S T A T E   O F   M A R Y L A N D

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

MARTIN O'MALLEY
Governor

ANTHONY BROWN
Lieutenant Governor

ELLIOT SCHLANGER
Secretary

Questions/Responses #2
CAD/RMS/AVL/AFR
RFP Project #060B0400007
February 17, 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: The RFP requires an "unbound original." Should offerors include tabs/dividers for each section in this original?

   Response: As long as the proposal format instructions are followed.

2. Question: Is a direct response required for any of the items in RFP Section 2?

   Response: Please read RFP Section 3.4.2.4.1 and respond according to the instructions. The areas covered in RFP Section 2 should be addressed for exceptions and to demonstrate best practices approach complete the requirements.

3. Question: Regarding RFP Section 3.4.2 Format of Technical Proposal. To be sure that we comply with the rules for organizing the response, is it the State's wish for offerors to number their proposal "3.4.2.1 Title and Table of Contents," etc.? Or simply 1. Title… 2. Executive Summary, etc.?

   Response: Providing a response numbered as in the proposal format instructions is the preference.

4. Question: Regarding RFP Section 3.4.2.4.1, Offeror Technical Response to RFP Requirements, General: The State requests that offerors "shall address each RFP requirement in the Technical Proposal and describe how its proposed services will meet those requirements." Will the State please specifically clarify which section(s) of the RFP is to be responded to beneath this header?

   Response: The Technical Proposal should address the overall system and how the proposed system addresses the needs in RFP Section 2.

5. Question: A number of the roles that the RFP outlines in RFP Section 2.19.1.1.2 are not separate personnel, but duties performed by the same individual. Further, some of the roles are not applicable to the proposed solution. Please note whether we are required to provide resumes for the entire list or only those that are applicable?

   Response: As required in RFP Section 3.4.3.7 offerors are to provide resumes for key project management personnel with the proposal response. Those include resumes for the Program Manager, Project Manager and any other personnel that are critical to the offeror's implementation of the Core System. With the exception of those categories listed above,

resumes for the rest of the labor categories in RFP Section 2.19.1.1.2 would be provided at the task order level.

6. Question: RFP Sections 3.4.4.1 and 3.4.4.2 require 3 references each. Are these separate requirements for a total of 6 references?

   Response: References may overlap but offerors should outline which requirement is being met by which reference.

7. Question: The fourth bullet in RFP Section 3.4.4.2 includes "performance objectives satisfied." Please clarify what information is needed.

   Response: References should be identified as to which services are utilized. For example, if a reference only uses the RMS software, not CAD, but is relevant to the proposal this fact should be indicated in the proposal.

8. Question: RFP Section 3.4.3.3, item b: please clarify the system's role in supporting Transportation operations.

   Response: MTA is one of the MDOT modals to be supported by the proposed system. If the proposed system takes transportation operations into account please include it.

9. Question: In RFP Section 4.5, both 4.5.1.1 and 4.5.2.1 are blank. Please advise if there are any missing requirements.

   Response: Those sections of the RFP read as follows:

   4.5.1 General Selection Process:

   4.5.1.1 The Contract shall be awarded in accordance with the competitive sealed proposals process under COMAR 21.05.03. The competitive sealed proposals method is based on discussions and revision of proposals during these discussions.

   4.5.2 Selection Process Sequence:

   4.5.2.1 The first level of review shall be an evaluation for technical merit by the selection committee. During this review, oral presentations and discussions may be held. The purpose of such discussions shall be to assure a full understanding of the State's requirements and the Offeror's ability to perform, and to facilitate understanding of the Contract that shall be most advantageous to the State.

10. Question: Please verify that Attachments A, F, H, I, J, K, O and Q are strictly informational items that should not be included in the proposal response.

    Response: Attachment F – Price Proposal Sheet is the only attachment which must be submitted with the response, please see RFP Section 3.5.

11. Question: Regarding the Functional Requirements Document, because of the different nature of CAD and RMS systems, different responses may be required for the different software. Please advise how responses should be entered when a single response does not apply to both.

    Response: Offerors should separate the response by system such as CAD, RMS.

12. Question: Given that law (RMS) and fire records management (FMS) systems are generally separate, will the State please clarify with items within the functional requirements are directed towards RMS versus FMS?

    Response: Assume Law RMS unless otherwise described. Fire RMS is not priority to the Core System but critical to future integrations, a proposal with this added best practice functionality will be considered favorably.

13. Question: Please clarify the State's need for a Geographic Information System. Requirement 32 states that an interface is required to the State's existing GIS. Requirement 562 states "The CAD system must have a seamlessly integrated computerized map, which is a digitized map (GIS database) supporting Tactical Map Display (TMD). The system shall contain a map-centric TMD, in which the GIS/Map is fully integrated with the CAD system. Mapping component systems, in which a separate TMD application is linked to the CAD system, may be proposed." The TMD sounds very much like a GIS. Please explain.

    Response: A Tactical Map Display is a sub-set of the full Geographic Information System more suitable for a mobile environment. Bidder should describe the systems mapping functionalities as it relates to strategic, tactical and administrative uses.

14. Question: Please explain what is meant by requirement 35 regarding LInX/RCAS, as no requirement is stated.

    Response: LINX/RCAS is a NEIM compliant XML data transfer. ICD will be provided.

15. Question: What are the functional requirements of the interface listed in Requirement 45?

    A new Statewide 700 MHZ radio system will be used by multiple agencies participating in this initiative. The State desires that the CAD system interface to this system. This radio system has not been fully implemented and therefore will need to be planned accordingly as part of the implementation. (Single Directional Interface).

    Response: Requirement #45 is the master time synchronization. This is a standard interface for CAD systems to sync times with the radio system, etc. If you meant Requirement #46, which is what is copied in the question, the State wants offerors to list their typical interfaces to a radio system. Unit IDs, dispatch/arrival times.

16. Question: Requirement 195 appears to be incomplete. What are the conditions?

    Response: Requirement #196 lists the conditions.

17. Question: Please define "EMD" component in requirement 590. Does this refer to an emergency medical pre-arrival system (e.g. ProQA)?

    Response: Yes, Emergency Medical Dispatch such as ProQA, APCO EMD.

18. Question: Requirement 608 does not appear to be a function. Please clarify.

    Response: System will store the data listed in Requirement #607.

19. Question: Please define "Contact database" in requirement #614.

    Response: As stated in Requirement #611.

20. Question: Requirements 622-632 require that the selected offeror supplies geographic data. Inasmuch as geographic data changes over time, does the State wish the offeror to propose a service contract to maintain geographic data?

    Response: No. There is a position that can be used to maintain this system. See 2.19.1.8 GIS Technician.

21. Question: Should requirements 706 and 707 be combined?

    Response: Yes.

22. Question: Requirement 1062 appears to be incomplete. What processes must occur?

    Response: Those listed in Requirement #1064 below as a minimum. It should not limit the offeror's "best practices" solution.

23. Question: Please define "OCC," as mentioned in requirements 1372, 1373, etc.

    Response: Helicopter EMS Operational Coordination Center.

24. Question: Requirement 678 asks for offerors to provide a response regarding compliance with a policy that is only available through a signed non-disclosure agreement. Please supply the proper paperwork so that we may request this document.

    Response: Section 4.4 (page 12) of the DoIT Security Policy, found at http://doit.maryland.gov/support/Documents/security_guidelines/DoITSecurityPolicy.pdf discusses the need for DR for each critical system.

25. Question: Requirement 702 was hidden. Was this inadvertent?

    Response: Row 702 was not a functional requirement and is therefore to remain hidden.

26. Question: As it is formatted, the spreadsheet must be condensed so significantly to fit the responses from an entire row on a page, that it will be very difficult to read when printed. In order to provide a document that can be easily reviewed on paper, it is suggested that the State creates a single column for a requirement code (i.e. Out of Box=O, Configuration required=C, etc.) to allow ample room for comments.

    Response: The functional requirements matrix may be manipulated to allow a single space column for the codes and more space for the comments and proposal reference at offeror's discretion. The document is readable when printed at 11x17.