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| ADDENDUM NSP7149 Z1, QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS |

Date: June 26, 2024

To: All Bidders

From: Jason Dean

Nebraska State Patrol

RE: Addendum for NSP7149 Z1

to be opened July 22, 2024 at 2 p.m. CST

#### Questions and Answers

Following are the questions submitted and answers provided for the above-mentioned solicitation. The questions and answers are to be considered as part of the solicitation. It is the responsibility of bidders to check the State Purchasing Bureau website for all addenda or amendments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question No. | RFP/ITB  Section  Reference | RFP/ITB  Page # | Question | State Response |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | **Section I-Procurement Procedure Item J – Submission Requires:** The Technical, Cost Proposal and Proprietary Information should be uploaded as separate and distinct files. | 4 | **It states there should only be 3 documents submitted – Technical, Cost Proposal, and Proprietary Information.** |  |
| **Question 1:** What about Exhibit A – Technical Matrix? This is party of Technical Approach, but do you want that submitted as a separate Xcel file or included within the Technical Approach in PDF format or both? | **Answer**: Yes, the Technical Matrix should be submitted in the separate Xcel file. The Technical Approach should be answered in the PDF format. |
| **Question 2**: Cost Proposal is to be submitted separately – we are assuming you want this submitted as an Xcel file? | **Answer Question 2**: Yes, submit the Cost Proposal in the Xcel file format. |
| **Question 3**: Deviations – the RFP states that we should list all deviations we have with the terms and conditions and RFP – do we upload this as a separate attachment or as a section in the proposal? | **Answer Question 3**: Submit deviations to the terms and conditions in a separate attachment. |
| 2 | **Section VI – Proposal Instructions:**  Content requirements for the Technical and Cost Proposal are presented separately in the following subdivisions: format and order:  Technical Proposal 1. Corporate Overview 2. Technical Approach | 38 | The RFP does not provide clear instructions on how NSP would like Vendors to organize their response. Sections of the RFP have “bidder response” sections. |  |
| **Question 1**: Based on these instructions and subsections they require; it does not provide any guidance on where we include Sections II-V in our response. Do we add these sections in our technical proposal even though they aren’t listed here, or can you define where Sections II-V fit into the subsections listed under Technical Approach? | **Question 1**: Please answer the question underneath each section. If the requirement needs a narrative response, then provide a narrative response. If the requirement represents a “Comply”, “Not Comply” or “Read and Understood”, then please add that response. |
| 3 | **Section VI – Proposal Instructions Technical Approach Requirements state to include these subsections.** i. Understanding of the project requirements. ii. Proposed development. approach. iii. Technical considerations. iv. Architecture Solution. v. Detailed project plan. vi. Deliverables and due dates. vii. Technical Matrix – the features and functions that will make the Agency’s public safety agencies work in a more efficient way, and in a way that increases officer and public safety (Exhibit A). | 40 | **Question 1:** Can you better define each section you list here and what information is to be included in each of these sections?  Or can you reference the sections of the RFP that speaks to each one of these? We would like to know what information you are wanting in each subsection without having to assume based on subsection title. (i.e. Development approach – what are you referring to here? Interface development? Or is this the full scope of work?) | **Answer Question 1**: These sections are self-explanatory for bidders. If you need clarification on one or more, please send that in as a question. |
| **Question 2**: Proposal Instructions state we have to include Project Development and Scope of Work as detailed in Section V. However, the subsections in Section V are different then what you list here. Can you tell us exactly where we are to insert Section V in the Technical Approach Section, or should this be its own section in the proposal? | **Answer Question 2**: Answer to Question 2: The bidders should respond to the RFP in the order in which the RFP is organized from top to bottom. For Section VI.2, under each section, respond either as Comply, Not Comply, or Read and Understood if the requirement does not require an answer. If the section needs further explanation, then complete the response with narrative to satisfy the RFP sub-sections criteria. NSP suggests creating a Word document from the RFP PDF and use that as the baseline for responding to each section |
| **Question 3**: Subsection V – Detailed Project Plan – asks for detailed project plan, but Section V – Scope of Work also asks for detailed project plan. Do you want this project plan with the SOW or as its own subsection as shown here in Technical Approach – or both? | **Answer Question 3**: NSP is not requiring a Scope of Work for section V.E. The RFP states “Please provide an outline of the Scope of Work to illustrate the methodology and approach for the Implementation and Operations plans. The bidder is to provide an Outline that incorporates the items under section V.E. not an actual Scope of Work or Project Plan. In the Technical Approach section V.G.2, provide a sample Project Plan. |
| **Question 3: Technical considerations**. Can you define what you are requesting here versus Architecture Solutions? | **Answer Question 3: Technical Considerations** include but not limited to Integration with legacy systems and interfaces, customization verses configuration, data migration, cybersecurity remediation and end user security, and licensing and documentation. Software architecture refers to the deployment of different environments (cloud, on-premises) and infrastructure requirements (servers, networks, storage). |
| 4 | **H. Current CAD and MDS Challenges and Limitations** 4. Interfaces | 35 | **Question 1**: Not all interfaces listed here are listed for pricing in the Cost Proposal. Should we only price those interfaces in the Cost Proposal? | **Answer Question 1**: The heading of V.H. is: **CURRENT CAD AND MDS CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS**. The list of interfaces are examples of interfaces that could prove to have challenges with engineering and/or deploying them. The full list of interfaces can be found in the Cost Proposal. |
| 5 | **H. Current CAD and MDS Challenges and Limitations** 4. Interfaces  n. AVL/MACH | 35 | **Question 1**: Can you explain what AVL/MACH interface is? | Answer to Question 1: The existing Mobile solution is called Mach which uses AVL to transmit location coordinates back to CAD. If NSP elects to keep the Mach Mobile and AVL solution, the CAD vendor will need to interface to the solution. When the vehicle transmits the latitude/longitude coordinates back to CAD, the coordinates will need to be converted to the closest address point or mile marker. The replacement CAD solution should allow for reverse geo-coding of the coordinates to the closest mile marker/post based on agency-defined parameters to allow CAD and mobile users to quickly and easily locate units and calls. |
| 6 | **H. Current CAD and MDS Challenges and Limitations** 4. Interfaces p. Towing interfaces i. Tow Exchange ii. Omnix iii. \*\*\*add Sarpey tow provider\*\* | 35 | **Question: 1**: Can you explain what these towing interfaces are? | Answer to Question 1: Towing: we use a tow rotation based on county, determine who is next on the list for a tow. All vehicles towed are then entered into the NIS hot files (through Omnixx).  The exception is the following:   * Tow Exchange: any vehicle towed in Omaha/Douglas County go to the Omaha Police Department impound lot rather than the tow company lot. Tow Exchange is the program used by the Omaha Police Department impound lot to document the tow is required prior to the tow company arriving at that lot. No NIS entry required. * Sarpy County – we are required to email Sarpy county impound when a tow occurs in Sarpy County. No NIS entry required. |
| 7 | **H. Current CAD and MDS Challenges and Limitations** 4. Interfaces q. NDOT IP based cameras | 35 | **Question 1:** Can you explain what your expectation is for this interface? | Answer to Question 1: Nebraska Department of Transportation (NDOT) IP Based Cameras.   * They use a program called IRIS. This allows dispatch to see the NDOT cameras along the insterstates and highways to have a view of road conditions, incidents, and flow of traffic. Currently we have this program running on a single separate monitor. It would be helpful to have this integrated into a CAD map to see the camera in the area of the incident quickly. |
| 8 | **H. Current CAD and MDS Challenges and Limitations** 4. Interfaces t. Salamander Live | 35 | **Question 1:** Can you explain what your expectation is for this interface? | Answer to Question 1: The trooper will use a barcode scanner to scan their ID’s in the Salamander application in the field as they arrive or leave a scene of events. The “unit history” would automatically populate into CAD call or CAD event.  The unit history will be searchable and reportable. |
| 9 | **H. Current CAD and MDS Challenges and Limitations** 4. Interfaces e. CAD and CAD | 35 | **Question 1.** You mention CAD to CAD interface. Is this needed if the CAD system we provide is a consolidated, Multi-Jurisdictional CAD system? Which other CAD vendor are you to interface too? | Answer to Question 1 and 2: A CAD to CAD interface is not needed for this RFP. |
| **Question 2.** This is not listed as an item on the Cost Proposal. | Answer to Question 1: The existing Mobile solution is called Mach which uses AVL to transmit location coordinates back to CAD. If NSP elects to keep the Mach Mobile and AVL solution, the CAD vendor will need to interface to the solution. When the vehicle transmits the latitude/longitude coordinates back to CAD, the coordinates will need to be converted to the closest address point or mile marker. The replacement CAD solution should allow for reverse geo-coding of the coordinates to the closest mile marker/post based on agency-defined parameters to allow CAD and mobile users to quickly and easily locate units and calls. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

This addendum will be incorporated into the solicitation.