ADDENDUM TWO
QUESTIONS and ANSWERS

Date: December 21, 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.	MIN-9	19	Does the state of Nebraska have a current contract with Microsoft Azure GovCloud? If so, please provide a copy of this contract.	As stated in Addendum One, Question 55: 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.
2.	NET-1	22	For all attached devices, both computer-to-computer systems and directly connected end user systems, will these systems communicate on a State provided network and pass to the hosted solution at an exit point provided by the State, or will each system connect directly to the cloud-based solution without using any State provided network?	Yes, these systems will communicate via a state-provided network.
3.	MIT-12	49	Please provide examples and scope of this requirement.	Considering the context of the surrounding requirements, MIT-12 pertains to authenticating the systems that are being interfaced to the MSS for information exchange. For example, the MSS must be able to ensure that the Patrol Criminal History (PCH) system that sends a RAP sheet back to the MSS is a valid information

				source. The scope of this requirement is the MSS.
4.	Attachment A Implementation Plan		4.1 The COOP capabilities provided by the contractor under this contract shall be maintained as active-active site. What is the preferred relational database management system (RDBMS)?	NSP does not have a preference. Bidders are expected to propose a solution that includes a RDBMS that meets the MSS performance requirements.
5.	MBP-1		The solution shall 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. NSP can configure new MKEs or modify existing MKE using OpenFox Configurator on the fly. However, If a new field added to a MKE should be supported by the hot file database or require a special edit, it may require programming assistance from [redacted]. Is this the expectation of NSP?	As stated in Addendum One, Question 1: 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.
6.	MBP-13		MBP-13 The solution should utilize nonsequential message and response return techniques to improve performance and timeliness of information. What does it mean exactly by "nonsequential message and response"?	When a query triggers multiple queries to several systems, the responses may not come back in the order in which the queries were presented. The solution needs to be able to accommodate the management of these nonsequential responses.
7.	MAD-4		The solution should provide a “watchdog” functionality, whereby an agency/user is notified if another agency/user ran the same switch transaction within a specified time frame (e.g., an officer in a different jurisdiction ran the same license plate query two days prior). What is a typical retention period for the system to keep the switch transactions on file in order to provide this "watchdog" functionality? For example, if the same plate query happened 2 years ago, should it trigger the notification?	Attachment C, MAD-4 is deleted and replaced with the following: The solution should provide a “watchdog” functionality, whereby an agency/user is notified if another agency/user ran the same switch transaction within 30 calendar days (e.g., an officer in a different jurisdiction ran the same license plate query two days prior). No

8.	MIN-12		The system should be designed to provide fault-tolerant processing. Please provide examples of "fault-tolerant processing".	Fault tolerance is the property that enables a system to continue to work properly if components fail. For example, if an interface connection fails, the system will queue message transactions until the interface is back online.
9.	MWF-12		The solution should provide for confidential transaction-processing capability; for example, allow an authorized NSP administrator to designate an inquiry as “confidential” such that subsequent viewing of messages relating to the inquiry/response can be restricted, including writing audit trail information to a confidential or restricted audit log. Should a “confidential” message be excluded from Archive and Retrieval, and/or from the switch trace command?	No, confidential messages are not to be excluded from Archive and Retrieval and/or from the switch trace command.
10.	MAP-47		The solution shall enable users to recall (configurable by NSP) and resend recently sent messages. The solution shall also provide cut-and-paste functionality. If a message has been processed by hot file and/or NCIC, there is no way to recall. For example, if an EW has been processed by hot files, then it can't be recalled. A CW or XW has to be submitted to remove the entry. Is this the expectation of NSP?	The system shall allow the user interface (UI) to retain previously sent transactions and their variables for the purpose of reusing the construct of the message in a subsequent message(s). The system shall also allow users to recall a message from the log files to allow for a cut and paste functionality.
11.	II Payment B		Taxes would the vendor be exempt if this is a cloud solution? i.e, no physical servers in NE?	Vendor should consult a SALT attorney to discuss the tax implications of cloud solutions and server storage facilities.
12.	U 4 J		Statutes Which statutes determine early termination?	Please refer to Section II. Terms and Conditions U. Early Termination. Also, the State requires the ability to terminate contracts based on vendor insolvency, the direction of the legislature, claims based on fraud or misrepresentation, and the other enumerated provisions of the Early Termination section.
13.	Hot Files		Hot Files Please provide list of local only and NCIC mirrored hot files	Refer to the Hot Files section (p.17) of Attachment C for the complete list of local and NCIC mirrored hot files.

14.	Hot Files		Hot Files Please list any intergrations between hot files and other applications	The hot files only integrate with the MSS solution.
15.	MIT-17		The solution shall interface with the Mobile Architecture for Communications Handling (MACH) Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) system. What is the current interface protocol used to communicate with the MACH and AVL system?	As stated in Addendum One, Question 23: MACH AVL interfaces with the MSS as a mobile device.
16.	MIT-17		The solution shall interface with the Mobile Architecture for Communications Handling (MACH) Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) system. Who is the MACH and AVL system vendor?	The MACH vendor is Technology Enterprise Group, Inc. Currently MACH is the only AVL used by the Nebraska State Patrol for MSS queries. Other agencies may have other AVL or Mobile terminal vendors.

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