ADDENDUM NO. 1
DATE: June 7, 2018

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP): B180003244 RPD Records Management System
RFP #B180003244 WAS ISSUED: Tuesday May 15, 2018
PROPOSALS ARE DUE: Tuesday June 19, 2018 02:00PM (UNCHANGED)

To Whom it May Concern:

The intent of this Addendum is to provide answers to questions raised during the question submittal period. As noted within the RFP under Part II, “Instructions to Offerors”, subparagraph 1.2.1, “Inquiry”, questions regarding this RFP were due no later than 05:00PM EST on Tuesday June 6, 2018. No further questions regarding the Statement of Needs will be entertained after that date.

All other General Terms and Conditions, Special Terms and Conditions, and other language remain the same.

1. Q: Will the City consider a 45-day extension on the proposal due date, based on the scope of the project? This would place the new due date at 8/3/2018. Vendors require ample time to review and accurately respond to the functional requirements contained within the requirements matrix. The new deadline will allow sufficient time to answer the matrix, revise proposal documents as needed based on the City’s future Q&A responses, coordinate with subcontractors and formulate the best solution for the City.

   A: The City is unable to grant any extensions on the proposal due date.

2. Q: Does the City have a technology preference (e.g. Amazon Web Services, Microsoft Azure, etc.)?

   A: The City prefers Amazon Web Services (AWS) over Microsoft Azure.

3. Q: For the data migration/conversion requirements in sections RFP 2.4 and 2.5, can the City please clarify the following: the approximate number of years of data to be migrated, the number of existing total records, the number of existing data tables and data columns, the numbers and types of records (e.g. x # of Names, x # of Warrants, etc.)? Can the City also please provide sample data of all components expected to be migrated as part of this contract?

   A: Responses:
   3A.i. Number of years of data to be migrated: Twelve (12).
   3A.ii. Number of total records: The City is unable to provide this information.
   3A.iii. Number of existing data tables: The City is unable to provide this information.
   3A.iv. Number of existing data columns: The City is unable to provide this information.
   3A.v. Numbers and types of records: The City is unable to provide a list that is all-inclusive.
   3A.vi. The City cannot provide sample data.

4. Q: Can you clarify for me if you all are looking for software specific for the processes around the Police and to conduct police specific operations? Or, a records management solution to maintain all data fed into it from those specific systems? And house all of that data?
A: The City is seeking a Records Management System to manage and maintain all standard police agency related data as well as have data exchange capability with the external systems specified in the RFP document.

5. Q: Is the government looking for a COTS product or a custom developed system?
A: The City is seeking a system that can be customized to the specific needs, business processes and practices of the City of Richmond Police Department.

6. Q: What is the current system being used?
A: The City currently uses ONESolution RMS from Superion (formerly known as SunGuard).

7. Q: Regarding the requested integration with LexisNexis as indicated in RFP Exhibit III “Existing Systems”, can the City please clarify which LexisNexis system or systems require integration with the RMS (e.g. eCitation, eCrash, Accurint Crime Analysis Software, Accurint Virtual Crime Center, etc.) and clarify the expected workflow(s) and data exchange(s)?
A: Accurint Crime Analysis Software.

8. Q: Please provide more information on the City-based application QueTel and clarify the expected workflow and data exchange between QueTel and the RMS.
A: QueTel is the application currently used by the City of Richmond Police Department for evidence management. If the proposed RMS solution does not have an included evidence management module or system, then the City would expect the solution to have the ability to pass through incident property and evidence data with QueTel in a manner that will eliminate and avoid duplication of data entry. QueTel has a SQL backend.

9. Q: Please provide more information on the City-based application inVize and clarify the expected workflow and data exchange between inVize and the RMS.
A: RESPONSE: inVize is the application used by the City of Richmond Police for document management. It provides the ability to locate and view digitally-stored records. Ideally, the proposed RMS solution would provide the ability to connect to digital records based upon incident number and/or name record.

10. Q: Please clarify the City’s interpretation of Data Migration versus Data Conversion:
A: Responses:
10A.i. Data Conversion - the transformation of data from one format to another. It implies extracting data from the source, transforming it and loading the data to the target system based on a set of requirements.
10A.ii. Data Migration - the process of transferring data between silos, formats, or systems.

11. Q: Please confirm that the City is seeking fixed price proposals.
A: The City is seeking fixed price proposals. Please refer to Exhibit II “Sample Services and Pricing Schedule” on page 51 of the RFP for a suggested format for the pricing schedule. While is may be unreasonable to expect development of a cost sheet that will encompass all potential services, the Offeror’s pricing schedule should include pricing for any items, components, or services that the Offeror’s feels may be integral to the overall provisions of services as envisioned and
described in this RFP. Please include any recommendations for potential cost containment for this Contract.

12. Q: Question about Section 5, Item 1c. in Area 28 of the Functional Specifications regarding “Interface from LEADS”.
A: “LEADS” refers to the LeadsOnline investigation system.

13. Q: Is the City requiring the inclusion of a mobile replacement with the RMS proposal?
A: Yes, the City requires the inclusion of a mobile replacement with the RMS proposal.

14. Q: Is the City requiring the inclusion of a JMS with the RMS proposal?
A: Yes, the City requires the inclusion of a JMS.

15. Q: The Functional Specifications spreadsheet is locked and will not allow the expansion of cells to view all the contents. Can the City provide an unlocked version of the spreadsheet?
A: The City will not provide an unlocked sheet. If you select the cell you’re trying to read, it will populate at the top of the page. Within that top box, there will be arrows so that you can scroll and view all the information. (See screenshot below).

16. Q: The "Functional Specifications requirement workbook" provided with the RFP is highly restrictive and does not allow changes to the "Explanation" column cell size. Will it be possible for RPD to provide a version of the spreadsheet which allows resizing of cells if needed, or can we create an editable copy of the spreadsheet to provide the respond?
A: The City will not provide an unlocked sheet. If the Offeror needs additional space to provide explanations, please submit on a separate sheet and reference the Functional Specification being addressed.

17. Q: What is the funding source and budget for this project?
A: The City is unable to provide budget information regarding this project; Offerors are encouraged to submit a comprehensive proposal based on their subject and industry knowledge and understanding of the City’s requirements.

18. Q: Can companies from outside of the United States submit proposals?
A: Yes.

19. Q: Will we need to come over there for meetings?
A: Assuming “there” is the United States, yes.
20. **Q:** Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA?
   **A:** That is a business decision to be made by the Offeror, upon a thorough review of the requirements set forth in the RFP.

21. **Q:** Can we submit the proposals via email?
   **A:** Please refer to subparagraph 3.0 entitled “Proposal Contents” on page 14 of the RFP, and subparagraph 4.0 entitled “Submission of Proposals” on page 29 of the RFP.

22. **Q:** Please define “limited” use of the RMS by these Agencies? Do they need access (view) only, or do they need to enter data in the system? Which modules do they need access to? Are these agencies set up on the server as separate entities? Are the licenses for these agencies included in the user counts in the RFP?
   **A: Responses:**
   - **22A1.** “Limited” means that other agencies will have full access to the system with restrictions implemented through access-control levels.
   - **22A2.** Other agencies will require the ability to both enter and view data.
   - **22A3.** The other agencies will have availability to all modules, however extension of access will be managed through access-control levels.
   - **22A4.** The agencies are set up as separate entities on the server.
   - **22A5.** The licenses for other agencies specified are included in the total user counts for the Richmond Police Department.

23. **Q:** Is the City seeking a field reporting system (i.e. mobile RMS, not mobile CAD)?
   **A:** Yes, the City is currently seeking a mobile field reporting RMS, NOT mobile CAD.

24. **Q:** Knowing that the agency is asking for a site license, would the agency provide concurrent user counts for the following systems? Concurrent users are defined by the number of users on the system at any one time.
   **A: Response:**
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>RMS</th>
<th>FBR (Mobile RMS)</th>
<th>JMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond PD</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Sheriff</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCU PD</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. **Q:** Please clarify the intent of the RFP as it relates to JMS. Also, there is no request for pricing for JMS in the pricing forms. Please provide direction regarding pricing.
   **A:** The City is seeking a system inclusive of a Jail Management System (JMS). Preferably, pricing will include both RMS and JMS. As noted, the Pricing Schedule included within the RFP is a suggested (sample) format only. Offerors are encouraged to submit a comprehensive schedule that captures all relevant information to their proposed solution.
26. **Q:** There are plenty of third-party devices, to be integrated with RMS such as MicroFilm, CAD, LPR, Scanner, Digital Camera, Finger Print Scanner, Bar code generation & Scanner, POS, etc. We would need to know the specifications of all such third-party devices to provide software development support.

    **A:** Microfilm, Scanner, POS, and Digital Camera are not applicable. It is expected that the prospective contractor will work with various vendors regarding each API and any required development.

    34A1. CAD – The ability to receive CAD data and the ability to automatically correctly populate required fields in RMS and Mobile.
    34A2. LPR – The ability to cross-reference vehicle data in RMA and DMV based on captured license plate information from LPR.
    34A3. Fingerprint scanner - Live scan, requires bi-directional data.
    34A4. K-9 X/Y data is provided by tracking devices on each animal.

27. **Q:** Are we required to discuss disaster recovery methods for the RPD Records Management System?  
    **A:** Offerors are encouraged to submit information regarding disaster recovery and redundancy options of their proposed Solution.

28. **Q:** Is the City requiring the inclusion of a JMS with the RMS proposal?  
    **A:** Yes, the City requires the inclusion of a JMS with the RMS proposal.

29. **Q:** Does the City have any data sovereignty restrictions?  
    **A:** Off-premises data storage must be located in a facility located in the state of Virginia, United States.

30. **Q:** Question regarding RPD RMS Functional Specifications.xlsx – Area 12 Equip Main Module: Is the expectation that the system shall track daily equipment readings for items requiring maintenance in real time?  
    **A:** Yes.

31. **Q:** Question regarding RPD RMS Functional Specifications.xlsx – Area 27 Permits and Licensing: What is meant by “support” for the requirement that “The software must support the following types of Permits or Licensing”?  
    **A:** The Offeror’s solution shall allow for data capture, verification, transmission and printing.

32. **Q:** Question regarding RPD RMS Functional Specifications.xlsx – Area 30 JMS Module: What is meant by “tracking and movement of inmates...electronically” in the requirement that “The system must provide the ability to manage the tracking and movement of inmates throughout the facility electronically.”?  
    **A:** The ability to instantly provide the location, identification and pertinent data (i.e. medical info, historical info, etc.) of an inmate at any given time. The system must be compatible with biometric scanners such as single-finger, dual-finger, or ten-print scanners as well as armbands/wristbands.
33. Q: Question regarding RPD RMS Functional Specifications.xlsx – Area 30 JMS Module: Can you please provide more details about the JMS system; to include, current data format(s), any encryption being used, amount of existing data, existing API’s for the JMS system if any, type of system, i.e., web based or desktop software, and type (Oracle, SQL Server, Postgres, etc.) and version of existing JMS database.
A: The existing Jail Management System (JMS) is a client-server application and not web-based. The data in the existing JMS is in SQL format. The amount of data is approximately 8TB. Information regarding encryption is currently unavailable. There are no API’s for the currently existing JMS.

34. Q: Regarding the requirements that the RMS system must have data exchange with the DMV, TREDs, Live Scan, and LIDS; can you please specify if this data exchange is bi-directional, or whether the RMS must only either ingest and push data to/from these systems?
A: Details regarding specific API’s for these items are not available at this time. Responses:
   36A1. DMA TREDs: Unidirectional, information input into TREDs must be able to be pushed to the RMS. DMV TREDs has an API.
   36A2. Live Scan: Photo and fingerprint data must be exchanged bi-directionally.
   36A3. LIDS: For JMS, the data requirement is bi-directional, the new system must be able to push information to LIDS and be capable of receiving from LIDS.

35. Q: Are there any known budget parameters for this project that can be shared publicly?
A: No.

36. Q: Regarding the 72 hour migration of existing data to the RMS; what is the total size of data in the existing system, what type and version of database is it stored in, and what format is the data in?
A: Responses:
   36A1. Data Size = Approximately 4TB
   36A2. Data Type and Version = SQL Server 2012
   36A3. Data Format = SQL, .MDF and .LDF (log files)
Vendors must take due notice and be governed accordingly. This addendum must be acknowledged and included with the bid submission as indicated in the IFB or your response may not be considered.

Sincerely,

_Ebony K. Beaver_

Ebony K. Beaver, CPPB, VCO
Contract Specialist

Acknowledged by: __________________________________________
Company

By: __________________________________________
(signature)

Name: __________________________________________
(printed)

__________________________________________  __________
Title                                      Date