

ADDENDUM TWO

DATE: September 30, 2013

TO: All Vendors

FROM: Michelle Musick/Nancy Storant, Buyers
 State Purchasing Bureau

RE: Questions and Answers for RFP Number 4479Z1
 to be opened November 12, 2013 2:00 p.m. Central Time

Following are the questions submitted and answers provided for the above mentioned Request For Proposal. The questions and answers are to be considered as part of the Request For Proposal.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
1. Will the state be open to considering a cloud-based hosted RMS solution?	No.
2. Will the State consider an Irrevocable Letter of Credit from a national bank in place of the Performance Bond?	No.
3. Will Nebraska accept a US-based Escrow agent that will provide the same quality of service and reliability as the National Computing Center in the UK?	Yes.
4. Is a narrative response required for every requirement in the matrix (beginning on page 78) or only those requiring additional information?	No, they are not required, but will be scored. The more information provided, the better opportunity for scoring.
5. Section II.G, Proposal Opening, appears to indicate that proposals may be viewed by Vendors during the same period of time that the Nebraska Evaluation Committee is performing their evaluation of proposals (subject, generally to provisions of II.TT, Proprietary Information). Is this correct?	Proposals will be available for viewing by those present at the proposal opening. After the public opening, proposals will no longer be available for viewing or for Records Requests until an Intent to Award has been posted.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>6. Concerning the use of TRACS for eCitation and eCrash data collection: will the NSP consider a fully intrinsic citation and crash data solution? We provide a 100% MMUCC compliant crash solution, completely and seamlessly woven together with citation, DUI, and Tow capabilities.</p>	<p>NSP is embedded in use of TRACS and desires to continue using but will consider other options.</p>
<p>7. With regards to interface with Tiburon CAD, will the NSP purchase Tiburon's Universal Data Stream or TiburonCONNECT functionality, and facilitate the cooperation needed between Tiburon and the selected RMS vendor?</p>	<p>There are no plans to purchase these products; however, if these products are necessary for the continued functionality, all costs including maintenance fees should be included in vendor's proposal response as an optional interface cost.</p>
<p>8. With regards to interface with Tiburon CAD, what are Tiburon capabilities to accept and process AVL/GPS information from the selected mobile vendor's MDC?</p>	<p>The current version of CAD that NSP is using does not have the capability to accept and process AVL/GPS information from the selected vendor's MDC.</p>
<p>9. The RFP notes in IV.B.5.d. that the "AVL system is not currently integrated with CAD..." What are the NSP's current AVL capabilities, and how/by whom are they provided?</p>	<p>The NSP currently uses MACH for the AVL solution. This application is provided by TEG.</p>
<p>10. Can an example of the desired Juvenile Contact form be provided?</p>	<p>The form may be found at the following link: http://supremecourt.ne.gov/sites/supremecourt.ne.gov/files/rules/forms/NE_Juv_Civil_Citation.pdf</p>
<p>11. Requirement ARCH-5 indicates that the NSP will <u>only</u> consider a fully browser-based RMS solution. Other requirements seem to indicate the NSP will accept a more traditional Client/Server or Thin Client model (for example, IR-17). Please clarify the NSP's position.</p>	<p>NSP will consider all options that will operate efficiently within NSP's mobile environment. ARCH-5 states, "The system should be a web based solution utilizing a service-oriented architecture..." where "should" indicates an expectation, which is not a mandatory requirement. The request may be "preferred", but not required.</p>
<p>12. We understand the NSP's desire for a "device agnostic" (ARCH-7) solution. What are the mandatory (minimum) device and OS requirements for client device support?</p>	<p>Please refer back to Section IV, B and ARCH-7. Any solution will have to operate in the current environment and be adaptable to future technologies.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>13. A number of references are made to using information from a variety of tools, databases and resources. Please describe the NSP’s vision for Timesheet data, citing if necessary the Timesheet collection method/system to be interfaced?</p>	<p>Please disregard any reference to interfaces with timesheet data.</p> <p>Section IV “Calls for Service”, “Incident Reporting”, and “Investigative Case Management” on pages 97 – 109; is hereby amended to all references to “(NFIN, Timesheets, CAD, SOR, PCH)”, will be changed to “(NFIN, Timesheets, CAD, SOR, PCH)”.</p>
<p>14. Requirement CS-2 indicates the NSP’s desire for self-dispatch or silent-dispatch capabilities. Does the existing Tiburon CAD support this type of bi-directional data exchange?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>15. Requirement CS-2. The RMS should allow users to create incidents and their associated incident numbers in CAD, with minimal associated details. What is the intended functionality for the RMS to create for service in the CAD? Is it NSP’s intent to also replace the MDC/MACH capabilities currently in place?</p>	<p>The intended functionality is for the investigator to log into RMS and create his/her own case number.</p> <p>NSP does not intend to replace the MACH application at this time.</p>
<p>16. For Requirement CS-3, please describe the vision for number 22: “<i>All radio traffic entries for units attached to the call</i>”.</p>	<p>Section IV “Calls for Service” CS-3, page 98; the intent of NSP is to populate RMS with as much of the accompanying CAD call information as possible.</p>
<p>17. Is there currently a State standard for the “Probable Cause Affidavit report form that can be printed and/or sent electronically to the local jail facility” (Arrest: Key Concern 2)?</p>	<p>There is no state standard or form. Please see response to question #31 for additional information.</p>
<p>18. FM-1.6. indicates the Fleet Management solution should provide information regarding parts inventory and warranties. “Parts inventory” seems to imply a full inventory management solution for all vehicle service and repairs. Please elaborate on the “parts inventory” requirement, including any interface to a broader Fleet Service application.</p>	<p>An interface will not be required as there is no Fleet Service application. Equipment/items assigned to the vehicle and their associated serial number will need to be tracked in the RMS. (radio, repeater, portable radio, scanner, in car video radar, lidar, etc.)</p> <p>The Fleet Management solution should also capture information related to unit service and repairs (date, description of service/repair, associated cost, and unit #).</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>19. The Implementation Approach section indicates the go live for RMS to be not later than 1Q-2015, and the optional CAD, if selected, not scheduled for go live prior to 4Q-2015. Given the expense and effort required of the NSP, Tiburon, and the selected CAD/RMS vendor on integration tasks, would the NSP consider pulling the optional CAD go live forward to coincide with RMS go live?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>20. For Requirement CAD-4.31, please elaborate on the desire for the RMS to “Support interface with multiple user-defined premise information databases that are automatically searched and generate a pop-up message to alert the operator if a new incident is created and a match is found in the premise information file.” Is there a common adapter for all of the user-defined information databases? Or would a custom interface be required for each of these user-defined information databases? Please also approximate the number and type (RDBMS) of each of the user-defined information databases.</p>	<p>No, there is no common adapter for all of the user-defined information databases.</p> <p>Yes, a custom interface may be required for each of these user-defined information databases.</p> <p>Approximately three (3) user-defined information databases are used to include: SOR, TraCS and RMS.</p>
<p>21. Regarding Requirement CAD-4.41, does the NSP currently employ a method to “provide the call taker with a list of structured questions to ask the caller” such as Priority Dispatch, APCO 9-1-1 Adviser or similar electronic product? Please elaborate.</p>	<p>No, the Nebraska State Patrol does not currently use this type of product.</p>
<p>22. If a Communications Specialist transfers units from their primary geographic area to another (CAD-36), is responsibility for the CFS also transferred to the corresponding Communications Specialist for the “new” area? Or must the original Communications Specialist continue to manage the CFS to completion?</p>	<p>Yes, if a Communications Specialist transfers units from their primary geographic area to another, the responsibility for the CFS is also transferred to the corresponding Communications Specialist for the new area. No, the original Communications Specialist does not need to continue to manage the CFS to completion.</p>
<p>23. Requirement SR-9 – please provide examples of report types indicated.</p>	<p>Please see response to Question 31.</p>
<p>24. GIS Mandatory Requirement (page 129) – Please further define the requirement “multiple geo-code service simultaneously”</p>	<p>The ability to connect to more than one geo-code service (of NSP’s choosing) occurring at the same time.</p>

QUESTIONS		ANSWERS
<p>25. Requirement INT-24 Filebound – RMS requirements indicate a linking to information stored in Filebound, but the Interfaces section indicate a requirement to send images and documents and files. Please further define the requirement with the Filebound document management system. If a send function is truly required, please provide interface specifications.</p>		<p>“Interfaces - Filebound”, INT-23 (not INT-24), page 163 states “The RMS should be able to send images, documents and supporting files directly....” where “should” indicates an expectation, which is not a mandatory requirement. The request may be “preferred”, but not required.</p> <p>The user should be able to store a link within the RMS to a record within Filebound.</p> <p>Since “send function” is not required, specifications will not be provided at this time.</p>
<p>26. Requirement INT-25 BEAST – please provide additional description, capabilities and specifications for interfacing to the BEAST system</p>		<p>The vendor of this application is Porter Lee (http://www.porterlee.com/). No API currently exists; however, this vendor has interfaced with RMS solutions to varying degrees. Data is stored in Oracle.</p>
<p>27. Can you please providing the following information regarding your existing RMS system so we can accurately size your system?</p>		<p>The number of CAD Calls for Service is represented in the table on page 35 as “CAD Events per year”. The Records Case Reports is represented in the table on page 35 as “Incident / Cases per year”.</p> <p>All remaining categories will not be collected through this system.</p>
Item	Annual Number Created	
CAD Calls for Service Per year		
Records Case Reports Per Year		
Field Interviews Per Year		
Bookings Per Year		
Warrants Per Year		
Citations Per Year		
Pawns Per Year		
<p>28. What network connectivity is available from the primary site and the disaster recovery site to the various workstation locations?</p>		<p>Primary site is 1G. DR site is 200M shared. Outlying connectivity varies – including 3G modems, 4G modems, 1-10M DSL, 10M Ethernet.</p>
<p>29. What is the distance between the primary site and the disaster recovery site?</p>		<p>Between 50-100 miles.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>30. ARCH-2. The RMS should support residing on servers located at and maintained by NSP. All new enterprise applications at NSP are deployed - in a Hyper-V environment using Windows 2008 and 2012. Describe the optimal hardware architecture and configuration for bidder's proposed solution. Please list the specific hardware components necessary to implement the proposed solution. Include the recommended configuration for the system (processors, cache speed, memory, configuration[s]) and any additional requirements to operate the RMS solution. Further, bidders should provide an overview of the use of IP ports, protocols and transports required by RMS and other proposed application components. Finally, please describe the firewall configuration necessary for operations. Include any additional configuration and port requirements for a public access component. Will NSP only consider a virtualized solution? Is Hyper-V the only software to be used for a virtualized solution? Will other solutions or software be considered?</p>	<p>NSP prefers a virtualized solution.</p> <p>Hyper-V is the preferred software to be used for a virtualized solution. NSP's databases currently run in a Hyper-V environment. If an alternative solution is proposed, the vendor's database will be expected to operate within that environment.</p> <p>Other solutions or software may be considered.</p>
<p>31. SR-9. The RMS should support creation of a variety of standard or commonly used types of Incidents/Reports and allow new types or templates to be created over time. NSP currently utilizes the reports such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Case Reports 2. Use of Force 3. Pursuit Critique 4. Search Warrant 5. Standardized Field Sobriety Test 6. Evidence Inventory 7. Missing Persons Report <p>Do the following reports need to be created by the vendors? If so, can you provide a sample of these reports?</p>	<p>Yes. If the proposed RMS solution has a pre-formatted report, it must be customizable to NSP's needs. Please provide any report building application functionality.</p> <p>Please see report samples attached which include the following: Evidence Inventory (Attachment 1), Pursuit Critique (Attachment 2), Use of Force Report (Attachment 3), and Case Report (Attachment 4).</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>32. CAD-39. The CAD system should allow for held status codes for monitoring and granting of outstanding requests. Can NPS explain “monitoring and granting of outstanding requests”?</p>	<p>Monitoring and granting of outstanding requests specifically relates to situations where a lower priority call has come in and is put on hold until the nearest unit becomes available for assignment.</p> <p>An example would be holding a CFS for a specific unit. When that unit becomes available, it would be recommended for assignment to that call.</p>
<p>33. Interfaces e-Citations NSP currently uses TraCS 10 for e-citations. The RMS system would be expected to integrate with TraCS data. Until the appropriate services are available to consume TraCS data in a more automated way NSP would like the RMS system to consume XML files that TraCS produces for each e-citation. Do you need to be able to print e-citations migrated to the RMS system in a specific state or NSP format? If so, can you provide an example?</p>	<p>No printing is required.</p>
<p>34. e-Crash NSP currently uses the Department of Roads web based electronic accident form (EAF). However, it is NSP’s intention to develop the State crash form within NSP’s TraCS 10 along with e-Citation. The RMS system will be expected to consume XML files that TraCS produces for each e-crash. Do you need to be able to print e-Crash reports migrated to the RMS system in a specific state or NSP format? If so, can you provide an example?</p>	<p>No printing is required.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>35. RMS Incident Publish The vision of NSP is that the Incident Publish interface will be able to support multiple purposes depending on the event that is triggering it. For example, this interface may support the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision Data to NDEX, LINX or other regional /national repositories 2. NIBRS based reporting to Crime Commission 3. Provision Data to Fusion Centers <p>Do we need to provide interfaces to these systems as part of the base solution? Or should these be considered optional interfaces?</p>	<p>Yes. The proposals should include costs for each interface solution.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>36. Training Vision Based on past experience, NSP prefers the contractor to provide a vision of direct training to all staff (i.e., this precludes use of a train-the-trainer approach which has failed in the past). NSP would prefer a multi-phase approach in which users are first introduced to basic functions of the RMS and at a later time, a subset of all users also receives intermediate and advanced training. It is expected that approximately 25-35% of users will receive intermediate and advanced training. It is expected that trainings will be targeted for the type of users (e.g., officer, administrative personnel, system administrators, etc.).</p> <p>Could NSP please identify how many users need to be trained for Law Records Managements System training?</p> <p>Depending upon the number of users that would need to be trained, it may be necessary to conduct multiple training sessions that may affect project duration and cost. Would the County consider a Train-the-Trainer training approach rather than end-user training?</p> <p>If CAD system is optionally bid, how many users would need to be trained for the CAD system? Depending upon the number of users that would need to be trained, it may be necessary to conduct multiple training sessions that may affect project duration and cost. Would the County consider a Train-the-Trainer training approach rather than end-user training?</p>	<p>Approximately 600 users need to be trained for Law Records Management System.</p> <p>The State will not consider Train-the-Trainer training.</p> <p>Please refer back to Page 36 in the RFP for the number of CAD users. The State will not consider Train-the-Trainer training.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>37. Training – (Requirement IMP-1). In IMP-1, you state “The RMS contractor SHALL provide onsite, hands-on end user training directly to all system users” and you also state “NSP prefers the contractor to provide a vision of direct training to all staff (i.e., this precludes use of a train-the-trainer approach which has failed in the past).”</p> <p>We prefer a Train-the-Trainer approach, which we have used successfully in all of our implementations, and our project staff have a great deal of expertise and experience with guiding customer training staff through the necessary processes. A train-the-trainer approach allows customers to (1) build up their own in-house expertise, and (2) to customize training materials to reflect police business procedures.</p> <p>QUESTION: Will NSP consider a train-the-trainer approach?</p>	<p>No. The State will not consider Train-the-Trainer training approach.</p>
<p>38. 99.999% uptime</p> <p>Form C, section E specifies</p> <p>5. System Maintenance shall also include all services necessary to maintain the 99.999% system operational uptime, and redundancy, described herein for all products provided by the contractor to include all system configurations, troubleshooting, and resolution of system errors, malfunctions, and system restoration. Scheduled downtime for maintenance or upgrades shall not be included in the calculation of system operational uptime.</p> <p>Our company will not agree to this number as a mandatory requirement. We typically contract for 99.5% availability, although in practice availability is usually much higher.</p> <p>QUESTION: Is 99.5% operational uptime acceptable?</p>	<p>Yes. Form C, Section E is hereby amended to read as follows: “99.999% 99.5% or greater”</p>
<p>39. Equipment & Asset Management and Fleet Management</p> <p>QUESTION: Are these requirements mandatory?</p>	<p>No.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>40. Project Methodology (Requirements IMP-1, IMP-4, IMP-7, IMP-8, IMP-9) We would like to propose an alternate approach to implementation that differs from the one proposed on pages 143 – 146 of your bid. We have our own project methodology that we have used to successfully implement more than 20 large RMS replacement projects. QUESTION: Can we answer these questions within the context of our own (proven) project methodology? QUESTION: For the requested test plans: we are willing to provide these but at this stage we can only provide examples. Actual test plans for NSP would be developed in conjunction with the NSP team as part of the project. The reason for this is that the test plans incorporate agency-defined configuration parameters based on specific business needs. The actual test plans are agency specific. Is this sufficient?</p>	<p>Yes. Please state how your solution meets or exceeds the RFP requirements.</p> <p>Yes. Please state how your solution meets or exceeds the RFP requirements.</p>
<p>41. Optional CAD system QUESTION: This is presented as an optional unit of functionality but there is an extensive set of requirements. How will the scoring be weighted? Will preference be given to vendors who provide both RMS and CAD?</p>	<p>There will be no preference given to vendors who provide both RMS and CAD as the State may or may not purchase the optional CAD.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>42. Mandatory requirements In the Section V Proposal Instructions that begin on page 49, you state “This section documents the mandatory requirements that must be met by bidders in preparing the Technical and Cost Proposal.” QUESTION: Does this statement mean that all of the requirements in Section V are mandatory, or only the ones specifically marked as mandatory and requiring initials?</p>	<p>Mandatory Requirements for the RFP is listed on page 5, Section II, L. 1-5.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Signed, in ink, Request for Proposal for Contractual Services Form; 2. Executive Summary 3. Corporate Overview 4. Technical Approach, and 5. Cost Proposal, Attachment D <p>Proposals not meeting Mandatory Requirements will be excluded from further evaluation.</p> <p>Form C, page 64, states that the bidder’s initials signify guaranteed compliance with the project requirements; which is the Technical Approach, item #4 of the Mandatory Requirements. A bidder may indicate any exceptions to project requirements including an explanation for the bidder’s inability to comply with such requirements which includes a statement recommending requirement the bidder would find acceptable. Inability to guarantee compliance or rejection in whole or in part of the project requirement may be cause for rejection of a bidder’s proposal.</p> <p>Form D, page 182, the Cost Proposal Templates; is the Cost Proposal, item 5 of the Mandatory Requirements. The Mandatory Cost Proposals include Tables D1 through D6; forms which must be completed and returned with the Bidder’s response. Table D7 through D9 must be included if responding to the Optional CAD Project.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>43. Technical Support (Item 1.a.i on page 75) This item states: “The contractor must provide user support Monday through Friday, at least eight (8) hours per day. The coverage should be twenty-four (24) hours a day, seven (7) days a week, every day (24 x 7 x 365) for RMS support.” QUESTION – Regarding the “user support” portion of this requirement, our support model typically features the contractor providing third-level end user support to customer-appointed points of contact. The customer’s help desk and RMS specialists provide level 1 and 2 end user support. Is this an acceptable model for NSP?</p>	<p>Yes. This is an acceptable model for NSP.</p>
<p>44. With reference to page 1: It is not clear what Round 1 means and what Round 2 means. i.e. If we miss the round 1 deadline can we still submit all of our questions in round 2?</p>	<p>Missing Round 1 Questions will not eliminate a bidder from submitting questions for Round 2.</p>