STA plan to leverage Azure Fabric, Data Warehouse, or Power BI as the primary reporting layer, and how should the EAM feed these systems?	STA plans to use both the EAM and other means for reporting. Please refer to the software requirements worksheet included with the RFP for EAM reporting requirements.
75	N/A	N/A	Does STA expect internal staff to administer the EAM (configurations, workflows, asset models), or is long-term vendor support expected?	Anticipated vendor support is listed in the RFP, section 2.9.
76	2.9.4.1	N/A	The RFP states STA plans to migrate "list of assets, condition data, inflight work orders, material lists and material quantities" and leave Tyler EAM in place for historical data. Can STA provide: a. The approximate volume of records to be migrated in each category? b. The desired retention period for "inflight work orders" (e.g., open work orders, work orders from last 12 months, etc.)? c. Clarification on whether "material lists" refers to inventory master data, BOM structures, or both?	Inflight work orders is intended to refer to open work orders. Material lists refers to inventory master data.
77	4.3.4	N/A	The RFP requests proposers to "identify any proposed phasing (e.g., fleet and materials management, followed by facilities)." Does STA have a preference for: a. A single go-live vs. phased deployment approach? b. If phased, which functional areas should be prioritized first?	A. STA has no prescribed preference and explicitly invites proposers to recommend the optimal approach. Proposers are required to identify any proposed phasing in their response. B. While STA is open to the selected vendor's recommendation, our preference if phased is: Phase 1 – Fleet Maintenance, Work Management, Mobile, Inventory/Warehousing Phase 2 – Facilities, Capital Planning, Advanced Analytics, Full GIS integration

Question #	Document Section	Page Number	Question	STA Response
78	2.1.1	footnote	The RFP mentions that "high-level business processes" will be provided to shortlisted proposers before demonstrations, and "all the process maps and hierarchies will be provided to the selected Proposer at the start of the project." Can STA clarify: o What is the level of detail/completeness of the current process maps?	The current process maps indicate the activities and steps, and roles that perform those steps/activities.
79	2.1; 4.3.3.1	N/A	If proposing both options, should we submit TWO complete proposals or ONE proposal with alternative pricing tabs?	Submit one proposal with alternative pricing tabs in Attachment C (one tab for SaaS pricing, one tab for on-premises pricing).
80	2.1; 4.3.3.1	N/A	For on-premises solutions, will STA provide detailed infrastructure specifications (server sizing, storage, network bandwidth, etc.) or should proposers make assumptions?	For on-premises solutions, the proposer is solely responsible for specifying all hardware, server sizing, storage, network, and infrastructure requirements. STA will not provide specifications.
81	2.9.5.1	N/A	The RFP states "The selected Proposer shall have responsibility for development of the interfaces on EAM side (Source or Target) and provide project management support for any interface updates or development of STA interface components or third-party external system components." a. For the Tyler ERP interface specifically, will STA be responsible for the ERP-side development, or is the selected proposer expected to coordinate/manage all aspects? b. Are APIs currently available for all listed integration systems?	A: STA (or its Tyler support vendor) will be responsible for any required development on the Tyler ERP side. The selected EAM proposer is responsible for the EAM side and for overall interface project management and coordination. B: Many of the STA software listed in Section 2.9.5.1 have available APIs. Some (e.g., DDC compass) use BACnet protocol (which is standard for building automation).
82	2.4	N/A	The RFP lists anticipated STA project staff. Well STA please specify: a. Expected percentage time commitment or FTE allocation for STA resources? b. Whether STA has backfill plans to maintain business operations during implementation?	Please refer to STA's response to Questions 15 and 16.

Question #	Document Section	Page Number	Question	STA Response
83	4.3.4	N/A	The RFP requests proposers describe "the amount of work/activities to be performed on-site (at STA facilities) or remotely." a. Does STA have specific expectations for on-site presence during key phases (e.g., go-live, training)? b. Are there any restrictions on remote work or offshore resources?	Please refer to STA's response to Question 17 and to Q2 in addendum 1.
84	2.9.6.1	N/A	The RFP lists 7 required environments (Gold, Sandbox, Development, System Test, Training, Production, QA/Production Patch). a. For on-premises proposals, is STA providing infrastructure for all environments? b. For SaaS proposals, should all 7 environments be included in the subscription cost?	A. Yes B. Yes
85	2.9.7.1.6	N/A	The RFP states "STA will conduct UAT" with proposer support. Will STA provide dedicated UAT testers or will this be conducted by SMEs in addition to their regular duties?	STA will conduct UAT using its own staff (primarily SMEs).
86	DED 2.8	N/A	The RFP requires proposers to develop a DED for each deliverable before starting work, then obtain STA acceptance. What is the expected STA review time for DEDs (separate from deliverable review time)?	STA anticipates to review the DEDs within five (5) business days of receipt of a complete, high-quality submission.
87	2.9.2.1; 2.3	N/A	The RFP requires an RTM that maps requirements to system components, test scenarios, and training modules. a. What tool/format does STA prefer for the RTM (Excel, dedicated requirements management tool, etc.)? b. Should the RTM be maintained and updated throughout the project lifecycle, or is it a point-in-time deliverable?	A. No specific tool/format is mandated for the RTM. B. Yes. The RTM is a living document that must be updated and maintained throughout the project lifecycle.
88	N/A	N/A	Is this procurement subject to FTA funding? If yes: a. Which FTA requirements apply (Buy America, DBE participation goals, etc.)? b. Are there specific FTA clauses that must flow down to subcontractors?	No, this procurement is not using Federal funds.
89	N/A	N/A	Is this project subject to prevailing wage requirements (Davis-Bacon)?	No.

Question #	Document Section	Page Number	Question	STA Response
90	2.1.1	N/A	HDR is identified as STA's consultant who prepared business processes and is supporting the procurement. Will HDR have any ongoing role during implementation (e.g., providing requirements clarification, validating deliverables)?	HDR assisted STA with development of the RFP and procurement support only, and is under contract till final vendor selection. HDR is not currently under contract for implementation-phase services. STA is considering engaging HDR (or another third-party consultant) for independent oversight of the selected EAM vendor to provide project management office (PMO) support, change management, requirements clarification, and/or deliverable validation during implementation. Any such engagement would be managed directly by STA and would be separate from the EAM vendor's contract. The selected EAM vendor will remain the single point of responsibility for all software, implementation services, and deliverables as described in the RFP.
91	N/A	N/A	While the timeline shows a target implementation period, is there a specific required production go-live date or is this flexible based on the selected proposer's proposed schedule?	Please refer to STA's response to Q44.
92	5.4	N/A	The RFP states STA will provide "demonstration scripts and sample STA data" to shortlisted proposers. Can STA confirm: Approximately how much advance notice will be provided before demonstrations?	STA anticipates providing 7 to 14 days advance notice before demonstrations and provide each vendor the same number of working days to review and prepare for the demonstrations.