

New York State Office of Cyber Security and Critical Infrastructure
Coordination

Friday, June 27, 2008 at 1.00 PM Eastern

Tom Smith

Frank Winters

Cheryl Benjamin

New York State Office of Cyber Security and Critical Infrastructure
Coordination

Friday, June 27, 2008 at 1.00 PM Eastern
Tom Smith
Frank Winters
Cheryl Benjamin

OPERATOR: The conference is now being recorded.

Cheryl Benjamin.: Did somebody join us?

ANDY MUNYON: This is Andy Munyon with Facet Technologies.

Tom Smith: Okay, thank you. We are going to wait now probably 4-5 minutes, take a roll call.

ANDY MUNYON: All right.

Frank Winters: We just got a message saying, "You are now being recorded."

Tom Smith: Did you get that when you signed in?

ANDY MUNYON: Yes I did.

Tom Smith: Okay, this is...we're experimenting here. This is our first time through with a...doing this kind of conference call.

ANDY MUNYON: Okay.

Tom Smith: So I am going to just put you on mute for a second.

ANDY MUNYON: Sounds good.

[On mute till 0:01:52]

MIKE BUCKLEY: Hello?

Andy Munyon: Hello.

MIKE BUCKLEY: Hello.

Frank Winters: Good afternoon. CSCIC is here. We are just going to give it a couple more minutes to let the participants on, but who just joined us?

MIKE BUCKLEY: This is Mike Buckley from NAVTEQ.

Frank Winters: Very good. Welcome Mike, welcome Andrew.

MIKE BUCKLEY: Thank you.

EDWARD GARRIGAN: This is Ed Garrigan from C.T. Male Associates.

Tom Smith: Okay thank you. We will go and do a complete roll call in a few minutes.

New York State Office of Cyber Security and Critical Infrastructure Coordination
Friday, June 27, 2008 at 1.00 PM ET

EDWARD GARRIGAN: Okay.

[On mute till 0:03:16.5]

Susan Davidson: Good afternoon.

Frank Winters: Good afternoon. CSCIC is here.

SUSAN DAVIDSON: Hi. It's Susan Davidson from Kelly Atlas.

Frank Winters: Very good Susan. We are just going to give it a couple of minutes and then we'll go through a roll call of all the participants.

SUSAN DAVIDSON: Okay.

[On mute till 0:05:16.3]

MALE SPEAKER: Hello?

MALE SPEAKER: Hello.

Frank Winters: Good afternoon. CSCIC of New York is here. Who just joined us?

BERNARD CATALINOTTO: Bernard Catalinotto of Data Enhancement Services.

FRANK Winters: Hello Bernard, Frank Winters here. We are going to give it just a minute...

BERNARD CATALINOTTO: Fine.

FRANK Winters: ...and then we will go through a roll call.

BERNARD CATALINOTTO: Excellent.

[On mute till 0:07:37.7]

TOM SMITH: Good afternoon. We are here at CSCIC in Albany. We'd like to get started. We are just going to go around the table to let you know who's here at Albany, and then I will go down the roster of those who pre-registered for the teleconference just so we know if everyone's on the phone or if we need to check up on people who are...might have had difficulty dialing in.

I assume that everybody got the...an announcement when we started that, this is a recorded call. There is going to be a transcript of the call. We haven't quite decided how to distribute that or whether it's going to be distributed or whether it's to just be part of the procurement records.

So, just before we start, I am Tom Smith. I am the counsel for CSCIC. I am also the designated agency contact for this procurement which is something we'll discuss a little more in a minute. And now we'll go around the table here.

ROGER CORYELL: Roger Coryell. I am the lead technical person on the streets for the state.

CHERYL BENJAMIN: Cheryl Benjamin. I am the GIS Project Manager for the streets and address data.

TOM HENDERSON: Tom Henderson. I am the CSCIC employee on the Valuation Team.

FRANK Winters: Good afternoon. I am Frank Richards, and I am the GIS Manager for CSCIC here in Albany.

Tom Smith: Okay and let me just down the roll call of the people who pre-registered. For Facet Technology, Jamie Retterath.

JAMIE RETTERATH: Here.

Tom Smith: For Facet Technology, Andrew Munyon.

ANDREW MUNYON: I'm here.

Tom Smith: For NAVTEQ, Athar Naqi

Athar Naqi: Here.

Tom Smith: For NAVTEQ, Michael Buckley.

MICHAEL BUCKLEY: Here.

Tom Smith: For NAVTEQ, Michael Finn.

MICHAEL FINN: Present.

Tom Smith: For Tele Atlas William Bates.

WILLIAM BATES: I'm here.

Tom Smith: For Tele Atlas, Susan Davidson.

SUSAN DAVIDSON: Here.

Tom Smith: For C.T. Male, Ed Garrigan.

EDWARD GARRIGAN: Here.

Tom Smith: For Data Enhancement, Bernard Catalinotto.

BERNARD CATALINOTTO: Here.

Tom Smith: For Data Enhancement, Colleen Ditmars.

COLLEEN DITMARS: I'm here.

Tom Smith: For Data Enhancement, Kevin Zang. Colleen, do you know if he's planning on joining us?

COLLEEN DITMARS: I'm sorry, I don't know, I will go ahead and make a phone call to him very quickly.

TOM SMITH: And for Baker, Michael Crino. Okay, maybe we will check up on that in a minute or two, if we don't hear a beep. Just to let you know, we are...just as a preliminary part of this. This is something of an experiment to our...maybe our effort to reduce our carbon footprint rather than have everybody schlep here at Albany. That's \$4.25 a gallon or god knows how much jet fuel to the gallon.

We thought we will give the teleconference a try. So, if there are any bugs in this process, you know, their reflection is and the fact that it's really our first time through with this process. What I would like to do is just sort of set the stage from my perspective of what the counsel's office is responsible for and then we'll get into the nitty gritty of the RFP.

As Frank will mention briefly in a little bit, one of the things that we have been working on in this process and one of the reasons why we did the draft RFP and we've been working on it for several months now is that from the states perspective, we've invested a large amount of time and money in the current product. And as we recognize that the world has changed as we had been investing all the time and money in the product, we are trying to move into the current environment in the way that's most advantageous for the state. And as some of you may know, our contracts are subject to review and approval by other state agencies including the Office of the Attorney General and the Office of the State Comptroller. And one of the issues that we expect to come up in this process is the fact that as currently proposed in this RFP, this asset that we spent all the time and money creating is essentially going to be given away, if you want to look at it like that. And we're going to be asked to justify why that's in the best interests of the state and that's why you'll be able to see is a theme that we repeat several times in the RFP that we are looking for the to vendors who respond to this request for proposals to recognize the value of what they are getting from us, both initially and as an ongoing deliverable from us of authoritative edits and other information.

So that's sort of the background why that's a recurring theme in the RFP. Second, I'll be the first to acknowledge that it's not easy to do business with the State of New York. Every year there are more and more certifications and forms to fill out and I don't envision that getting better anytime soon. We are in a...have a similar interest with the vendors in getting a good product and getting a contract done, so to the extent that you have questions about forms that need to be filed or certifications that need to be filed, please reach out to us, you know it is in our interest to get the contracts done in a timely fashion, almost as much as it is yours.

Among most things are, if you haven't gone through a contract with the State of New York in a while, the vendor responsibility process has been revamped. We are required to do an extensive analysis of your responsibility, your, you know, how you've done with other New York State contracts. How you've done elsewhere, where there have been issues and if there has been issues, how we determine that you the vendor were responsible notwithstanding some issue and how that issue was resolved. Another set of requirements that have come in the last two years are the procurement lobbying restrictions, so as it's explained in the RFP to the extent that you want to attempt to influence the procurement, you have to call me, I am the designated agency contact. To the extent that you have factual questions about the submission of the documents, those can be directed to the solicitation contact who is listed in the RFP, but we are required to certify that you have been in compliance with the procurement lobbying restrictions that are described in the RFP and if you haven't, that will be something that we haven't...we have to take into account determining whether you were a responsible bidder in this procurement.

There are, as we know very clearly, the responses to this RFP are subject to the Freedom of Information Law. You are provided the opportunity to identify portions of your proposals as trade secret or otherwise sensitive but just to let

you know, if you do that, it should be clearly marked and you have to describe the rationale, why that's the case. Why the disclosure of this information, under the Freedom of Information Law would injure your competitive position. And that's something that you need to do upfront.

So, to the extent that you submit a proposal and at the bottom of every page it says "Proprietary/Confidential." we are essentially going to ignore that because it won't have complied with the provisions of the statute or the RFP. So that's just something that you need to evaluate that carefully upfront.

And lastly, the extraneous terms process. There is a process for you to offer alternative terms, but they have to be set out in the manner provided in RFP and of particular note in this, your extraneous term in your proposal should not include a canned software agreement. To the extent that you want to propose terms that are not material deviations in addition to the terms that are in the RFP, you need to set those forth separately and specifically in the extraneous terms form and we will evaluate whether or not we would like to accept those in the event that you are going to be awarded the contract. And the basis for that is that we have to keep everybody on the same playing field. We cannot make material changes to the RFP for a single vendor. So, that's one of the things that you have to take into account if you are going to offer an extraneous term, then you have to set it forth in the form. And as I said, Frank that pointing out, I said software agreement I meant data licensing agreement. I'm an old mainframes data contracts, center of contracts person, so I tend to slip back into this software world.

Just I think the last thing for me, we are going to take questions at the end and we have a little process set out so that we make sure that we get to everybody's questions. And with that, I am just going to step out, Mr. Crino has not joined us, so I will have somebody call him. But now I will turn it over to Frank to talk about the background of this RFP.

FRANK Winters:

Thanks Tom and thanks for everyone who took the afternoon and a good chunk of it here, to participate. We are really excited about being at this point. It was a lot of work to get here. What I'd like to accomplish in the next fifteen minutes would be to kind of reach a common understanding. Some of the people on the phone have bits and pieces of the story of what its like to work with us and more importantly, what is it we are trying to accomplish. I think, if we put, what comes out in black and white in the RFP into a bigger context, you will be able to make a more reasonable proposal and we will...and we will understand each other a little bit better.

So, I'll give you some background, I'll cover kind of the lay of the land as it is today and then I'll cover what we expect the roles will be moving forward in a partnership. And then of course I'll turn it over to Cheryl with a bunch of the items in the RFP that's might otherwise be easy to miss out of a 125 pages, there are some items that might only have a few lines but we will bring out some details on some of the things, that we just want to make sure we call your attention to. And then of course, give you your opportunity.

So the background, many of us have been in the businesses of mapping from the good old days of mapping at DOT. The background I am covering here, starts with a three and half year effort to build the New York State Streets and Address database and then a year and half of maintaining that. That street and address database that we are talking about here contains all the roads in the State, roughly 140,000 miles of centerlines. The street names, the aliases, the address

ranges, the address points and attributes adequate for your basic network navigation routing. When I say basic I mean those sort of network navigation routing attributes that make sure we don't turn left off a bridge or go the wrong way off the interstate or go the wrong way on a one way street.

Other attributes that would use for specialized, network routing like overweight, over height vehicle permitting and that sort of thing, are not covered and those will be added by others, by [inaudible].

These then the streets data layer, when we use the term "vertically integrated" as if it were part of the English, what we mean there is the streets data layer where appropriate is collinear sharing the same vertices with other features. Say a village boundary goes along the center of Main street. That will be exactly the same vertices and we have all the framework layers are of interest to us, street is one piece of that integrated puzzle. We also have...and we'll get into our partnership and our leadership role in the state here, but our current data products is available in its full content to members of the New York State GIS Data Sharing Cooperative, state agencies and local governments in general and we've a very well established GIS Data Sharing Cooperative with some 700 of different agencies who have signed a standard agreement and it's a pretty mature cooperative. There is also a version of the street data file which is available for download to the general public that contains the full geographic content. And many of the attributes that are of high value are restricted to only the...available to the cooperative members under a password. So the public could download a version and see the roads with the street names for instance, but if you need to see, have the attributes for a network navigation or an address, geocoding, you would only get those through the cooperative.

The good news is we have lots of users relying on this data product. The bad news is we have lots of users relying on this data product. We have applications that are built using a fairly specific data model. Right now that's in ESRI 9.1 geodatabase format. The ALIS applications are an example of the accident location coding applications are examples, of one of those sets of attributes. So when you see references to 9.1 or specific data model entries, we've tried to bioil it down to just the specifics that we really need to keep the wheels on the applications. That's not to say that over the next five years we will be locked in that. We will work together with our customers and the other people that are maintaining the applications and with the winner of this contract to work out the most efficient delivery mechanism. We don't intend to stay in the 9.1 world, but that's where we have to be right now because of the applications that we are supporting.

One thing that's important for you all to know is that New York State through leadership of our office; we host the GIS Coordination Program. That GIS coordinating body has been in effect for more than a decade. We have a long track record of working with and taking care of lots of stakeholders around the state.

Our Ortho program is worth mentioning because it's a good example of a success of state and local government collaboration, and it's really a foundation on which not only the technical geography is based but also the relationships that are going to be necessary for you to get the value out of our contracts. Before we started the Ortho program there were disparate flights of orthophotography being done by local governments, by state agencies, there was a whole bunch of different programs. Now that we have a program that kind of takes into account everyone's needs and is base funded the way it is, there is one

Ortho program and local government chooses to even fund...the funding participants on our program. So I mention that so that you have an understanding that we are not just starting new relationships now. We are building off the ones we already have and taking this into a higher level with the next framework data layer that we are really after being the streets maintenance.

We just got done going around the state with the revised or the brand new GIS strategic plan. We went to...six cities around the state and talked to 160 stakeholders and really had a very open process. Streets and address and maintenance were an integral part of this strategic plan. So why will I say all that? I just want you to all...know that we do take the partnerships seriously. We know that the best data is local. People that have their finger on the trigger, making these changes is local. We are committed to the partnership and the various programs support each other. Our success in Orthos and our success in streets are really synergies that come together. And I want to point this out here because we hope that the winner of this procurement tapping into those partnerships will find some values and we'll find value in that and also I hope that your proposals reflect the recognition that you anticipate that value like Mr. Smith said earlier.

So today where are we? We have been for the last year and half in sort of a bare bones maintenance mode. We have some partners. We haven't actively gone after new partners. But we have had the data in use by lots of local governments and we have been responding to requests that we have been working with a vendor up until...how long ago?

Cheryl Benjamin:

End of March.

FRANK Winters:

End of March, to get those requests done. We have just finished a software environment called the Map Maintenance Notification Tracking Module and that is an online application where authoritative source at local governments or other agencies can come in and say, "Main Street starts here and ends here and from this address to that address." And we are just wrapping that up now. But really, the stage we are at right now is we are going from a build mode to a maintenance mode. And the analogy I like to use is how would you structure a company to build a railroad, and then how different would it be to operate that railroad. We are just making that transition now. We also recognize that things have changed. Ten years ago we were doing all our own mapping. We were in the business of mapping streets around the state as most of the mapping was done by the public sector. Some of these companies that are on the call today we recognize...have come out of and had their birth in public sector mapping.

We have realized things have changed in that with on-vehicle navigation and location based internet addressing, there are market drivers well beyond the public sector resources being put on this. We think that's a good thing. There is mapping that's happening whether we want it to or not. So what we are trying to figure out and I think we have done a pretty good job here is where is the appropriate role for us in government to play, CSCIC in particular and then what role are our private sector partners most able to efficiently play, and then how do we tap into our other users for their role?

I think we have come up with a pretty nice balance there but I think that we are pushing the envelope a little bit in that it's my impression that this maybe one of the first procurements...kind of recognizing that it's not just work for hire, its not just licensing. It's these roles that we're getting sorted out now. So that's

just kind of a disclaimer and so you understand that we are trying to think creatively and proactively here.

Then as Mr. Smith said, we also are in a pretty interesting spot, we've recognized these roles, we've been thinking and living this stuff, but now we have to convince our control agencies that we are getting the best value for the state, and this thing we...that we've built, now we're going to license from someone else and given the states financial situation, its not bad times and times for a whole bunch of new initiatives. Its time to be to be lean and efficient and make sure we are just playing the right role and not beyond. So, I mentioned that so that your proposal can take that into consideration as well. And also so that you don't think we are just plain nuts with some of the things we are pushing here.

We will mention a couple of times that...and in the RFP there is the opportunity for innovative ideas for changes in technology that keep the quality high and keep the efficiency high which also will keep the costs in check. For instance if...and we didn't require web services as a delivery mechanism because we realized we don't have the funds to have you build a web services environment for us. But should that be a direction that your company is you're positioning yourself there and you choose to use a web service delivery mechanism as one of the ways you are going to deliver data to us, we are open to that. Provided the...it adds value, it make it more efficient on your side, it makes it more efficient for us to use, better turnaround time of deliveries and it does not negatively impact the cost on our...from our perspective. That's an example of the kind of innovative things that we're...that we're encouraging here, but also framed in the tight fiscal situation that we are in.

The other area that I'll mention similar to that is we've backed off to quarterly deliverables as a requirement. If your company is tuning up and is able and willing to make those deliveries monthly for instance, that might be an efficiency gain on our side for review, and in processing of that data. Its certainly better for our customers, another innovative kind of thing that you can propose. So we have our minimum to keep the costs in check and the door is open for your creative ideas.

So a bit on the roles we expect to play here. First, our role, we will work the partnerships in New York State. You will have one place to look to for edit changes from the whole public sector of New York State. We will screen the edits; the edits you will get will be vetted. The edits that you will make that you will be requested will not be a forum for two people who disagree over the street names to argue about the street names. This is Main Street. No this street is Pine Street. Now there is two edits that went back and forth. They will be vetted by us. Then you would, actually perform the edits and while you are doing that extract what other...whatever value it is you can extract for other commercial ventures and processes or whatever else you have. You have full access to information we give you to do other things with. Once the edits are performed, you will send those back to us and we validate and sample and do a QA process and then we take on the responsibility of distributing that to our user community and that is a control user group well understood and well exercised GIS Data Sharing Cooperative. It is one of the main mechanisms there.

So we are doing what we can to keep the value of our information received consistent and to keep the value high, and hopefully that will reduce the work needed for you to maintain street data in New York State from what it would be if you were not partnering with us. So, the fieldwork that you do, maybe some

of that fieldwork run around with a vehicle with GPS on it can be...can be used to initially to gain your comfort level with the type of edits we're giving you and then maybe those resources are redeployed in other places outside of New York State.

We've been in this business for a long time. Some of us have our roots in DOT mapping tech. Most of the senior people on this project have been directly in the trenches of doing research, reaching out to folks for years updating mapping at DOT and right on up through our current framework responsibilities. And we're believing that the research that you need to do to validate these changes will be reduced by the quality of the edits.

Like I said, we are just getting started with map maintenance. We are really going to start a push to bring more partners on and to actively solicit more and more counties and local governments for their feedback. Now that we will have a mechanism to actually accomplish those edits. We've been sort of holding up a lot water behind the dam and we are going to really bring the partners on.

The numbers of edits that we have talked about in the RFP will reflect, you know, reflect our anticipating appetite. Did I miss anything in the background anybody would like to add?

Okay, I will turn it over to Cheryl, and Cheryl can mention some of the items in RFP that we just want to make sure we call your attention to.

CHERYL BENJAMIN: Okay I have a pretty bad cold. So if you can't understand what I'm saying, please ask me to repeat something, I will be happy to do that. I am also going to be trying to refer to specific pages and sections in the contract RFP. So if you have a copy of that you might want to follow along in the different items I'm going to cover.

The first item that I want to just reiterate is regarding the contract term. That's in Section 5.01 on Page 19. This is technically a three year contract. The State will have options to renew it for one year periods, two separate times, and the other thing I want to point out is not really mentioned in here but with the quarterly deliverable, the contract technically starts when we get approval from the State Comptroller's Office and that may not align with exactly with one of your quarterly deliverables, when normally it takes place in your standard process in the commercial side of the house. So what we would end up doing is thinking of the deliverables, with your quarterly deliverable and so for example, if your first...if the contract's signed on let's say November 1st but your quarterly deliverables are September 30th we would not want to take a deliverable one month into the contract because we wouldn't really have given you anything you could incorporate into the dataset and return to us. So we would look for your next quarterly deliverable at end of the December to become the first official quarterly deliverable. And then we would just sync it up at the end of the contract through another provision I will talk about in a little bit.

At the very beginning of the contract, there's going to be a...most likely a transition period. That's actually detailed in the section of the contract on Page 42 Section A 2.2.1.6. In that particular section we will talk about what they call a transition period. Most likely there is going to be different types of things that you aren't going to be able to do immediately.

For example, one of the things that we want to do is we don't want to go backwards with the quality of the product, that we are delivering to our customers, our partners out there in local government. And in several sections you hear about having data that is at least as accurate as what we currently have with geometry as accurate. Containing the same amount of public streets and address points.

What we want to do is make sure that you can meet that requirement. Also the capacity requirement it may require on your part that you can't currently right out of the gate, be able to process on average 1500 edits a month or 4500 edits a quarter or also that you can't immediately get your data into CSCIC's required data model. What that might require is for example, you can't provide a file immediately. You may want to just take the existing CSCIC products and edit them with the edits that we provide. In this contract we allow upto 1 year maximum to get up to speed on all these requirements. We would want the transitional plan for the deliverables to be provided at the beginning of the contract. There is some details regarding that in the contract. Specifically we want to know about how many edits will be actually provided to us with each quarterly deliverable, and if you cannot process the 4500 edits in a quarter, if we did provide 4500, when that differential amount would be sent to us.

One other things also that we want to point out is that in the data model, and the data model is actually Attachment 3 to the Exhibit A and the Data Dictionary, which provides more details about the data model on Pages 64, 65 and 66. It gets into exactly what attribute fields must be delivered in the data model. There is a requirement that these fields exist. There is also a requirement that some of them must be populated, but not all of them. In the last column in the data dictionary will tell you whether or not in the address point or the street segments that field needs to be populated.

If it says 'yes' we expect values to be in those attribute fields. If it says 'no' we expect the attribute fields exist in your delivered product, but it does not have to have had anything in it. It can remain blank.

The other thing too when we are in this initial transition period, the contract RP states that we will have monthly meetings. In the beginning, expect there to be much more frequent meetings. And we want to make sure that communication is open and flowing between the two groups. It might get into the project managers on both sides having daily calls, we can call, we might have larger group calls as needed to address technical issues. The intent is not to put an onus on documenting every little single thing that happens, but to make sure that we are aware of what each side is doing and that there is no miscommunication happening, so that the state doesn't get delivered products that we have to turn around and reject. We want to make sure that both sides are continually keeping open flows of communication.

That kind of stuff is at the beginning of the contract. At the end of the contract, Section 5.15 on Page 26 we talked about the transition period at the end of the contract. I mentioned earlier in the contract term that we would try to sync up quarterly deliverables. If for example we don't take a quarterly deliverable so let's say, four months into the contract's beginning, the contract lets say does go for three years and we take the two optional, one year extensions, we get to the end of five years.

We are really kind of short one deliverable. So what we'd like to be able to do is to take advantage to get one last deliverable within that contract. So we have put in a transition period that allows upto a maximum of 180 days to be able to

continue to take the same type of services. So that will help us to get to that last quarterly deliverable in because it would occur after the five years. It also will become valuable to the state if we are in the middle of a procurement following this one, where we've gone through a process and may be we haven't a gotten final OSC approval to continue on with the new contract and we are waiting for that, so there might be a couple of months in that whole process of either the valuation piece or the final approval piece that we need to make sure we continue to receive services. That will be part of the contract transition at the end. And again, any of the deliverables that will come during that time period would be at the rates set forth in this contract.

Frank talked a little bit about roles. I wanted to spend a little bit of time, especially talking about the roles of local government and our Data Maintenance Program and where we are with things.

We briefly touched on it in Section A 2.1.5 on Page 38, where we talk about edits or edits coordination role. In that section we talked about a number of local governments and counties that actually participated in data maintenance. And when we talk about the actual numbers I wanted to point out that there is actually a difference between data build and post data build participants. We talk about the number of people who actually participated in the original data build at 28 counties. Now we started our data build process back in 2002/ 2003, when we were doing outreach for county and local governments and we had discussions with each and everyone of the counties in New York State and out of those counties, some 28 of them at that time felt comfortable enough to provide us data or wanted to participate in anyway possible and sign what we call Local Data Provider Agreement. And the signature of that agreement was required because they were indicating that any of the information or data sources they provided to us would be shared with our data maintenance provider and they could go ahead and incorporate that into any of their commercial products. So that was one of the things that we wanted to make very clear.

Participation in our program by county/local governments is not mandatory. It's totally upto the local governments to determine if it's in their best interests or not to do that. Some chose not to participate because they did not want their information or their data at that time to go to the commercial data maintenance providers. Others chose not to participate just because they did not have the resources or staff or time to be able to put into it at this point, and they did not want to be on the hook even though in the agreement there was no clause for them to actually to do much of anything.

When we actually put out the data, the data was officially released in July 2005; however in July 2004 we made the data, a beta version of the data available to members of the data sharing cooperatives and our local governments. They immediately started putting that data into their applications, that's when the actual reliance on our data model started. And the local governments who started incorporating it did not necessarily have to have participated in our Data Maintenance Program. So some of the municipalities and counties who had our data and did not sign up for the local Data Maintenance Program as they started to use it, began to become dependent upon it, and began to see the value in it. And after we released the official version, that's when we kind of kicked off with okay, that's kind of when we started maintaining the data, finished other builds, all the stitching together. We were now going into maintenance mode. And we had three counties within the first year who asked if they could participate in the Data Maintenance Program and they actually signed the local data provider agreement.

We've had discussions with many more municipalities since then. Eight of them had asked for a copy of local data provider agreement which is the eight additional counties that are referenced to in this agreement. There are some counties we've talked to who do not have an agreement yet. But it is anticipated that over the next year as we start putting out some of these tools and we start having more frequent deliveries available that the county and local governments will again start asking about participating in this local Data Maintenance Program as well as us reaching out to these who we know our data needs to be improved from the current status that it might be at.

The process that we are going to use when we work with a local government, and one of the things that we'll use is our Map Maintenance Notification tool. And there is a little flyer that we made available that is on the website that you can download and take a look at. Basically a web based tool. Access to that tool is going to be restricted to people that we consider having authority to sign street names and addresses. Because our goal is not to be able to take in any type of information from anybody because that will take a lot of effort on our part to research it. But if we get the key people who are actually in the know or in the pipeline of where these changes exist, provide those updates to us as soon as possible.

So for example, when we're going to talk to a county and figure out who in the country can submit changes to us that are authoritative, street names, address numbers, route numbers, all that type of important street related information. We actually go to the county and we ask the county GIS Manager to bring together all the appropriate organizations within the county in addition to some of the more advanced local governments within their county because we are looking for a cooperative venture where we're not having to reach out to the 30 or so local governments that may exist within a county but work directly with the county, who in turn then works with their local governments. So when we sit down with a county they typically bring in the GIS people, their planning people, their building department, their real property services group, their E911 community, anybody who might touch an address within the county. And we actually sit there and we do a little demo about what the Map Maintenance application is about and then we talk about roles and where addressing is actually assigned within the county and local government. And we start and we look at all the municipalities and individuals. And in New York State, it's a home rule state, so every county does something individually and on their own. There is no over arching body that says thou shall name and number your street this way in New York state. Each county kind of has to figure that out for themselves. Generally, most counties try to follow the NENA addressing standard. That's the National Emergency Numbering Association. Some follow them partially...some come up with different rules for how far along the street that they assign an address number on the right or left. So as part of this meeting we try to sort all that out.

The first thing that we try to sort out is if the county or the local government who assigns street name and in some counties it's great. One organization in the county does everything. In other counties for example in Chautauqua county that I met with a couple of months ago, there are some cities that do all the names and numbering assignment and that's it.. And we will share that information with the county but the county has absolutely no say with it. Others, local governments assign street names but they have nothing do with address numbers, they turn to the county and ask the county to do that. And in some localities, the local governments do nothing and they ask the counties to

do everything. So we have to map all that out ahead of time and then we start talking about where the government different addresses are collected. And we plot all that out on charts that we put up on the wall and we color code them and by the end of the day because it usually takes almost a full day, we figure out where the key links are in the process, and who it would make sense to have as an authoritative user of the map maintenance application to submit updates. As they go through that process of figuring it out, we also stress that we don't want it to be just one person. If that person leaves the government who is going to be taking over that position? We want to have a couple different people available that can pick up slack at any point as it keeps...as its moving along.

The way that our tool actually works, the local government can have an internal review themselves before that edit even comes up to New York State. And there has to be one person within the local government or at the county level that says, "Okay, this is acceptable" and can pass it through to New York State. So I just wanted to kind of point this out that this is not just, you know send us your data file whoever is there, we really take the effort to go out, get the people to talk to each other, figure out what those items are. Once they've identified who those people are going to be, then we end up working with their IT Group to setup an authenticated account that uses the New York State Directory Services authentication program, which allows access into the application. And that way the local governments have identified who can have access to it, we allow them access to the application and then we go back into the local government and we train them how to use the tool.

Now as Frank mentioned, we have been in a mode of bringing this tool up on board. We went around the state last May and demoed a beta version of the application and the local governments that showed up, I think we have something like 71 different participants and it was a hands-on workshop where they actually got to log into the application and test it out and play with it. We had requests by 29 individual local government organizations that said when the tool is up and active contact us, we'd like you to come back and talk to us again. And some of those 29 organizations are already some of the 28 local governments that have signed up with the local data provider agreement and many of them are not. So over the next year our plan is to get back in touch with those folks, go back there and start working with them and bringing them up on board.

Now, MMNT is just one way to submit updates. We kind of look at that as the one up tool. In our previous contract, our vendor provided us a tool that was most efficient for them to process updates and it was very valuable for a local government that wanted to look at every individual segment and validate the street name and address ranges on it. If your organization has such a tool we want to know about that in your proposal. Our goal again is not to make the whole process difficult, we want to be as efficient as possible, we want to use the appropriate tools for the appropriate purposes.

Other ways that we've had local governments work with us, you know, map maintenance is great if they have resources or the other tool a vendor may provide. But they may also not have resources to work with us but they may have a file they maintain in their E911 system and they want to turnaround and give that to us, which we can then ingest either ourselves using MMNT or a contractor provided tool or with their permission turnaround and provide that to the vendor. Those local governments again, will sign a Local Data Provider Agreement ahead of time if they were going to authorize us to provide their updates whether it be a street centerline file, whether it will be address points,

whether it will be parcel boundaries. So they'll have a clear indication, whether or not we can provide that to our contractor.

Once we have local governments on board and they're submitting information to us, the role of our agency at CSCIC is, we kind of act as a single point of contact between a contractor and all the edits that we're going to be collecting from our county and local governments. What we do is we've been now doing maintenance for about three years between the original contract and these 'bare bones' maintenance contracts purchase orders that we've done. And we have the experience now of understanding the importance of making sure that we are speaking the same language as our data maintenance contractor. So whoever is the winner of this procurement, we need to make sure early on we understand and are speaking the same terminology. So we will have lots of discussions about types of edits, supporting what's going to make sense, so when it hits your floor the editor there understands exactly what we are talking about.

By us doing a single review ahead of time even though we have, you know, 1600 local governments in New York State, when an edit comes in we are going to make sure the terminology is going to match, and we will go back and we will train our local government. If they are submitting something worded a little bit not in the same way that you would understand it, we would ask them to change that. We might change it initially, but we don't want to keep having to change it every time it comes to us. So we will work backwards so that when it comes to you, you can take it and adjust it quickly.

The other piece of the puzzle is, you know, once the data comes from us into our edits to do, you are going to be ingesting that information and incorporate those edits. You are also going to be taking information from your own sources whether it be from the US Postal Service files, whether you have relationships with delivery carriers and utilities or other companies that are providing you updates or online programs with the general public to notify you. Any source where you are actually taking in information and validating it and adding to your database. We expect that information to come to us as well.

Earlier I talked about the initial one year potential transition period. If you are at a point where you are not able to provide us a product and you are updating our individual street file, and address point file during that time period, we would expect by that end of the first year what you are going to be providing us will include your edits that you are getting from these other sources. A part of the reason that we are doing the licensing is that we realize what you are able to bring the table to us is the value of all the different types of edits.

There is in the contract, one of the attachments, I believe it is attachment D3. In appendix D Part 3 on Page 111, it's important for you to list in general categories the types of different source research that you bring out. We do not need to know the names of individual organizations or companies that you work with but you can categorize them. You know, you could have things that we gave as examples in here; three major delivery carriers; four utilities; and again we are talking about areas that cover New York State only. So when you are looking at your sources please focus on what you have in New York State because we are not scoring you or validating stuff that you are doing outside of New York State. We are interested in what are the relationships you have already established for source information within New York State and that we understand the value that you are bringing to the table.

The more information that you can give that to us, and the more granular that you can be, the better we will be able to understand the value of your source information. If you get edits and it conflicts with information that CSCIC provides we are also going to want know in that sheet how are you are going to actually work out that differential and figure out what the changes your proposal should indicate how you are going to deal with conflicting resource information.

On the flip side when things come back to us you may reject an edit that we sent. We are going to expect some kind of an explanation of why it's been rejected. We will work with the local government to validate that information. However there will be some probably back and forth and we expect that because we will have different sources that are competing. Again communication is key to all of this. But every edit that you return to us will be reviewed by someone within CSCIC and validated that yes, you made the edit requested, it was made completely and as expected and if it wasn't, it could be a communication issue. One of the things that we are going to end up doing is we are going to try to keep things flowing to you on a continual basis. What we've been doing and we'd like to be able to continue to do is at the end of every week whenever we've received an edit, we ship that off to you. So, that you can have a continual inflow of updates and changes that you can keep making to your data product.

We will have to come to agreement as part of the contractual process, is on when those edits have to submitted by certain dates in order to make it into your next quarterly cut off date. We want that to be no longer than six weeks before that delivery date. So if you are going to deliver something to us at the end of the month, a month and half before then would be the expected date at the worst case scenario that New York State would be submitting you an edit and we would expect to see that edit as long as it was within the first 4500 edits to be in that quarterly deliverable. But that exact date we will work on and will be included in the contract.

Going into the review and acceptance of the deliverables: On Page 40 of the contract in Section A.2.3.4 we talk about deliverable acceptance. The actual contractor deliverables that are in there we expect to see address points, the street and alternate names, when you actually...pardon me, let me back up a second. Acceptance of deliverables. Okay what we are going to do is CSCIC is going to return, you know, once we actually get into the review of what you give to us as in a quarterly deliverable, we are going to start looking at those immediately. Now, if we have submitted to you 4,500 edits over three months and you've been getting them on a weekly basis, you can't expect us to review 4500 edits in one or two weeks, it's going to take a while to ingest that. We are going to start looking at them immediately and at the end of every week out of all the edits that we have reviewed, if we find that if any are inaccurate or incomplete we are going to return them to you. Again, we want to start and avoid the miscommunication as soon as possible. Those edits that we return to you, we have a new section we talk about having to return them back to us, and respond to those edits within 15 days.

Now what we are asking you to do is, we're in a disagreement about an edit. You need to look at that edit again and say, "oh yes, we misunderstood, we will make that correction. It will be in the next quarterly deliverable." We don't expect you to make that edit and get it back to us in 15 days. What we would like is a review and a response back on whether or not you agree with the edit. If you agree with the edit you need to tell us when you are going to fix it. If you

don't agree with the edit we need a justification of why you don't agree with the edit.

In the actual review of the 45...let's say there is 4500 edits CSCIC has submitted. We don't expect them all to be 100% correct. But we do expect them to have at least 95% of them corrected and meeting the accuracy standard. If 95% meet them, then we can authorize payment. We are committed to once we receive a deliverable having everything reviewed no later than two months. That provides us with the opportunities, if unexpected activities are going on in our agency or we have people out that we are able to cover all 4,500 of those edits within a two month time period. Frank talked before about innovative approaches. This is where you know looking at, is it possible to give us more frequent deliverables so that we get those back sooner, that we can review them quicker and therefore we can give acceptance quicker. That's just something to keep in mind.

And one of the things to note is on Page 45 we talked about during the transition period... we are expecting that part of the acceptance, we want to see 100% of the planned and backlogged CSCIC edits come back to us and being able to accept it . And at least 95% of everything that CSCIC has submitted within the quarterly edits that are returned to us have passed. So if you submit...if we've submitted edits and you've got some backlog edits then let's say its actually 6000 edits have been incorporated, 95% of the 6000 edits have to be incorporated correctly.

Getting to that whole process, it will probably take us a while to get up to 6000 edits within a quarterly deliverable, expect us to ramp up slowly with you guys and we're not saying you are going to get a 100 edits the first month. We are already starting to compile edits and we have several hundred edits already backlogged and we expect to increase those numbers; we can load you up in the beginning. We will have an exact number for you, upon contact award – what's already sitting in the queue. However, it will be part of your plan, you know to assume you're only on the hook for 4500 edits per quarter to get submitted, but it will be to your advantage to try to get as much of that good information into database as soon as possible.

In the actual proposal, you have different deliverables that have to be provided to us. It's important that you provide as much information to us as possible about these deliverables. For example for address points, the streets, the alternate street names, we would like you to be able to identify and provide details on any additional attributes besides those that are required within the data model, the data dictionary. If you are going to be populating something that say it's not required to be populated, please point that out to us, it's to your advantage to do that. In addition, if there is any other things with network navigation for example, that you are going to be providing to us, we are going to need to know a lot more about it. We did not put a whole lot of information about that in RFP, its not a file we're turning around and providing to you. There is some information, some network navigation such as the two levels, to to and from directions and one of the things that I was asked to make sure I point out is, in the data model we indicate that there is a one way attribute. It will be delivered to you unpopulated, but we are requiring it to be populated back to us. We need to know the details on the structure of what you will provide for network navigation. For example, if there is a separate file, is it attributes of an existing street files? How comprehensive is the network navigation you are able to provide? Is it going to be able to be provided statewide and regional for all our attributes, or for some attributes? And exactly what

attributes does it include? And a description of what those are? Now Frank is there anything else, or Kevin, about that you want to add?

FRANK Winters: Just a one, we have a list of attributes that we have on our data product. There is one of those, which will not be provided by us, just want to make it clear the one way attribute we do not have ownership and license to provide to anyone else at this point. So that's something that we will only get back from you, and you will not get it from us because it's not ours to give you. Just an example of, you know, we take the license provision seriously we will, in the future one as well. Is Kevin Hunt on the line?

KEVIN Hunt: Yes I am.

FRANK Winters: Okay, is there anything to add on network navigation from a DOT perspective Kevin?

KEVIN Hunt: I don't think so. Just as Cheryl said providing details on the data structure and perhaps other customers are using it.

FRANK Winters: That's one of the...this is on the list partly because there wasn't a whole lot to say about it in the RFP, but just because its one sentence doesn't mean its proportionally important. It's on page 34 that that we are looking for network navigation attributes to be supplied and we've only got one little bullet, but please do explain how that will be accomplished, and we are flexible in that area. But that will be an area that we will be looking to differentiate the competitive proposals.

KEVIN Hunt: Right, Department of Transportation is relying on that functionality today and in the future.

CHERYL BENJAMIN: Also in your proposals there are in the quarterly deliverables, we've already talked about the streets and the address points, there is another item that we call the Record of Street Changes. And we don't require a specific way that they have to be sent to us other than it has to be some type of GIS file that you will be able to tell exactly what has been changed within that quarterly deliverable by individual street segment. What we are looking at, you know, what's been added, deleted, and realigned. You want to know the type of change that occurred on that segment, what segment was affected. What attribute values were actually modified? What the values were before and after some of the proposals and you need to confirm that you can do that and if you have any specific details on what you'd like to provide about that we would be happy to see them in the proposal. Again it helps us to understand what you're actually bringing to the table for us. And you know, if you can be innovative and creative, great.

In the annual deliverables, and it's...basically we are just looking for stuff that you guys already are doing. We are looking for Census geography and we are looking for details on the attributes that you are going to provide with Census geography and some information on how they are created so that we understand how they are vertically integrated with the streets file. So if you have that block information we want to know when that Census block is supposed to be aligned with the streets that is occurring. And then the other thing I want to point out is the annual deliverable. They come once a year. The first annual deliverable will be synced up with the first quarterly deliverable, and then each year thereafter the contract will be in annual deliverable of that product.

If you have anything that we need to know is different about that, if you have a different proposal regarding when the annual deliverable should occur, please let us know. And then the last thing that I want to talk about regarding description of the deliverables in the proposals is, at the very beginning of Exhibit A in Section 8.1 on the top of Page 35 there's actually a note that we said if there is anything additional that you guys want to throw into the proposal and provide to New York State that would be beneficial to us, any additional data sets that aren't going to impact the costs at all to New York State. You need to list those items and provide details about them. We need to know, again, how complete they are, how comprehensive, how up to date, what information is contained into them. Again, that information helps us understand what you are able to bring to the table in your proposal...Should I go into anymore about innovative approaches. Frank, or....?

FRANK Winters: Yes, on the top of Page 34 at the very beginning of A1, its worth highlighting here because this little phrase...might be easily glossed over, it's just introductory. But we are serious when we say that bidders are encouraged to submit innovative proposals to support and then it goes on from there. By innovative proposals, we recognize that we have articulated some minimum needs, but to the extent that your company can differentiate itself by going beyond the minimum that we have asked for in delivering these, clearly the streets being the most important of all the deliverables, then please explain that in your proposal to win the maximum points in the evaluation.

Just to give you an example of what we are talking about, we have asked for a quarterly deliverable, quarterly for the streets. If you, for the same cost, or for greater efficiency, can post streets to a web service and we can start our edit process off of streets on a more continuous basis... explain to us how that would work and explain how our customers might also benefit from that and explain to us any other specifics you can about how a web service. Just as one example of an innovative way to make deliveries to us. If you aren't going that route with web services, but you think, well we are going to be maintaining these data layers and making edits on a fairly continuous basis maybe a monthly delivery is of not much great cost to you to provide because you've tuned up your processes to kick up monthly deliveries fairly painlessly and with monthly deliveries, we get the data sooner, we could start our edit process sooner, you can get your payment sooner. If that's a benefit to both of us, explain how that would work in some detail. We will carefully consider those things and that's a way that we are giving you an opportunity to differentiate yourself from your competitors.

CHERYL BENJAMIN: And you could indicate if you required the one year transition period similar to what we do for the other 4500 edits.

FRANK Winters: Right there is, unlike some of the proposals which are where we have very tightly defined, our other request for proposals are very tightly defined exactly what we expect, this one we described the minimum of what we expect and have left the door open for creative thought and innovative technologies.

TOM SMITH: Now, I think we are going to go briefly... I'll just talk a little bit about the licensing provision and again to sort of circle back to the theme of what we are trying to do here is craft a solution or a contractual provision that take us from the model in which we have been operating up until now into the new model that recognizes the way the environment, the industry has changed, going from us owning our products and then permitting someone else to licensing it, to providing all our information to a vendor who will then own it. But we will retain a perpetual license to use the deliverables both the quarterly deliverables

and the information that the additional information that comes in the annual deliverable. And essentially, what we would like to do and although we are recognizing the changed environment, the changed industry, we want to continue to do business as we have done in the past to permit us to share these...the deliverables with the state agencies, members of the data sharing cooperative, local governments in the State of New York. In addition there is the provision for the public domain version, which does not include address or routing information, which is made available on our website. And essentially, when we say perpetual license at the end, we will even if the maintenance portion of this stops we would have the right to continue to use this product in the future. And a part of this is based on we did go out and examine licenses in other states and procurements that other states have undertaken and we are trying to again move into this new format. So this is, we would like to continue to be able to do business the way that we've been doing that it serves both our needs and the needs of our partners in New York. So that's the genesis of the licensing provisions as they appear in the RFP.

CHERYL BENJAMIN: It's noted and then I believe bold and maybe even red, in your proposals you're going to be identifying project references. CSCIC will be contacting project references and we will be contacting them anytime from July 23rd to August 1st. So those people that you put down for as references must be available during that time period. I just want to point that out. At this point, right on schedule, we are going to go into a little bit of discussion about the payment schedule and cost calculation. And I think what I want to do, just to avoid any possible confusion and make sure we are all on the same board about what we are calling an edit because we keep referring to 4500 edits per quarter and, you know, assume CSCIC is going to send approximately 1500 edits a month. What's an edit?

There are three primary ways that we'll be shipping what we call single edits or individual edits. One of them is with the Map Maintenance Notification tool. One is them is with the street name editor application which provides a file that we made a sample available to you online and then again any contractor provider tool. In Map Maintenance Notification and Tracking, we can make changes such as those that we talked about in Section A.2.1.5 1.3 that is on Page 38 to 39 and also edit point edits, which is A.2.1.5.2 on Page 40. We try to tell you all the different things that we can tell you about the street. We could be adding a street, we could be deleting a street, we can be making a modification to the street name.

In all cases each submission of a map maintenance change will be considered one edit. And to give you an example of different things that might come through map maintenance, if we indicate "here is a new street" and we digitize the likeness of the street, we give you the street name, we give you the classification, we give you the address ranges to put on it. That's one edit. A lot of information, but that will come through map maintenance as one edit. We also might have an alternate street name that needs to be added on a street within a village and a map maintenance that will come through as one edit. We are changing the street name and we'd probably tell you what the source is. It may actually affect 500 segments in the file if it's a very segmented file, and it's a big village but that would be considered one edit. We might also be looking at an individual segment and indicate that there is an incorrect address range on it and it needs to be modified. And the address range may currently be stating that is supposed to end at 42, and we are saying, "No it needs to end at 48." So we will flag that in there. Now that will also require you to modify the next adjacent segment, but that wouldn't also be added necessarily as an additional

edit within the file. We've submitted one if it requires something on either end of that segment to be modified. That's still only considered one edit even though you may have to modify a second segment.

Similarly again, if we are changing an individual segment we may not only indicate that there is an address change but we may ask you to add an alternate name or two alternate names. That again is all done in one map maintenance submission and therefore it will be considered one edit. In the Street Name Editor, hopefully you've all had a chance to look at the sample; at least there were about a dozen entries. Each entry within the table is considered one edit. So you may have an indication of a street name change, it may cover numerous segments; it may cover three sections of segments of one edit, as long as it's in the line, each one will be considered one edit. And then with the contractor's tool based on our past experience typically it will be...end up being like a Shapefile and again each line that's generated within the Shapefile will be considered one individual edit. And if a contractor tool is provided to us, we would clarify before we even started using that tool exactly what an edit will be defined so that there is no confusion on either side. Again generally we are using those types of tools to do more efficient editing and if we are going to have someone go through and for a street say this entire street is this name and it affects 100 segments in the real file but we are giving it to you as one indication within your tool that would be one edit. However, if we have somebody else who is touching every individual segment and telling you for every individual segment what the address ranges are, each segment that they give them listed address ranges would be an individual edit. So if there is street and it's got three segments and they tell you the address ranges for each individual segment that will go in your tool three times and be counted as three edits. There are....

FRANK Winters:

Just as point of clarification on the contractor tool Cheryl is talking about. If you are the winning bidder; we are talking about your tools, should they exist. If you have a tool that you can provide to us that is efficient, we mutually agree that we are going to use that, that's the tool. I just want to make that clarification so you don't scratch your head and wonder where are these tools are coming from. They are your tools if we both agree that they are happening. And the reason for this big description of what we call an edit is not so that we can gain the system or so that we can get more out of you than you anticipated, its really just so that we all are understanding what we mean is an edit and so that you can price your solution accordingly, and you can understand, in that way we will have an apples-to-apples comparison amongst the various proposals. Go ahead Cheryl.

CHERYL BENJAMIN:

In the RFP in Section A2 in the summary of deliverables, we have some sections where CSCIC will be providing data. And one of the things that we talk about is what we call municipality-wide submission of address points and parcel boundary data. What we are talking about is on occasion we get from county or local government, they have an address point point file, they may have generated themselves. Sometimes they're building centroids, sometimes they're parcel centroids, sometimes they are parcel centroids that have been moved to driveway entrance. If we get a municipality or a country that says, "We want to give these to you, we want them incorporated into your file for address points" and they sign a local data provider agreement, we will provide them to you, however those will not be counted as an edit or a series of edits. That is high value information and we are hoping that you as the potential bidders on this contract understand that and that it is a.... of course that will be needed to be added to the address point file and then we could work out a schedule on when that would be used to improve the address ranges on these street segments. It is

not something that we would expect that if we gave it to you on some month that it would show up in the next quarterly deliverable. We would work that out in the project schedule on when it could be geared into your system and have enough people available to do that processing and get it in there. And once we have agreed to that we will also be letting the local government who provided that information know when that work will be done. And again, if we are seeing that we are making progress on obtaining a course like that it, we would let you know, as early in the process as possible so that you could start looking at your production schedule and figure out where in the alignment...that actually would go.

That other item that we have talked about in that section is. As Frank mentioned the state has this long eight year history of a statewide Digital Orthoimagery Program where we have imagery that's been collected for a portion of the state every year. Every year we will do a different part of the state. It is imagery that we do make available for download up on the web and also as a web service. However, we can work it out that when the imagery is through the process in house, even before it may even be up on the web, we may be able to ship that to you sooner. Again if the contractor uses that Orthoimagery to add new streets or other stuff that we have not indicated within any of the other tools. Again that would not be counted as an edit against New York State, it's just another source similar to what you are learning from USPS or from one of your other data maintenance partners of additional source information. But we would help to try to make that available to you more quickly that it would be available online and perhaps a way that you could get it in house much quicker.

There will be probably indications that we and CSCIC may indicate within map maintenance to add a new street. We may have seen it in our brand new Orthoimagery, because in a map maintenance, Orthoimagery is one of the layers. If we do indicate to you, we want you to add it from the Orthoimagery, it doesn't mean it's going to be not counted. That will be counted because it was submitted through map maintenance. It's all the more reason though that you probably are going to want to make sure you have our Orthoimagery when its available because a lot of times we may make modifications and refer to that Orthoimagery as where we got that information from.

So at this point I think I am going to turn it back over to Tom and ask him if he can go over a little bit about the edit value table and the pricings of those examples.

TOM Smith:

Okay, this is reflected in Appendix E, of the RFP which I hope as we drafted, it is clear, and again you know, not to beat the theme of we are trying to recognize that we are now licensing information from the vendors and we are paying for edits on a potentially a per-edit basis, and we've determined that for our purposes it will be best used, a tier pricing model. It was a little bit of a wrinkle again to try to recognize the fact that there is a lot of value to the edit that we've done a, you know, sort of pre-screen, done our due diligence on before we turn them over to you to be included in the deliverable. We want to afford the opportunity for you to indicate how much value you will assign to those that can be assigned from edit one in saying, well the individual edit price is reduced or conversely we are offering you the opportunity to bid a cost decrease factor at some point in the process. And there is really a lot of latitude on how this can be presented. It's not to say that, you know, you couldn't get to tier 3 and say every edit above that is zero or for every edit above 5000 you know we will credit you back a certain amount. We are looking for again an innovative response and to hammer on the theme that recognizes the value of what we are

bringing to this relationship that presumably reduces your work load in maintaining your New York State product. So that's really what we're continuing to try to get to and we want it to be able to show to the control agencies that we have done everything that we can do to maximize our return on the large investments that we have already made in this product that we are now going to be turning over to the vendor that wins this contract. So that's really again, Appendix E is a reflection of that theme that we've been talking about since the beginning. So, I think we, you know, between the table and the example and the additional discussion here I think that's about all that we can say about that. Just a couple of things on the administrative proposal requirement, there is a provision in there if you read it that says, "a vendor could submit more than one proposal," you know, if you want to Proposal A and Proposal B we certainly invite that, but what I do want to make sure is that you understand that each of those proposals would have to be complete, so that we can evaluate them separately during process without having to be concerned that we were looking at, you know, one administrative proposal and two technical proposals or two cost proposals. So if you choose to provide an alternative it has to be a complete alternative so we can evaluate it and score it separately. And again just to another separation issue, we do want you to submit the administrative costs and technical management proposal separately as described in the RFP. There shouldn't be any cost information in the technical proposal. There shouldn't be any technical narrative in the cost proposal. So that that, you know, help us maintain the integrity of our procurement process and also that we can present a clean procurement record to the control agencies. Now, we are remarkably close to our schedule, I'm frankly shocked. Just how it is to do work with us. What you can expect.

TOM Smith: So, we are now going to move to the question and answer period, a couple of preparatory remarks. We are going to...this is in addition to the formal Q&As which are due a week from today, or no, next Thursday. And all these Q&As will be posted up on the website. So we will have one set of questions and one set of answers. We will do our best to answer questions here this afternoon. If we don't know the answer or we have to think about the answer we will tell you that and then we'll provide a written answer by I believe in the schedule is by the 11th and it would be the written response, which is the definitive response. So we have received a few questions prior to this teleconference. So, we are going to through there and then we will go through and get the rest of your answers and what we are going to propose to do is we'll I've got to pick some names out of the hat and we will go through and give everybody a chance to answer one, and then we will keep going around until we've answered all the questions. So right now we will go through the questions that we received prior to the call and then we will go to new questions.

ROGER CORYELL: All right. I am going to be reading the question, followed by the answer, and just to reiterate what Tom was saying, just in case you miss some part of this answer, it will be posted to the website so that you can get it in full and there also are some links that you will be able to go to, to get further information on a few things.

QUESTION 1: Is there a company currently performing these services? Are there currently incumbents performing these services?

ANSWER: RFP Section 1.02 states "from July 2005 through March 2008 CSCIC maintained the streets and address points with the assistance of a commercial data maintenance provider". No company is currently performing or has been performing these services since March 2008.

QUESTION 2: Is there a definition description for navigation data that is mentioned in the RFP? What are the attributes of navigation data?

ANSWER: Network navigation is currently accomplished in New York State using a combination of attribution on the street layer and a dedicated turn restriction layer that prevents illegal or impossible turns when running network navigation solutions. Attribution on the street segment layer used for network navigation may be viewed in Appendix A, attachments 3 & 4. The specific fields used are: One way, FT_cost, TF_cost, F_Zlev, T_Zlev. Additional information on these fields maybe found on Pages 71 and 72 of the RFP. New York State currently uses an ESRI turn feature class to restrict illegal turns in network navigation solutions and then there is a link for further information.

QUESTION 3: Will the contractor have perpetual rights to incorporate data from New York State CSCIC sources, create derivate works, and freely distribute commercially?

ANSWER: Yes. The contractor will have perpetual rights to incorporate data and edits provided by CSCIC during the term of the contract.

QUESTION 4: Can you share a specification for address point data?

ANSWER: Please refer to the data model in RFP attachment 3 to Exhibit A Page 58 and to the data dictionary and RFP attachment 4 to Exhibit A, Pages 64 through 65 for the address point specification.

QUESTION 5: Which counties provide street data changes and when?

ANSWER: As stated in the Edit Coordination Section of RFP Exhibit A, Section A.2.1.5 edits, participation in CSCIC Data Maintenance Program is not mandatory and County and local governments submit edits and updated data sources as time permits. There is no list of counties or other data maintenance partners that are continuously providing CSCIC with updates, since their participation depends on their available resources. Since early 2007, CSCIC has received updates or source information of varying completeness and at various times from the following counties: Chautauqua, Essex, Genesee, Greene, Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, Saratoga, Schenectady, Steuben, Sullivan, Ulster and Westchester. In addition, CSCIC received edits from the town of Bethlehem in Albany County and for the roads in all New York State Parks from the New York State Office of Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation.

QUESTION 6: Which counties or other entities have provided address point data? Which provide point address change data, and when?

ANSWER: Most addresses point data was obtained or generated from parcel data during the original data build. Details on exactly what was received for each County can be found in the Streets Source Usage Document, we refer to them as SUDs, located online and the link is provided. Since the original data build CSCIC has received address points from Madison County and the City of Yonkers, which is in Westchester County, that CSCIC was permitted to share with CSCIC's data maintenance provider at that time.

QUESTION 7: Can we get a sample geodatabase for a whole county? This county must border the other states and participate in the MMNT Update Program?

- ANSWER: As was discussed earlier, during the pre-bid conference call MMNT has not been rolled out to CSCIC's data maintenance partners, but will be in use by the time this contract is awarded. CSCIC's data maintenance partners have submitted updates using a custom tool provided by CSCIC's commercial data maintenance provider or have provided updated data directly to CSCIC. There is no difference in the format, structure or completeness of the New York State street database between counties. As stated in the RFP Exhibit A Section A.2.1.1 streets from New York State, a sample of the data is available upon request from the CSCIC's solicitation contact.
- QUESTION 8: Can we get a sample geodatabase for a whole County that does not participate in the MMNT Update Program?
- ANSWER: Please see response to question #7.
- QUESTION 9: Are the contractor provided data enhancements non-original CSCIC data being shared with the US Census Bureau?
- ANSWER: Yes. CSCIC will share the quarterly deliverables and the annual census geography deliverable with the US Census Bureau. However, CSCIC would not share the annual neighboring state streets deliverables with the US Census Bureau.
- QUESTION 10: Is the vertical integration of census data on a per county basis acceptable? eg. for non participating counties, is vertical integration via a commercial census product acceptable?
- ANSWER: No. The geometry of the census boundaries for all counties in the annual census geography deliverable must align and be coincident. In other words, vertically integrated with the corresponding streets quarterly deliverable.
- QUESTION 11: Can sample data be provided for the Change Requests submitted via the MMNT application?
- ANSWER: Yes. CSCIC will post sample MMNT requests on the website.
- QUESTION 12: Can we get a list of the 31 participating counties and 8 potential pending counties names?
- ANSWER: 28 Counties chose to participate in the original data build. Please note that this does not mean they are actively participating in data maintenance at this time. The 28 counties are Bronx, Broome, Cattaraugus, Cayuga, Clinton, Columbia, Erie, Fulton, Genesee, Kings, Lewis, Madison, Montgomery, New York, Niagara, Onondaga, Orange, Oswego, Queens, Rensselaer, Richmond, Schenectady, Schoharie, Seneca, St Lawrence, Tioga, Washington and Wayne. The three counties that chose to join CSCIC's Data Maintenance Program after the data build are Essex, Greene and Ulster. The eight counties that CSCIC is currently having discussions with regarding joining CSCIC's data maintenance program are Chautauqua, Franklin, Saratoga, Steuben, Suffolk, Sullivan, Tompkins and Westchester. And finally...
- QUESTION 13: Can we get a MS Word formatted file for Appendix C, Administrative Proposal?
- ANSWER: Yes. A MS Word formatted file for Appendix C, Administrative Proposal can be provided by an email request to the CSCIC solicitation contact at

alice@cscic.state.ny.us. Please note that some pages of Appendix C are only available as images within the MS Word document.

TOM SMITH: Thank you Rodger, very nice speaker. We may...that might be one thing that I just as I sat here that we do another one of these on the call rather than go through reading it, if we get them done on time, we would email them out as draft answers to the question to be, you know, subject to further editing, but as I said well, this is our first time through this process. So, right now I am going to pick a name out of the hat and what we'll do is we go through the group once and then if...then I will go through again to go to your second questions and so on. So the first one out of the hat, Facet Technology, do you have a first question?

ANDREW MUNYON: We don't have any questions at this time.

TOM SMITH: Okay. Number 2, C.T. Male?

EDWARD GARRIGAN: We have no questions at this time.

TOM SMITH: Number 3, NAVTEQ?

MIKE BUCKLEY: No Questions.

TOM SMITH: Was that a no? No question?

MIKE BUCKLEY: No.

ATHAR NAQI: Actually yeah, this is Naqi. I have a quick question here just more on the administrative side on page 15? You know, the top line says, you know, T&M proposal must contain the following instructions in the order enumerated below. Then there is on Page 107 there is another order, I thought it was Page 107, so I am sure one is an oversight or a typo whatever?

Cheryl Benjamin: Naqi are talking about in the middle of Page 15, it says "in addition the bidder must specify in its agreement and its numbered a,b,c,d,e,f?"

TOM SMITH: I think he is looking at the top of the page?

Athar Naqi: Yeah on the top of the page organizational overview is A, but Page 107 is Part 1 which is fine I guess, project overview is B on Page 15. On Page 107 is Part 2 but then we have you know, number C is references but references is Part 4. Do you want us to use Part 1, 2, 3 and 4 as in Page 107 or the one that's listed on Page 15?

(Muted from 107.12 till 107.28)

TOM SMITH: Hold on just a second.

Athar Naqi: Okay.

(Muted from 107.30 till 108.05)

TOM SMITH: I think we're inclined to say just follow the format as it appears in the Appendix the very parts as they are identified there in the Appendix.

Athar Naqi: Sure it makes sense. I just wanted it to be clear. Thank you.

TOM SMITH: Sure. Thanks. Baker Corp? I don't know whether Mr. Crino ever was able to join us? Apparently not. I...We called and emailed, but didn't get a response. Data Enhancement, any questions?

COLLEEN DITMARS: I don't have any at this time. Thank you.

TOM SMITH: Thank you. And Tele Atlas any questions?

SUSAN DAVIDSON: Yes, this is Susan Davidson. One quick question you did say that the whole transcript of this conference call might be online or might be available after the call?

TOM SMITH: Yes I...again this is our first time through that the vendor that we are using for the conference call has promised us the transcript within 48 hours, but we honestly don't really know what it's going to look like, really what the format is going to be. So I am just going to reserve judgment until we actually have it in hand about how we would...how we would distribute it or how we would post it, but that's certainly our intent that you know, if we'd done a live free bid with a stenographer, we would have made that available as well. So, we are going to post on the website, the participants in the pre-bid and if not at the same time, very shortly thereafter we would...we will try put up the transcript.

SUSAN DAVIDSON: Thank you.

TOM SMITH: All right, well as I said, we have another until the third to submit additional questions and we'll...oh yeah I am sorry, does anybody else any have any follow up questions.

Frank Winters: Facet?

ANDREW MUNYON: Nothing.

Frank Winters: C.T. Male?

EDWARD GARRIGAN: None.

Frank Winters: NAVTEQ?

Athar Naqi: None.

Frank Winters: Baker? Data Enhancement?

BERNARD CATALINOTTO: No.

Frank Winters: And Tele Atlas?

SUSAN DAVIDSON: No.

TOM SMITH: All right. So if you think of any others submit them to the ALIS mail box in writing and we will have the answers..... and thank you for participating. Oh I am sorry I skipped something that is my responsibility. Just the rest of the timeline as I mentioned the final questions are due on July 3rd at 4:30. We will have our responses out posted on the website by Friday July 11th. Proposals are due at 2:00 on Tuesday July 22nd. We are intending to notify the selected bidder and the non-selected bidders on Monday, August 4th. We will finalize the contract with the selected bidder by August 15th. And then, we would put

together the contact package and submit it to the control agencies. A ballpark would be 4 to 8 weeks after we finalize the contract.

(Muted on 112.42 until 113.08)

So, that would be... that is our anticipated timeframe and we appreciate everybody participating and we look forward to reviewing your proposals. Thank you very much.

Colleen Ditmars: Thank you very much.

SUSAN DAVIDSON: Thank you.

Male Speaker: Thank you.

Male Speaker: Thank you.