

ADDENDUM ONE QUESTIONS and ANSWERS

Date: December 7, 2022

To: All Bidders

From: Connie Heinrichs, Buyer
AS Materiel State Purchasing Bureau (SPB)

RE: Addendum for Request for Proposal Number 6724 Z1 to be opened January 12, 2023 at 2:00 p.m. Central Time

Questions and Answers

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. It is the Bidder's responsibility to check the State Purchasing Bureau website for all addenda or amendments.

Question Number	RFP Section Reference	RFP Page Number	Question	State Response
1.	Attachment C	Pg.3, MBP-1	While much of the configuration for message keys can be done by NSP administrators, we believe an advanced, modern user interface requires vendor support in some cases. Would the State accept, as an alternative, vendor managed UI changes if they are included in the annual support with a reasonable response time SLA?	Attachment C, MBP-1 is deleted and replaced with the following: The solution should accommodate changes to existing message keys by NSP administrators and the addition of new message keys as required, specifically allowing NSP administrators to add new, and change existing, message keys without vendor programming assistance.
2.	Attachment C	Pg.6, MBP-17	See question 1. Would the State accept, as an alternative, vendor managed UI changes if they are included in the annual support with a reasonable response time SLA?	Attachment C, MBP-17 is deleted and replaced with the following: The solution should enable key components of the MSS to be modified by system administrators to meet changing federal and state standards, without the need to contract with a vendor to make changes.
3.	Attachment C	Pg.7, MAN-1	We think it is better for NSP administrators to configure logging of images rather than individual users. Is that acceptable?	Attachment C, MAN-1 is deleted and replaced with the following: The solution shall log every inbound and outbound transaction and messaging action. Images should be cited without including the image file in the log, unless specifically requested

				by the user. Logging should be configurable by MSS administrators.
4.	Attachment C	Pg.17, HF-1	Since NSP requires NIEM XML (in HF-3), should this reference the recently released "NCIC NIEM XML Policy Manual" referenced in NCIC TOU 22-3?	It is not clear that the "NCIC NIEM XML Policy Manual" has been publicly released. However, it is the desire of NSP to remain compliant with the most current standards.
5.	Attachment C	Pg.17, HF-6, Pg.18, HF-7	Should these requirements only apply to Nebraska hot files? Search and reporting of NCIC hot files is limited to the capabilities provided by NCIC.	Yes. Attachment C, HF-6 and HF-7 requirement column NCIC or Nebraska is changed from "Both" to "Nebraska".
6.	Attachment C	Pg.18	Where can we find Nebraska reporting and state audit support requirements?	There are no documented Nebraska hot files reporting and auditing requirements.
7.	Attachment C	Pg.19 MIN-7	This requirement would not apply to a Cloud solution. Could NSP remove this requirement?	Attachment C, MIN-7 is hereby deleted.
8.	Attachment C	Pg.20 MIN-10	The hardware part of this requirement would not apply to a Cloud solution. Could NSP remove the hardware reference in this requirement?	Attachment C, MIN-10 is deleted and replaced with the following: The solution shall allow the addition of third-party software components (e.g., certification application).
9.	Attachment C	Pg.20 MIN-11	What are the anticipated increases in MSS throughput and workload over the five-year period?	Attachment C, MIN-11 is modified to include the following: The solution should be designed to allow for the addition of capacity to accommodate increases in MSS throughput and workload over a five-year period. The bidder should anticipate a 7.5% annual increase in throughput and workload.
10.	Attachment C	Pg.21 MIN-16	Can NSP provide the Omnixx Force/OpenFox Markup Language (OFML) specifications?	Yes, NSP can provide if requested.
11.	Attachment C	Pg.21 MIN-17	We believe SNMP monitoring is not applicable to a Cloud environment, as a Cloud environment provides its own network monitoring tools. Can NSP remove this requirement?	Attachment C, MIN-17 is deleted and replaced with the following: The solution should provide a Web-based tool set for centralized control of the system using an enterprise management platform.
12.	Attachment C	Pg.21 MIN-21	Does the disaster recovery hot site apply to all three environments (production, test, training) or just production?	The disaster recovery site in MIN-21 refers only to the production environment.
13.	Attachment C	Pg.22 MIN-22	While load balancing across geographically dispersed sites is a traditional solution to maximize resource usage, load balancing across sites is not necessarily beneficial in a Cloud deployment. In a Cloud deployment, resources are	Attachment C, MIN-22 is deleted and replaced with the following: The solution should include a disaster recovery hot site that provides real-time synchronization.

			quickly and easily added or removed as needed and built-in cloud solutions exist for disaster recovery. Can NSP remove the load balancing part of this requirement?	
14.	Attachment C	Pg.26 MAP-13	Is this referring to the vendor's development environment? There is no reference in the RFP to a deliverable development environment.	Attachment C, MAP-13 is deleted.
15.	Attachment C	Pg.28 MAP-22	If the MSS already associates a User with an agency, can the entry of Agency at sign-on be omitted?	No
16.	Attachment C	Pg.29 MAP-24	Items 1-3 are no longer considered secure by NIST standards. Can NSP remove these items, and perhaps replace them with an option for a self-service password reset capability based on the use of registered multi-factor authentication methods?	Attachment C, MAP-24 is deleted and replaced with the following: The solution shall comply with the password standards established by the current version of CJIS Security Policy (v5.9.1).
17.	Attachment C	Pg.35 MAP-53	Our experience is that mobile device management features can only be applied by the agency that supplies or authorizes the mobile devices. Can NSP remove this requirement?	Attachment C, MAP-53 is deleted and replaced with the following: If the solution accommodates access from a mobile device (MAP-52), the solution should provide mobile device management features for users accessing the solution from a mobile UI.
18.	Attachment C	Pg.40 MIT-13	Are the interface and protocol capabilities of the current MSS environment completely specified in the RFP? If not, can NSP provide specifications for the interface and protocol capabilities of the current MSS environment?	Specific interface protocols cannot be provided at this time. However, they can be made available or discoverable during detailed system design activities.
19.	Attachment C	Pg.39 MIT-4	Can NSP provide the interface specifications for the MSS interface to the PCH?	No, the MSS interface to the PCH uses Web Services.
20.	Attachment C	Pg.39 MIT-7	Can NSP provide the interface specifications for the MSS interface to Nebraska's DMV's Vehicle Title and Registration (VicToRy) server?	No, the MSS interface to the VicToRy server uses Web Services.
21.	Attachment C	Pg.39 MIT-8	Can NSP provide the interface specifications for the MSS interface to the OCIO state mainframe for DMV driver's licenses and photos?	This can be made available or discoverable during detailed system design activities.
22.	Attachment C	Pg.41 MIT-16	Can NSP provide the interface specifications for the MSS interface to the Nebraska SOR database?	No, the SOR database uses a batching process for sending and receiving transactions.
23.	Attachment C	Pg.41 MIT-17	Can NSP provide the interface specifications for the MSS interface to the MACH AVL system?	No. MACH AVL interfaces with the MSS as a mobile device.

24.	Attachment C	Pg.41 MIT-20	As stated in NCIC TOU 22-3, batch file processing MKEs (including \$.B) are not currently supported by NCIC NIEM. Can NSP qualify this requirement with “if supported by NCIC NIEM”?	Attachment C, MIT-20 is deleted and replaced with the following: The solution shall provide batch file processing from NCIC (e.g., \$.B), if supported by NCIC NIEM.
25.	Attachment D	Various pages throughout Attachment D	NCIC TOU 22-3 lists a number of NCIC MKEs that are not currently supported by NCIC NIEM. Can NSP note these in Attachment D with “if supported by NCIC NIEM”?	Per Attachment D, the solution shall accommodate all message keys in the table.
26.	Attachment C – Technical Requirements Section MIN-9	19	Will Nebraska consider any proposed solution that includes on-premises hardware?	No
27.	Attachment C – Technical Requirements Section MIN-23	22	In the event of the declaration of a disaster, what is the required time to become operational and active from the COOP site?	Attachment C, MIN-23 is deleted and replaced with the following: The primary site and the disaster recovery hot site should each be capable of providing 100% operating capability in the event that one site goes down and is inoperable. The disaster recovery hot site should be operational and active within 1 hour.
28.	Attachment C – Technical Requirements Section NET-1	22	It is understood that Nebraska prefers a cloud solution for the message switch. Is it acceptable for both the Primary site and the COOP site to reside within the same Cloud provider, assuming there is sufficient geographic separation between the Primary and COOP physical location?	Yes, this is acceptable.
29.	Evaluation Criteria	N/A	Please clarify the Evaluation Criteria for cost. Volume 3 – Cost Proposal Points shows 250 total possible points. The sample at the bottom shows the lowest cost proposal will receive 40 points. Will the lowest cost proposal be awarded 250 points or 40 points?	The evaluation criteria remain as stated. The lowest cost submitted will be awarded 250 points. The sample is an example of how this is calculated.
30.	MBP-5		The solution shall process all batch transactions from local agencies (e.g., processing a group of inquiries on a batch of data items or processing groups of record entries or modifications). Please specify what are the batch process needed, in which product (hotfiles, CCH??), MKEs, do they interface with a third party vender?	This can be made available or discoverable during detailed system design activities.

31.	MBP-17		<p>The solution shall enable key components of the MSS to be modified by system administrators to meet changing federal and state standards, without the need to contract with a vendor to make changes.</p> <p>Please provide of examples and scope of this requirement</p>	<p>For example, the issuance of a new FBI TOU that impacts MKE processing variables, such as adding a new required field.</p> <p>Also, see response to question #2.</p>
32.	MWF-15		<p>The solution shall provide the ability to manage a “dead letter file” of messages that cannot be successfully delivered.</p> <p>Is this for CCH, if not which application/product?</p>	<p>The “dead letter file” is for any message that cannot be successfully delivered to the destination, regardless of which system or application it is.</p>
33.	MAP-49		<p>The solution should provide the ability to load a Microsoft Word (or similar) file onto the system that is then available as a bulletin to advise of system updates and other information.</p> <p>Please provide details and examples</p>	<p>This is the ability to include an attachment to a broadcast notification or bulletin. An example is being able to create a missing person notice and attach it to a broadcast notification to all MSS connected agencies in the state.</p>
34.	MAP-51		<p>The solution should provide stackable transactions functionality, such as semi- batch processing.</p> <p>Please provide details and examples</p>	<p>For example, the current MSS can only process one update to Patrol Criminal History (PCH) at a time. This causes issues if one file errors. PCH would prefer to get a “batch” of transactions at a time.</p> <p>Attachment C, MAP-51 is deleted and replaced with the following:</p> <p>The solution should provide stackable transactions functionality, such as semi-batch processing.</p>
35.	MIT-6		<p>The solution shall seamlessly enable all current regional system interfaces to send properly formatted NCIC messages and transactions. This capability shall be in place on the first day of implementation.</p> <p>What is the current communications protocol for communicating to regional systems, is it DMPP-2020, custom NE state protocol or other?</p>	<p>Attachment C, MIT-6 is deleted and replaced with the following:</p> <p>The solution shall seamlessly enable all current regional system interfaces to send properly formatted NCIC messages and transactions. This capability shall be in place on the first day of implementation. The current communications protocol for communicating to regional systems is DMPP-2020.</p>
36.	MIT-7		<p>The solution shall interface with Nebraska’s Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV’s) Vehicle Title and Registration (VicToRy) server.</p> <p>What communications protocol is supported for communications with</p>	<p>Please see the answer to question #20.</p>

			DMV, is it DMPP-2020, Web Services or other?	
37.	MIT-8		<p>The solution shall interface with the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) state mainframe for DMV driver's licenses and photos.</p> <p>What is the current communications protocol between the switch and the mainframe, is it DMPP-2020, Web Services or a mainframe protocol such as TN3270?</p>	Please see the answer to question #21.
38.	MIT-17		<p>The solution shall interface with the Mobile Architecture for Communications Handling (MACH) Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) system.</p> <p>What is the current interface protocol used to communicate with the MACH and AVL system, is it a Web Services protocol (SOAP or RESTful), custom API or other?</p>	Please see the answer to question #23.
39.	HF-5		<p>The hot file solution should support Nebraska response formats.</p> <p>Please provide details and examples of Nebraska formats</p>	<p>The current Nebraska hot files use the legacy NCIC format prior to NCIC 2000.</p> <p>This can be made available or discoverable during detailed system design activities.</p>
40.	MAP-59		<p>The solution should provide for the development and maintenance of relational database structures for the support of MSS.</p> <p>Is MSS referring to allowing their staff to develop and maintain the databases?</p>	No, NSP does not intend to directly access the MSS databases.
41.	MAP-58		<p>The solution should provide tools for database design and development, including documentation, diagramming, normalization, database generation, screen design and generation, report design and generation, and procedure maintenance tools.</p> <p>Please provide details and examples of what is trying to be accomplished from the MSS side with these tools</p>	<p>Attachment C, MAP-58 is deleted and replaced with the following:</p> <p>The solution should provide best practice database design and development, including documentation, diagramming, normalization, database generation, screen design and generation, report design and generation, and procedure maintenance tools.</p>
42.	RFP Doc Section C		<p>Proposals due January 12, 2023 2:00 PM Central Time</p> <p>Due to the scope and breadth of the RFP, is an extension of the due date possible?</p>	Not at this time.

43.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.d		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Proposed Schedule Can the Schedule (IMS, DEL-03) be provided in Microsoft Project format (.mpp)?	Yes.
44.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.e		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Security Response Will preliminary versions of the In-Plant and Site Security Plan (DEL-10) and Property and Data Management Plan (DEL-32) suffice for this section?	Yes, as long as the preliminary versions of the DELs directly address the items in Section VI. C. 1. e.
45.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.g.i		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Operations Plan Response Will a preliminary version of the Interface Design Document (IDD, DEL-13) suffice for this section?	Yes, as long as the preliminary versions of the DELs directly address the items in Section VI. C. 1. g. i.
46.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.g.iii		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Operations Plan Response Will preliminary versiona of the Service Level Plan (SLP, DEL-33) and the Configuration Management Plan (CMP, DEL-29) suffice for this section?	Yes, as long as the preliminary versions of the DELs directly address the items in Section VI. C. 1. g. iii.
47.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.g.iv		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Operations Plan Response Will a preliminary version of the Service Level Plan (SLP, DEL-33) suffice for this section?	Yes, as long as the preliminary versions of the DELs directly address the items in Section VI. C. 1. g. iv.
48.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.g.v		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Operations Plan Response Will a preliminary version of the Training Plan (DEL-17) suffice for this section?	Yes, as long as the preliminary versions of the DELs directly address the items in Section VI. C. 1. g. v.
49.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.g.ix		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Security Response Will preliminary versions of the In-Plant and Site Security Plan (DEL-10) and Property and Data Management Plan (DEL-32) suffice for this section?	Yes, as long as the preliminary versions of the DELs directly address the items in Section VI. C. 1. g. ix.
50.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.g.x		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Operations Plan Response Will a preliminary version of the Service Level Plan (SLP, DEL-33) suffice for this section?	Yes, as long as the preliminary versions of the DELs directly address the items in Section VI. C. 1. g. x.
51.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.g.xi		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Operations Plan Response	Yes, as long as the preliminary versions of the DELs directly address the items in Section VI. C. 1. g. xi.

			Will a preliminary version of the Service Level Plan (SLP, DEL-33) suffice for this section?	
52.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.g.xii		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Operations Plan Response Will a preliminary version of the Service Level Plan (SLP, DEL-33) suffice for this section?	Yes, as long as the preliminary versions of the DELs directly address the items in Section VI. C. 1. g. xii.
53.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.g.xiii		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Operations Plan Response Will a preliminary version of the Configuration Management Plan (CMP, DEL-29) suffice for this section?	Yes, as long as the preliminary versions of the DELs directly address the items in Section VI. C. 1. g. xiii.
54.	RFP Section 6, Subsection C.1.g.xiv		Volume 2 Proposal Contents: Operations Plan Response Will a preliminary version of the Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP, DEL-22) suffice for this section?	Yes, as long as the preliminary versions of the DELs directly address the items in Section VI. C. 1. G. xiv.
55.	MIN-9 General Infrastructure	19	Does the State expect the vendor to manage their own instance with Microsoft Azure or will the system be implemented in an instance that already exists or will be provided by the State?	The State expects the vendor to manage their own instance of whichever infrastructure environment they propose. The State does not have an instance of Microsoft Azure or any other cloud environment for this purpose.

This addendum will become part of the Request for Proposal and should be acknowledged with the Request for Proposal response.