

MARTIN O'MALLEY Governor ANTHONY BROWN Lieutenant Governor

ELLIOT SCHLANGER Secretary

Questions/Responses #1 CAD/RMS/AVL/AFR RFP Project #060B0400007 February 10, 2010

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The following questions for the above referenced RFP were received by e-mail and are answered and posted for all prospective Offerors who received the RFP. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions are not binding on the State unless the RFP is expressly amended. Nothing in the State's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the offeror asking the question.

1. Question: From RFP Section 2.4.2.1: The Core System will not need to include full mobile CAD capabilities as many of these capabilities are currently provided by State provided software (CAPWIN). The COTS CAPWIN system will not be integrated to an offeror's COTS CAD therefore will COTS CAD Mobile be accepted in the proposal?

Response: RFP Section 2.2.6, Table A lists CapWIN as a system to which the State expects the CAD/RMS/AVL/AFR system to interface or integrate. The RFP does not exclude vendor CAD Mobile components from being submitted as part of offeror proposals.

2. Question: What tracking of fixed wing aircraft is required?

Response: The Maryland State Police (MSP) and Department of Natural Resources (DNR) operate fixed wing aircraft.

3. Question: What functionality is expected from the CAD-to-CAD interfaces? The RFP states only the ability to transfer incidents.

Response: RFP Section 1.1.9 states: The system will also provide the ability to interface with "non-participating" agency CAD/RMS systems to allow sharing of assets for coordination of emergency response. It is expected that systems which are interfaced will not provide the full range of status and management capabilities that is to be provided by an agency utilizing the statewide Core System.

4. Question: Does the State expect a records-to-records type of interface, or just extensive ability to query into 3rd party RMS systems?

Response: It is at the offeror's discretion to determine which is appropriate. Offerors should provide a description of how their solution handles this best. Warehousing and federated searching are part of the functional requirements.

5. Question: The Task Order process to add additional agencies is extensive. Is the expectation that the contractor will provide a fixed price for the agencies listed in the RFP, then other agencies may add on at a later date for additional price? Will a separate gap analysis be required to compare the capabilities of the deployed Core System with each new agency's 3rd party CAD and Records?

Response: Task orders may be used by the stakeholder agencies listed in the RFP and other agencies who wish to use the core system software and hardware architecture. Task orders may be either fixed price or time and materials depending on the nature of the work however, when the scope is a clearly defined set of tasks with distinct beginnings and ends, a fixed price will be used. The scope of each task order, including whether or not a gap analysis will be required, is dependent upon the nature of the work being undertaken. If the task order is to add a current non-stakeholder agency to the system, a gap analysis will most likely be required.

6. Question: Wording implies a staggered rollout with each participating agency being added to the system one at a time. Is that the intention, including the core agencies involved in the original project?

Response: Multiple agencies (MSP, MdTA, MTA and DNR) will be included in the core system rollout. Other agencies will be added as they request services under task orders.

7. Question: How much training is needed?

Response: The State will determine any individualized agency training needs through task orders, offerors are requested to propose a standard set of training classes as well as train-the-trainer components.

8. Question: Will each major agency require its own series of classes or are they willing to share?

Response: Training classes can be attended by multiple agencies if course covers all users but in some cases agencies may require individual training.

9. Question: Is the requirement different for provisioning and functionality training?

Response: Please clarify the intent of the question.

10. Question: The data conversion appears to be from multiple sources. More detail is needed about their current systems and the data to be converted.

Response: Details for data conversion requirements will be provided in task orders released through the contract. Those task orders will be priced using the proposed labor categories provided by the contractor awarded the contract as a result of the RFP.

11. Question: Is contractor expected to install workstations as well as servers?

Response: That is correct.

12. Question: Is disaster recovery expected to be only between a single primary and single secondary site?

Response: It is at the offeror's discretion to determine what is appropriate.

13. Question: Can the State provide further requirements or definitions of the type of disaster recovery capabilities?

Response: It is at the offeror's discretion to determine what is appropriate.

14. Question: References to documentation imply a customized user guide. Is that expected?

Response: This is dependent on the contractor's COTS user guide.

15. Question: Is customization expected per agency or for the overall system?

Response: This is dependent on the proposed COTS solution and its' ability to meet each agency's needs. The stakeholders will work to merge overlapping processes wherever possible but some agency customizations should be expected.

16. Question: There is a statement in the RFP that any materials provided by the contractor can only be approved for cost. Does this mean that the State will purchase hardware and/or third party software based on specifications provided by the contractor?

Response: The State will take advantage of best pricing for hardware and software if available on another State contract vehicle.

17. Question: The State requires that the contractor provide triage protocol software with which to define their own questions and workflow. Would this rule out a COTS system with pre-defined questions and workflow based on CAD best practices?

Response: No, as long as the proposed solution fits the business needs of the State.

18. Question: Would the State define expected integration with personnel management systems.

Response: It is at the offeror's discretion to determine what is appropriate.

19. Question: There is a requirement in the RFP that closed incidents cannot be updated, but a conflicting requirement that allows this. Which does the State require?

Response: Closed incidents should not be allowed to be changed, but a supplemental update can be added. Amendments will be made to RFP Attachment G – Functional and Technical Requirements, requirement #s 279, 494, 505 and 536 for clarification and issued.

20. Question: Please reference RFP Section 2.4.2.4 Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL). Would the State please identify the type of GPS devices currently being utilized?

Response: The answer is being compiled by the stakeholders and will be posted when available.

21. Question: Would the State please provide the following numbers for pricing purposes?

Response:

- Number of Call Takers (no dispatching capability) 50
- Number of Dispatchers (combined call taking/dispatching capability) 50
- Number of CAD View Only Users (browser-based access, no dispatching capability); provide a concurrent number as well. For example, if the State has 500 users, indicate how many would be in use at any single point in time; usually is 50 percent to 1/3 of the total number of users **400, 200 concurrent**
- Number of Browser Based CAD Users (call taking/dispatching capability) (total and concurrent) **20, 10 concurrent**
- Number of Supervisors **30**
- Number of RMS Users (total and concurrent) 500, 250 concurrent
- Number of Mobile Users (total and concurrent) **500, 250 concurrent**
- Number of Field Reporting Users (total and concurrent) **300, 150 concurrent**