RFP #200912570

MDPS CAD Interoperability and Replacement Project

Answers to Submitted Questions as of April 12, 2010

Revision: 1.0

A11. Narrative change from previous issue to better reflect the MDPS BCEC requirements

Revision: 1.1

A34b, and A34c. Narrative provided in response to question.

A36. Narrative provided to question

Q1. Is there a definition of "screening requirements" available, or is this a reference to an internal review process?

A1. There is no formal definition for the term "Screening Requirements". The screening requirements referenced in the RFP's Section 5.3.1, refers to Section 5.1.6, which in turn refers to the proposal submission criteria prescribed within the "Offeror's Instructions and Requirements", Sections 4.2 and 4.3. The screening requirements are an internal administrative process conducted by the MDPS BCEC immediately following the opening of Offeror Proposals. The aim of this screening is to confirm an Offeror's submitted Proposal has adhered to the Section 4.2 and 4.3 submission criteria, which at a minimum include:

- has the Offeror's Proposal been signed by an authorized representative of the firm;
- has The Offeror provided the required number of copies as well as an electronic version of the same;
- has a Technical and pricing proposal have been submitted; and most importantly
- To ensure the Volume I – Technical Proposal, does not contain any pricing information whatsoever. Should such an event occur within the Technical proposal, the pricing and/or financial data would render the Offeror's proposal invalid.

Q2. By responding to any Mandatory requirement with "N", is a submitted bid disqualified by default?

RFP #200912570

MDPS CAD Interoperability and Replacement Project

Answers to Submitted Questions as of April 12, 2010

A2. No. Offeror's, who submit a proposal which responds with a "N" to a mandatory requirement, shall not be disqualified. What the MDPS BCEC seeks is best value acquisition. Primary consideration will be given to technical excellence, price, and other matters being considered. In the event there are two or more technically equal proposals, price becomes more important. That said, a proposal submitted with a "N" to a mandatory requirement (assuming compliance with the initial screening requirements) will be evaluated by the MDPS BCEC Evaluation Team in accordance with the process prescribed within the RFP, Section 5.3.

Q3. By responding to any Mandatory requirement with "C" or "SC", is a submitted bid disqualified by default?

A3. No (similar to A2). Offeror's, who submit a proposal which responds with a "C" (Configuration or Customization), or "SC" (See Comment) to a mandatory requirement, shall not be disqualified. As stated in A3, what the MDPS BCEC seeks is best value acquisition. Primary consideration will be given to technical excellence, price and other matters being considered. In the event there are two or more technically equal proposals, price becomes more important. That said, a proposal submitted with a "C", or "SC" to a mandatory requirement (again, assuming compliance with the initial screening requirements) will be evaluated by the MDPS BCEC Evaluation Team in accordance with the process prescribed within the RFP, Section 5.3.

Q4. There may be additional effort to come to a resolution with Motorola and Tri-Tech regarding the mandatory interfaces to the Motorola mobiles/RMS and the IMC CAD/RMS/Mobiles is time-challenged: can an extension be provided to ensure we can be responsive to this RFP and best meet the needs of MDPS?

A4. No, the timelines described win the RFP Section 1.7 will remain in force. Should events demand an extension the state may consider an extension, however Offeror's should not assume this will necessarily occur and make best effort to comply with the Section 1.7 timelines.

Q5. Would it be possible to have an additional round of questions?

A5. No.

Q6. [Exhibit 8 I-12] "The CAD system shall support the ability to use multiple nature / type codes per incident." Could MDPS explain the reason for multiple nature/type codes for each incident (e.g. are they for supporting multiple services on a single call for service)?

RFP #200912570

MDPS CAD Interoperability and Replacement Project

Answers to Submitted Questions as of April 12, 2010

A6. The reason for multiple nature/type codes for each incident is to track the multiple offenses/incidents that have occurred, as well as to pass that information to the records system that may have the capability to capture Incident Based information for report to an Incident Based Reporting System.

Q7. [Exhibit 8 U-10] "The CAD system shall allow for held status codes for monitoring and granting outstanding future requests." Could the MDPS please explain the intent of the phrase "outstanding future requests"?

A7. Creating an incident card for an event that will occur on a future date, so when units sign on for the event/detail, the units can be attached to the card/incident.

Q8. [Exhibit 9 CSI-13] "The CAD system shall have the ability to interface to the current TTY system in order to accept emergency calls from hearing- or speech-impaired individuals; and" . Will the MDPS please provide a description of the exiting TTY interface including manufacturer, product name and product version? Is this TTY application known to have a CAD interface?

A8. The intent of this requirement is to capture the TTY transactions from the Plant/CML (E911 equipment) and bring it into the incident record.

Q9. [Exhibit 8.1- I-19] The incident record shall track the source of the call (e.g., public-initiated, seven-digit, field-initiated) providing the ability to call back from the CAD.

Question: does "the ability to call back from the CAD" imply a telephony capability, i.e. user shall be able to click on the number in the CAD incident and automatically dial it? Or is the ability to capture the telephone number in the incident record sufficient?

A9. The ability to call back from the CAD" does not imply a telephony capability, The incident record shall track the source of the call for contact information.

Q10. [Exhibit 8.6 - RP-4] The CAD system shall provide the ability to generate radio log reports by various user defined and selected parameters. Question: Please define the expected information in the radio log report.

A10. The MDPS BCEC RCC would run an inquiry on a unit with a date/time range, and the report would provide a chronology of the units logged activities

RFP #200912570

MDPS CAD Interoperability and Replacement Project

Answers to Submitted Questions as of April 12, 2010

Q11. MDPS is requesting that the proposed CAD solution be capable of supporting Fire and Ambulance capabilities, in addition to Police capabilities. Is MPDS looking for CAD capabilities that have been specifically designed for Fire and Ambulance services, or is MDPS requesting basic dispatch capabilities to support Fire and Ambulance services required? In other words, is MDPS requesting a true, tri-service CAD solution, or is MDPS requesting a CAD solution which offers basic support in a tri-service environment?

A11. The MDPS requires true tri-service CAD solution.

Q12. The MDPS has indicated a need for any Offeror to work with the existing CAD and IMC vendors in order to impellent necessary interfaces to those vendors' existing components. Does MDPS have a mechanism by which other Offerors will be able to engage these vendors from a "level playing field" perspective, thereby ensuring that responses from all Offerors can be compared by MDPS in a consistent, "apples to apples" manner.

A12. The MDPS BCEC does have a mechanism by which Offeror's would be able to engage the existing CAD vendors (Motorola and IMC) to secure information or data to support an Offeror's proposal. It is expected that the respective Offeror would reach out to Motorola and IMC respectively to secure the required data.

Q13. Will the state provide Offeror's with the Application Program Interface (API) to the Motorola MDT?

A13. The state does not own the Motorola CAD, PMDC, nor MDT source code, and it is expected that Offeror's would reach out to Motorola and IMC to secure the required API data.

Q14. Request clarification regarding the Tab number for section 4.5.5 Tab 4: Optional Costs (Cost Table 3.5).

A14. The Tab number is corrected to read: 4.5.5 **Tab 5**: Optional Costs (Cost Table 3.5) vs. Tab 4.

Q15. Section 4.4.6.1 Performance Plans, paragraph a, reads "… requirements for each of the performance plans listed below. There is no list of the plans required. Could the MDPS BCEC clarify which plans are referenced by this statement.

A15. The list of Plan's Offeror's must submit with their proposal falls under the primary Heading of Section 4.4.6 Tab 6 Performance plans, and shall include as a minimum the following:

4.4.6.1.b System Architecture;
4.4.6.1.c Hardware Requirements;
4.4.6.1.d Software Operations and Functional Descriptions
4.4.6.1.e Service Level Agreement (SLA)
4.4.6.1. f Project Assumptions
4.4.6.2.a Project Management Plan
4.4.6.2.b Quality Assurance
4.4.6.2.c Project Schedule
4.4.6.2. Training Plans
4.4.6.2 System Documentation

Q16. Section 4.4.5.1 Offeror's Experience, Expertise, & References, states "Offerors and their Subcontractors should clearly describe at least one (1) previous government project experiences of a similar nature and complexity in scope ".

However the fourth bullet in Section 4.4.5.1 states " The ability to successfully implement the solution, as demonstrated by implementation of comparable public safety solutions <u>in at least two</u> comparable agencies within the past five (5) years.

A16. Section 4.4.5.1 is corrected to read "The ability to successfully implement the solution, as demonstrated by implementation of comparable public safety solutions <u>in at least one (1)</u> comparable agencies within the past five (5) years.

Q17. With regards to Section 6.37 Irrevocable Letter of Credit, will the State of Maine accept a performance bond in lieu of the line of credit?

A17. No, the state's requirement is an Irrevocable Letter of Credit as defined in Section 6.37.

Q18. Please clarify the number of copies in addition to the original that vendors are to submit: Section 1.16 requests "An unbound original and nine (9) unbound copies", Section 4.3.2 requests that one original and 8 additional copies for a total of 9 complete hardcopy documents be submitted; and Section 4.5 requests "an original unbound copy, nine (9) unbound copies".

A19. Section 1.16, and Section 4.5 list the correct number of proposal documents to be submitted, i.e., "An unbound original, and nine (9) unbound copies in 3-ring loose leaf format,

including an electronic version (in Microsoft Word and Excel format on a CD(s), of each Volume I - Technical and Volume II – Financial Proposal (see Sections 4.2 and 4.3)

Section 4.3.2 is corrected to read:

a. Their original proposal (Volume I – Technical and Volume II – Financial) in hard copy format, and include nine (9) additional copies for a total of ten (10) complete hard copy documents;

b. The original, and nine (9) hard format copies, shall be provided unbound in a 3-ring binder in loose leaf format for each proposal (technical and financial);

Q20. Section 3.1.2 Scope of Work, last paragraph, requests Offerors to respond to Sections 3.2 through 3.38. Please clarify in which section of the proposal as defined in Sections 4.4 and 4.5 these responses should be placed.

A20. The intent of the last paragraph in Section 3.1.2 is not to request Offeror's provide a detailed response for each of the tasks listed between 3.2 through 3.38. The requirements the MDPS BCEC requires Offeror's to address and provide in their Proposal are well defined in Section 4. Rather, the intent of paragraph 3.1.2 is to ensure that Offeror's must consider the tasks, their level of effort, and associated pricing to successfully execute the CAD RFP's Scope of Work - defined in sections 3.2 through 3.38, when Offeror's assemble and submit their Technical and Pricing proposals in accordance with Section 4 – Offeror's Instructions and requirements.

That said, Section 3.1.2, last paragraph has been corrected to read:

"The Offeror is requested to consider the tasks, their level of effort, and associated pricing to successfully execute the CAD RFP's Scope of Work - defined in sections 3.2 through 3.38, when Offerors assemble and submit their Technical and Pricing Proposals in accordance with Section 4 – Offeror's Instructions and requirements with particular attention to the proposed method of performance of the support services and proposed infrastructure as described herein. The Offeror's response, whether responding to a mandatory requirement or a desired attribute, shall be binding upon the Offeror in the event the proposal is accepted by the state and is awarded contract."

Q21. Both Sections 4.5.4 and 4.5.5 specify that the responses to the sections should be put in Tab 4. Should the response to Section 4.5.5 be put in Tab 5 instead?

A21. Answer provided at **A14.**

RFP #200912570

MDPS CAD Interoperability and Replacement Project

Answers to Submitted Questions as of April 12, 2010

Q22. Due to the complexity of the RFP, would the State consider an extension on the due date for vendor questions?

A22. Answer provided at **A4.**

Q23. RFP Section 4.4.7.4 and RFP Section 4.4.7.11 (Functional Specifications Response). Section 4.4.7.4 states that vendors should "provide detailed written explanations for their response to each functional specification ID, according to the format outlined…at Section 4.4.7.11." Section 4.4.7.11 states that vendors should "add explanatory details as necessary."

If a vendor's solution meets the functional requirement as described in the RFP, does the MDPS require a written statement for each "Y" response within RFP Exhibit 8?

A23. If a vendor's solution meets the functional requirement as described in the RFP Exhibit 8, and provides a "Y" in response to a specific Exhibit 8 requirement, a written statement for that specific functional requirement with their proposal is not necessary. The submission of the completed Exhibit 8 spreadsheet within the Offeror's proposal is sufficient.

However, a written statement is required for those functional requirements described in the RFP Exhibit 8 which the Offeror has responded with a "C" (Customization or Configuration), "TP" (Third Party Software), "SC" (See Comment) , and/or "OC" (Other Capabilities).

That said, Section 4.4.7.4 is corrected to read:

"Immediately following the completed functional requirements tables, Offerors should also provide detailed written explanations for their response to each functional specification ID where the Offeror has responded with a "C" (Customization or Configuration), "TP" (Third Party Software),"SC" (See Comment) , and "OC" (Other Capabilities) according to the format outlined below at Section 4.4.7.11. However, if an Offeror's solution meets the functional requirement as described in the RFP Exhibit 8, and provides a "Y" in response to the specific Exhibit 8 requirement, a written statement for that specific functional requirement with their proposal is not necessary. The submission of the completed Exhibit 8 spreadsheet in the format specified at 4.4.7.11 within the Offeror's proposal is sufficient. "

Section 4.4.7.11 remains as written in the RFP.

Q24. RFP Section 4.4.8.4 and RFP Section 4.4.8.10 (Technical Specifications Response). Section 4.4.8.4 states that vendors should "provide detailed written explanations for their response to each functional specification ID, according to the format outlined…at Section 4.4.8.10." Section 4.4.8.10 states that vendors should "add explanatory details as necessary."

If a vendor's solution meets the technical requirement as described in the RFP, does the MDPS require a written statement for each "Y" response within RFP Exhibit 9?

A24. Similar to Q23, if a vendor's solution meets the technical requirement as described in the RFP Exhibit 9, and provides a "Y" in response to a specific Exhibit 9 requirement, a written statement for that specific technical requirement with their proposal is not necessary. The submission of the completed Exhibit 9 spreadsheet within the Offeror's proposal is sufficient.

However, a written statement is required for those functional requirements described in the RFP Exhibit 9 which the Offeror has responded with a "C" (Customization or Configuration), "TP" (Third Party Software), "SC" (See Comment), and/or "OC" (Other Capabilities).

That said, Section 4.4.8.4 is corrected to read:

"Immediately following the completed technical requirements tables, Offerors should also provide detailed written explanations for their response to each technical specification ID, where the Offeror has responded with a "C" (Customization or Configuration), "TP" (Third Party Software), "SC" (See Comment), and/or "OC" (Other Capabilities) according to the format outlined below at Section 4.4.8.10." If a vendor's solution meets the technical requirement as described in the RFP Exhibit 9, and provides a "Y" in response to the specific Exhibit 9 requirement, a written statement for that specific functional requirement with their proposal is not necessary. The submission of the completed Exhibit 9 spreadsheet within the Offeror's proposal is sufficient."

Section 4.4.8.10 remains as written in the RFP.

Q25. RFP Section 4.5.5 – Optional Costs. Should this section refer to the contents of proposal Tab 5 rather than Tab 4, which is defined in RFP Section 4.5.4?

A25. Correction provided at **A14.**

Q26 Is the Augusta RCC or the Gray RCC co-located at one of the State's two Data Centers?

A26. The Augusta, Maine RCC is co-located at one of the State's two Data Centers.

Q27. Is the Gray RCC the designated disaster recovery (DR) location? If not, where is the DR facility in relation to the RCC locations?

A27. The DR facility is located at the Office of Information Technology (OIT), Edison Drive, Augusta, Maine, which is approximately 5 miles distant from the Augusta RCC.

Q28. RFP Exhibit 8.6 – CAD System Reporting. Requirement RP-2h refers to a Duplicate Person Report. Is this report derived from a records management system and made available to CAD operators, or is the report created from data native to CAD?

a. Is this report used by dispatch and/or records personnel?

A28.a The duplicate person report is intended to keep the person database free of redundant entries. If an operator enters a person with the name of Bill Smith, 1984/01/12, but his real name is William Smith 1984/01/12, the CAD should be able to pull duplicate (soundex) names and/or dates of birth. The CAD administrator would run the report and after confirming the involvements, date of birth, address, or other such person identifiers and the Administrator would merge the 2 names files into one via the CAD application.

b. Is a copy of a sample report available? If not, can the State please the State please provide a list of typical data contained within the requested Duplicate Person report?

A28.b There is not an existing report. The current CAD system does not have a person database. With regards to a list of typical data contained within the requested Duplicate Person report - any field, or multiple fields, containing duplicate information that may indicate records for the same person would qualify. The primary fields being, name (last and first), date of birth, address, social security number - unique identifiers

Q29. [Exhibit 9 CSI – 3] "The CAD System shall interface with the KSO IMC CAD/RMS server providing relevant incident information for dispatching to IMC Mobile with Call-For-Service data to begin KSO IMC RMS reports utilizing the latest version of the NIEM/GJXDM standards." Is MDPS satisfied that the IEPDs described in Appendix I are sufficient to meet this requirement?

A29. Yes, MDPS is satisfied that the IEPDs described in Appendix I are sufficient to meet this requirement. More specifically, the Call for Service (17) and Closed Call for Service (18) IEPDs, also listed in Appendix K, should address this scenario. Upon selection of a vendor, there will be an initial "vetting period" for the vendor to validate/verify the requirements behind the IEPDs, and this would be a chance for minor changes to the IEPDs if they are required".

RFP #200912570

MDPS CAD Interoperability and Replacement Project

Answers to Submitted Questions as of April 12, 2010

Q30. [Exhibit 9 I-19]. The incident record shall track the source of the call (e.g., public-initiated, seven-digit, field-initiated) providing the ability to call back from CAD.

Question: does "the ability to call back from CAD" imply a telephony capability, i.e. user shall be able to click on the number in the CAD incident and automatically dial it? Or is the ability to capture the telephone number in the incident record sufficient? "

A30. No, it does not imply a telephony capability to the first part of the question. The answer to the second part is the required ability if to capture contact information

Q31. [Exhibit 9 INT-CMI-1]. The CAD System will provide complete integration with the existing Motorola Mobile Data System (PMDC) through the existing Mobile Data Node Controller (MDNC) using the latest version of NIEM/GJXDM standards. This includes, but not limited, to the following capabilities and functions:"

a. In likely event that the existing Motorola Mobile Data System (PMDC) does not provide a NIEM conformant interface, would it be acceptable to use the Motorola interface as provided since this will have a lower cost than the additional cost of developing a series of IEPDs to support the required mobile transactions?

A31.a There should be no cost for developing a series of IEPDs, as all IEPDs are already developed and are described and provided within the RFP. Usage of an IEPD may not be required as long as the Offeror can justify the reason for not doing so." Further, the MDPS requires all bidders to provide a NIEM conformant interface from their proposed COTS CAD to the Motorola Mobile Data System (PMDC) to ensure that a possible replacement of the PMDC system has a PMDC to CAD NIEM Conformant interface.

CAD-PMDC interface NIEM compliant is

The reason we insist to have CAD-PMDC interface NIEM compliant is future possible replacement of either PMDC or CAD system.

b. Does the MDPS desire to have input in the definition of the required IEPDs to support a mobile interface?

A31.b. The IEPDs have already been developed and the MDPS was one of several agencies represented by the group of subject matter experts that provided the requirements for these IEPDs**.**

c. Is it a requirement that the IEPDs developed in support of a mobile interface will utilize the state data broker?

A31.c . No, there is not a MDPS BCEC requirement for the Mobile Interface to utilize the state data broker.

d. As a possible means of reducing mobile interface service costs, would MDPS consider accepting a proposal to replace the existing mobile software that will be compliant with existing mobile hardware and network?

A31.d. This consideration is not within the scope of the CAD RFP 200912570

Q32. Section 1.29. Attachment B to Appendix D is referenced as being the "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters Primary Covered Transition"; however, as stated in Appendix B - Attachment B thereto would be the Vendor's proposal, and Attachment C would be the Debarment Form. Please clarify if the reference to Attachment B is meant to refer to Attachment C of Appendix D and if this form be submitted with the proposal or following contract award?

A32. A corrected version of the RFP is posted……The "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters Primary Covered Transition" is now referenced and Section 1.29 as Attachment C to Appendix D. Please submit the completed attachment with your proposal.

Q33. Section 4.3.2 paragraph c stipulates that PDF copies shall not be submitted. We request to be allowed to submit proposal attachments, signed forms, and additional information in PDF format.

A33. The submission of the electronic copy of the Offeror's proposal is essential when files are being reviewed the MDPS BCEC review teams, and the requirement that the electronic copy not be provided in PDF format shall remain.

Q34. [Exhibit 8.6 – CAD System Reporting]. Requirement RP-2b refers to a Warrant Report.

a. Is this report derived from a records management system and made available to CAD operators, or is the report created from data native to CAD?

RFP #200912570

MDPS CAD Interoperability and Replacement Project

Answers to Submitted Questions as of April 12, 2010

A34a. A warrant report cannot be generated from the CAD. The MDPS BCEC will be using the NetRMS Warrant Module.

b. Is this report used by dispatch and/or records personnel?

A34b. This report is used by dispatch, which is passed to the courts, who will use it to verify the warrants that they have issued to what we maintain in our system.

c. Is a copy of a sample report available? If not, can the State please provide a list of typical data contained within the requested Warrant report?

A34c. There is no report currently available, however, what the MDPS BCEC would like to see as an output is a list of warrants, by name, date of birth, court and docket number

Q35. Can the State provide vendors with a sample of the current geofile data and structure?

A35. The MDPS BCE does not have a sample, and hence cannot provide the current geofile data and structure. Typically, a goebase utilizes such information as street name, direction (N,S,E or W), suffex (Dr, St, Av, Ct Ci, Hw, Pl, etc..), starting and ending number for a block range, cross street at either end of the block range, common place name field or alternate name for the street, and in some cases lat/long indicators.

Q36. [Exhibit 9 CSI 22] "The CAD system shall support an NIEM IEPD interface to the Maine state wide MJISA data Broker." Does the Maine state wide MJISA data Broker currently provide an interface in support of the IEPD data packages described in this document, or is it up to the selected vendor to modify the state data broker in support of the described IEPD's?

A36. The current MJISA Data Broker does not currently support the interfaces whose information models are defined by the IEPDs in Appendix K. The successful Offeror would be expected to work with the State of Maine Data Broker team to enable these interfaces. The Vendor will be responsible for providing a Web Services end point, or endpoints, that can provide and consume NIEM compliant XML exchanges. The Offeror should be expected to work with the MJISA broker team in cooperation with both the CAD and RMS business team to develop and comply with an "exchange model" that serves the business purpose of the Brokered Exchange.