AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. Contract Number N/A	Page of Pages
2. Amendment/Modification Number DCTO-2010-I-0053-1	3. Effective Date 2/19/2010	4. Requisition/Purchase Request No.		5. Solicitation Caption Integrated Hrdwre-Sftwre I.T. Solution

6. Issued By: Code	7. Administered By (If other than line 6)
Office of Conracting and Procurement OCTO 441 4th Street, NW, suite 709N Washington, DC 20001	

8. Name and Address of Contractor (No. Street, city, country, state and ZIP Code)		
N/A	(X)	9A. Amendment of Solicitation No. DCTO-2010-I-0053
		9B. Dated (See Item 11) 2/19/2010
		10A. Modification of Contract/Order No.
		10B. Dated (See Item 13)
Code	Facility	

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

[ ] The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers [ ] is extended. [X] is not extended.
Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment: (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or fax which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment number. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or fax, provided each letter or telegram makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. Accounting and Appropriation Data (If Required)

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14

	A. This change order is issued pursuant to: (Specify Authority) The changes set forth in Item 14 are made in the contract/order no. in item 10A.
	B. The above numbered contract/order is modified to reflect the administrative changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) set forth in item 14, pursuant to the authority of 27 DCMR, Chapter 36, Section 3601.2.
	C. This supplemental agreement is entered into pursuant to authority of:
X	D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority) **Supplemental to respond to vendor questions**

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor [X] is not, [ ] is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. Description of amendment/modification (Organized by UCF Section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

The following amendment to DCTO-2010-I-0053 fielding responses to questions that were submitted by interested vendors.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item (9A or 10A) remain unchanged and in full force and effect

15A. Name and Title of Signer (Type or print)		16A. Name of Contracting Officer	
Kirk Benson/ Contract Specialists		John Varghese	
15B. Name of Contractor (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. Date Signed	16B. District of Columbia (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. Date Signed 3/26/2010

1. The RFI request document regarding Driver Authentication states that "any one or more of the following methods" will be required:
   - “Personal Identification Number (PIN)
   - Non Federal Personal Identity Verification Interoperable (NFI PIV-I) credential. For this RFI, a NFI PIV-I credential is defined as a credential compliant with the guidance set forth in Personal Identity Verification Interoperability for Non-Federal Issuers, issued by the Federal CIO Council in May 2009 (available at http://www.idmanagement.gov/documents/PIV_IO_NonFed_Issuers_May2009.pdf .
   - Biometric such as fingerprint”

   a. Will the NFI PIV-I compliant card be required?

      The District requires that the TSCC include the increased security of an integrated smart chip credential, specifically, the standardized, interoperable credential commonly referred to as Personal Identity Verification Interoperable (PIV-I).

2. If the NFI PIV-I card is required will the Taxi Driver's NFI PIV-I card be used for access to any facility other than the taxicab?

   No additional requirements to use the PIV-I card for physical facility access have been identified.

3. Is a formal TSCC vendor approval for compliance with Federal CIO Council's HSPD12 minimum requirements according to NIST Technical Specifications and FIPS requirements for the NFI PIV-I card and processing system required?

   TSCC vendors are not required to receive formal approval for compliance with HSPD-12 and NIST FIPS requirements for this RFI.

4. Who would be considered the issuer and Registration Agent responsible for Identity Proofing and issuing the NFI PIV-I card according to the NIST definition below. Is it the TSCC vendor, the District of Columbia Taxi Commission or other regulatory agency?

   The District will likely be an issuer of the PIV-I cards to operators.

5. Are there any other requirements for the PKI Certificate Authority? "PIV Issuer—The entity that performs credential personalization operations and issues the identity credential to the Applicant after all identity proofing, background checks, and related approvals have been completed. The PIV Issuer is also responsible for maintaining records and controls for PIV credential stock to ensure that stock is only used to issue valid credentials."

   No additional requirements for the PKI Certificate Authority or PIV Issuer have been identified as part of this RFI.

6. Will a unique NFI Smart Card GUID numbering scheme be specified by the District of Columbia Taxi Commission or other regulatory authority?

The PIV-I credential will use the Universally Unique Identifier (UUID) instead of the GUID. The UUID numbering scheme will be generated using the PIV-I Specification approved via NIST Standards and verified through independent testing. Note that the UUID would be used for low-level authentication which is not expected to be sufficient for the TSCC solution. The current requirement is for the TSCC solution to use the PIV-I Authentication certificate for validation and authentication.

7. What would be the term of the NFI PIV-I card indicated by the issue date and expiration date?

   The term of the PIV-I card has not been decided, but, it will likely be 3 years.

8. Will RFI responders be permitted to mark sections of the RFI "Proprietary and Confidential. Public disclosure is not permitted"? Otherwise will the RFI responses be made public after April 9th?

   As this is a request for “information” we are utilizing the expertise of the interested parties to help expand our core requirements with ideas of what those interested parties believe could be an ultimate solution. With this in mind, if vendors feel that information is of a proprietary nature and are not comfortable divulging that information, that will be a decision left to the vendor. Understand that with the freedom of information act all information is available to the public unless it can be justified that it should be deemed confidential . If we received any requests for information that was marked confidential, a letter would be issued to the pertinent party and a formal justification would have to be made through our legal counsel for OCP to legally withhold any information.

9. How do you plan to evaluate the vendor RFP responses as to whether they are responsive and meet the requirements for vendor approval to sell ?

   This is an RFI to better understand the viability of prospective TSCC solutions and to match DCTC goals to specific business and technical requirements. No formal vendor selections or approvals will be performed as part of the RFI.

10. Will there be an evaluation committee?

    See response to question #9 above.

11. Will a consultant(s) be used?

    See response to question #9 above.

12. Will the evaluation method, results and evaluators be disclosed following the evaluation and vendor selection process?

    See response to question #9 above.

13. Following the RFI, does the District of Columbia Taxi Commission intend to publish TAXICAB with SMART CHIP CREDENTIAL (TSCC) system operating standards for open market vendor competition?

That is, will any vendor who meets the standards of operation would be approved to sell and install their system. I am raising this question based on the unfortunate Taxi Industry experience in New York which has previously been reported in two attached "investigative" reports.

The District intends to use the information provided in response to this Request for Information (RFI) to develop a Request for Proposals (RFP), which would lead to the procurement of one or more TSCC solutions. The form and requirements for a TSCC RFP have not been determined and under no circumstance does this RFI imply or obligate the District of Columbia to issue an RFP.

14. Dispatch capabilities: dispatch is mentioned in the RFI as something that can benefit the drivers and/or taxi cab companies. Is the Commission's goal to use the deployment of technology in the cabs as an opportunity to increase dispatch capability in DC? Would the Commission expect that a larger number of cabs be 'dispatch-able' once the devices are deployed? Is the Commission considering requiring that the technology deployed have dispatch capability? Would the project require integration to the existing dispatch systems that are used by fleets (e.g., Pathfinder dispatch used by Yellow Cab)?

    The broad requirements include a messaging capability between drivers and dispatch which would only apply to drivers utilizing dispatch. TSCC vendors are encouraged to demonstrate or highlight additional driver interface features that would benefit drivers – not necessarily related to dispatch. No additional direction on dispatch policies are implied in the RFI.

15. Equipment deployment/rollout: given how many different taxi fleets there are in the city, what methods for deploying the equipment has the Commission considered? Has the commission considered a centralized deployment garage, and if not, would it be adverse to such a deployment methodology? Will the vendors be required to set up installation facilities or will the Commission be responsible for this? What type of certification and oversight will the city provide for installation?

    The District has not considered the methods for deploying equipment and would encourage ideas on potential deployment methodologies and certification policies.

16. Business model:

    a. Thus far we have not seen a totally free business model, since there is a significant upfront investment for the vendor in deploying the equipment; at least thus far, advertising revenue has not been sufficient to support the full cost of equipment and technology. In New York, the business model is largely built around credit card processing charges, with the costs to driver offset by higher tips and an increase in the cab fare. Has the commission considered something similar – increase in cab fare in order to help drivers with added costs of credit card processing? (It is important to note that Mayor Bloomberg agreed to the fare increase in New York in order to help drivers with the new costs associated with the PIM deployment. However, because the fare increase went into effect two years before the equipment was deployed, there was a significant amount of driver opposition to equipment deployment even

though fares had been increased to support it.)

Outside of the intent to deploy the TSCC equipment at no cost to the District or drivers, no decisions on the business model have been made. We look forward to ideas and creative options on structuring the business model.

b. Has the Commission considered, or would it consider, a surcharge model? We have seen this in some cities, such as Las Vegas, where passengers are charged $3 extra to pay with a credit card.

See response to question #16.a above.

17. Contracting: With over 6,000 cabs, 8,500 drivers, and 100 taxi companies, DC is very different from NYC, where individual driver/operators have to make a very significant investment in a medallion and thus are likely to stay in business for the long-term, whereas becoming an individual operator in DC is significantly easier and cheaper. Given this difference, has the Commission considered any ways in which it will assist vendors in protecting their financial investment when they deploy the equipment? If vendors are providing devices at no upfront cost to the driver, and the driver defaults on the agreement, what assistance is the city prepared to provide in terms of recovery of the assets. Some possibilities for this could include:

a. One or more vendors contracting directly with the Commission to deploy the equipment, which then would 'resell' equipment directly to fleets and drivers.

b. One or more vendors contracting with fleets, who then would be responsible for 'reselling' equipment to drivers.

No decisions on the contracting structure have been made and we encourage respondents to offer ideas on structuring contracts with drivers/operators.

18. If RFI responses include technology and hardware for using the PIV-I credentials for authentication:

a. Is it the intent of the District to require authentication solutions to validate the current status (valid, revoked, suspended) of the PIV Authentication certificate via real-time online certificate status protocol [OCSP] checks? Or will the District consider solutions leveraging a valid caching method, which polls certificate status periodically and can cache the responses for a very short period of time (useful in scenarios when network connectivity is unavailable or for very quick response times)?

The District would prefer an authentication solution that validates the current status of the PIV Authentication certificate via real-time OCSP checks. However, the District recognizes that network connectivity in a mobile solution cannot be guaranteed and a back-up cached OCSP response component of the TSCC solution will likely be required.

b. Will the District authentication solution be required to validate the issuer of the PIV Authentication certificate is a certified and federated issuing entity (PIV or PIV-I, not PIV-C or demo)?

The District intends the TSCC solution to validate that the issuer of the PIV Authentication certificate is certified and that the certificate is issued by a federated issuing entity (PIV or PIV-I). For the purposes of the RFI, it will be adequate to demonstrate authentication of a PIV-C or other demo certificate.

19. Will the District authentication solution be required to validate the attributes of the PIV-I credential holders to ensure the holder is a taxi driver, and not any of the other 5.5M+ individuals with PIV & PIV-I credentials?

Yes.

a. If yes, will these attributes be information that the District maintains and manages via District owned system such as a centralized database or service?

The District authentication solution is required to validate that PIV-I credential holders are licensed taxi drivers. Taxi license attributes will be managed by the District, but, the mechanism to communicate attribute information has not yet been determined. RFI respondents are encouraged to offer suggestions for communicating taxi license attribute information to the in-taxicab TSCC authentication solution.

b. If yes, will these attributes be available via webservices?

See response to question #19.a above.

c. If yes, will the District enforce PKI based system-to-system [DC SYSTEM -to-TAXI SYSTEM] security on the webservices to ensure the system requesting the taxi licensure information is a valid requestor with access rights to the taxi attributes, and no data is transmitted via clear text?

See response to question #19.a above.

20. Will the District accept suggestions via the RFI response for security features and best practices to protect any Personal Identifiable Information [PII] from being misused by the technology solutions?

Yes, suggestions in the RFI for security features and best practices for protecting PII are encouraged.

Will DCTC issue a mandate that all DC taxis must have the specified RFI / RFP equipment in their cabs to operate in DC?

DCTC has not made any decisions concerning whether or not to mandate any technology solutions contemplated in the RFI.

21. What is the number of actual taxi cabs that will need this technology in DC?

The number of actual taxi cabs operating in DC that will need this technology has not been determined.