



STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND INSURANCE

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 33501-215001
AMENDMENT # 2
FOR TECHNICAL, MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING
SERVICES FOR THE EMERGENCY
COMMUNICATIONS BOARD**

DATE: **January 20, 2021**

RFP # 33501-215001 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. This RFP Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled RFP dates. Any event, time, or date containing revised or new text is highlighted.

EVENT	TIME (central time zone)	DATE
1. RFP Issued		December 11, 2020
2. Disability Accommodation Request Deadline	2:00 p.m.	December 16, 2020
3. Notice of Intent to Respond Deadline	2:00 p.m.	December 21, 2020
4. Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline	2:00 p.m.	December 30, 2020
5. State Response to Written "Questions & Comments"		January 20, 2021
6. Response Deadline	12:00 p.m.	February 5, 2021
7. State Completion of Technical Response Evaluations		March 8, 2021
8. State Opening & Scoring of Cost Proposals	2:00 p.m.	March 9, 2021
9. State Notice of Intent to Award Released <u>and</u> RFP Files Opened for Public Inspection	2:00 p.m.	March 19, 2021
10. End of Open File Period		March 26, 2021
11. State sends contract to Contractor for signature		March 29, 2021
12. Contractor Signature Deadline	2:00 p.m.	April 6, 2021

2. State responses to questions and comments in the table below amend and clarify this RFP.

Any restatement of RFP text in the Question/Comment column shall NOT be construed as a change in the actual wording of the RFP document.

Question #	Question Location	Question	State's Response
1	Pro Forma Section A.3., A.6., and A.7.	Would the State be open to a recommended solution (software) to validate, aggregate, and provide multi-jurisdictional validations that are based on the NENA standards?	The State is not open to proposals offering software. The State seeks a solution partner that uses a non-proprietary software stack within an Esri environment to provide services to validate, aggregate, and provide multi-jurisdictional validations based on NENA standards.
2	Pro Forma Section A.3.	Is the Contractor expected to perform any edge matching or will this be the responsibility of the ECDs?	Yes. Contractor shall perform edge matching for all submissions made by 100 ECDs.
3	Pro Forma Section A.12.	Is there another vendor solution deployed at the local ECD level? Are there any custom dataming scripts (i.e. Python) deployed at the local ECD/GIS data steward level? Please describe what solutions are in place to collect GIS data from the ECD prior to statewide aggregation.	No. There are no dataming scripts from the State, but the ECDs may automate their own data delivery to the State's repository. ECDs submit their Esri geodatabase, shapefile or OGC-compliant file formats to the state's current SI provider. The State's requirement is that the file must be Ersi-compatible and in the State GIS data model.
4	Pro Forma Section A.13.	Does the State currently compile GIS data into an aggregated statewide dataset prior to uploading into Intrado's EGDMS solution?	Yes, the State's current SI provider compiles the GIS data into an aggregated dataset prior to upload.
5	Pro Forma Section A.14.	Is the intent of the State to replace the current SI solution through this RFP?	Please see RFP Section 1.1 for Statement of Procurement Purpose.

6	Pro Forma Section A.14.	Is the intent of the requirement to support the latest version of Esri file submissions to the SI?	The intent is for the selected solutions partner to utilize the latest version of Esri software to accept and process submissions of 911-related GIS datasets as they are updated by the data stewards from the 100 ECDs into aggregated datasets.
7	Pro Forma Section A.14.	Is it the States' intention for a third-party vendor to manage configuration of another vendor's SI? If so, has the vendor provided permission to do so?	No, this is not the State's intent.
8	Pro Forma Section A.16.	"The Contractor shall not utilize a proprietary software stack to implement Esri core solutions." 1. Can the State clarify what is meant by this statement? 2. Can the State provide a requirement for the use of the software you are requesting?	1) The Contractor shall provide its services based on an "out of the box" Esri solution to not restrict the localities in how they manage their data or restrict their Esri update processes. 2) Requirements remain as written.
9	Pro Forma Section E.2.	Does this term exclude potentially proposed proprietary software?	Per A.16, "The Contractor shall not utilize a proprietary software stack to implement Esri core solutions."
10	Pro Forma Section E.5. and RFP Section 3.3.2.	Is the State willing to sign a SaaS agreement? Would signing a SaaS agreement restrict the State's rights?	A SaaS Agreement could be acceptable. However, the State seeks a solution partner that uses a non-proprietary software stack within an Esri environment. Any SaaS Agreement could not materially change the Contract or any provisions of the Contract, or restrict the State's rights.
11	RFP Section 1.1.	Is Intrado's EGDMS currently deployed as the TECB (the State) NG911 spatial interface (SI)?	Intrado's EGDMS is currently deployed as its provisioning component of the ECDs' GIS data to the Intrado ECRF/LVF.

12	RFP Section 1.1.	Is the State soliciting a software solution in addition to managed support services to meet this stated goal, or does the State only intend to contract for services to accomplish the required objectives and complete the scope of services?	No. The State seeks a solution partner that uses a non-proprietary software stack within an Esri environment to provide services to validate, aggregate, and provide multi-jurisdictional validations based on NENA standards.
13	RFP Section 1.1.	Does the State currently provide GIS data management software to ECDs or provide a procurement mechanism for ECDs to purchase it? If so, which software platforms are currently deployed or made available?	No, the State does not provide GIS data management software nor a procurement mechanism to the ECDs.
14	RFP Section 2.1.9., 4.8.1, and 4.8.3	We consider our Credit Rating (A.3) and our most recent audited financial statements (A.5) proprietary and confidential financial information that would need to be submitted separately and not available for public inspection / covered in the FOIA. Will the State allow for a separate /confidential file containing this private information?	No, the State cannot allow for a separate file containing that information.
15	RFP Section 3.3.1., 5.2.4.2, 5.3.5., Attachment 6.1.3., and Section A Item A1.	These statements seem to contradict themselves; can the State please clarify how and when proposed exceptions be communicated to the State?	These provisions do not contradict themselves. The State may enter into limited negotiations that do not materially change the contract following the open-file period.
16	RFP Attachment 6.2. Section A, Item A.6.	Can the State speak to how the specific level/tier of sponsorship with Esri impacts the project? Will Silver level documentation deem the response non-responsive? If so, will the State be open to a statement indicating either Gold or Platinum partnership level will be provided upon award?	Esri Gold or Platinum Partner levels represents a level of integration and experience sought by the State. Item A.6. is a Mandatory Requirement with Pass/Fail evaluation as described.

17	RFP Attachment 6.2. Section A, Item A.7.	<p>Can the State clarify what they mean by 'proprietary software stack'?</p> <p>Can the State clarify this requirement since there is seemingly no software called for in this RFP?</p> <p>Can the State please supply the current GIS workflow(s) from local through GIS data endpoint (State), and what, if any, software is utilized? If software is currently utilized is it the States requirement that the respondent utilize that software?</p>	<p>The Contractor shall provide its services based on an "out of the box" Esri solution to not restrict the localities in how they manage their data or restrict their Esri update processes.</p> <p>The State seeks a solution partner that uses a non-proprietary software stack within Esri to provide services to validate, aggregate, and provide multi-jurisdictional validations based on NENA standards.</p> <p>ECDs manage their data in Esri-compatible format. ECDs submit their Esri geodatabase, shapefile or OGC-compliant file formats to the state's current SI provider. Current SI service partner aggregates, QAs, and reports back to ECDs to for local correction of errors. SI provider then provisions Intrado's ECRF/LVF via EGDMS.</p>
18	RFP Attachment 6.2. Section C, Item C.1.	Page 5 of the pro forma indicates the term of contract and renewal options but does not appear to include a project schedule that the respondent must adhere to.	Although there is not a project schedule, respondents shall provide a narrative describing how they will execute the scope.
19	RFP Attachment 6.2. Section C, Item C.9.	Is it the State's intent for respondents to provide and maintain a new NG911 spatial interface?	Correct, and provision the State's ECRF/LVF, which is currently performed via Intrado's EGDMS.
20	RFP Attachment 6.2. Section C, Item C.9.	What vendor will be providing the spatial interface or do you intend the winner of this RFP to provide the spatial interface?	Contractor shall provide the SI and provision the State's ECRF/LVF, which is currently performed via Intrado's EGDMS.

21	RFP Attachment 6.2. Section C, Item C.10.	<p>Can the State describe the current solution utilized by the 100 ECDs to validate local public safety 9-1-1 data?</p> <p>Has the State deployed or recommended a common GIS data management platform for GIS data validation and submission into the SI?</p> <p>If so, what is the current recommended/deployed solution at the ECD level which does/will provide quality control and reporting for GIS Data submissions for NG9-1-1 system provisioning?</p> <p>If there is a solution currently in place, is the State interested a replacement solution?</p>	<p>1) ECDs manage their data in Esri-compatible format. No QA/QI is performed locally. ECDs submit their Esri geodatabase, shapefile or OGC-compliant file formats to the state's current SI provider. Current SI service partner aggregates, QAs, and reports back to ECDs to for local correction of errors. SI provider then provisions Intrado's ECRF/LVF via EGDMS.</p> <p>2) No. The State has not deployed or recommended a common GIS data management platform. Rather, the State simply requires the ECDs to submit their Esri geodatabase, shapefile or OGC-compliant file formats to the state's current SI provider whom then uses a non-proprietary software stack within an Esri environment to provide services to validate, aggregate, and provide multi-jurisdictional validations based on NENA standards.</p> <p>3) N/A</p> <p>4) The term of the State's contract with the current SI solution partner has recently expired, thus requiring this procurement.</p>
22	RFP Attachment 6.2. Section C, Item C.12.	<p>In many cases, management and support of the Spatial Interface is provided by the vendor of the SI platform. Can the State describe how management of the SI is currently performed for the 100 ECDs in?</p>	<p>ECDs manage their data in Esri-compatible format. ECDs submit their Esri geodatabase, shapefile or OGC-compliant file formats to the state's current SI provider. No QA/QI is performed locally. Current SI service partner aggregates, QAs, and reports back to ECDs to for local correction of errors. SI provider then provisions Intrado's ECRF/LVF via EGDMS.</p>

23	RFP Attachment 6.2. Section C, Item C.16.	<p>Is the State's intent to use the transition process from TIPS standards to the NENA standards as outlined in the document "GIS Data Standards for NG9-1-1 v7.3.3" dated 9/15/2020?</p> <p>Can you please describe the customized data submission solution or service currently in place for ECDs in TN?</p> <p>How do ECDs currently submit GIS data for aggregation into EGDMS?</p>	<p>The referenced document governs the data format in which the ECDs submit their data to the SI not the transition process.</p> <p>ECDs manage their data in Esri-compatible format. ECDs submit their Esri geodatabase, shapefile or OGC-compliant file formats to the state's current SI provider. No QA/QI is performed locally. Current SI service partner aggregates, QAs, and reports back to ECDs to for local correction of errors. SI provider then provisions Intrado's ECRF/LVF via EGDMS.</p>
24	RFP Attachment 6.2. Section C, Item C.17.	<p>Can you please describe the specific functions that the State is seeking in custom ad hoc GIS web dashboard(s)?</p> <p>Can the State provide an example WebGIS dashboard currently deployed?</p>	<p>The State currently utilizes the Esri dashboard capabilities to display relevant information from the ESInet in an easy to consume visual. Google image search "esri dashboard 911" for examples. The State reserves the right to provide additional feeds for inclusion in the dashboard as the current landscape across Tennessee changes with current events.</p>
25	RFP Attachment 6.2. Section C, Item C.20.	<p>Can the State please verify if a current solution/services is in place to support local 911 offices?</p> <p>What current solution/services are in place, and do these solutions currently meet the needs of both state and local interests?</p> <p>Is it the State's intent to replace any/all local support solution/services?</p>	<p>Yes. A current service is in place and that contract is soon to expire, thus requiring this procurement.</p> <p>See prior answers for insights to current services.</p> <p>No, it is not the State's intent to replace any/all local support solution/services. State's intent is defined in Section 1.1 of the RFP.</p>

3. **RFP Amendment Effective Date.** The revisions set forth herein shall be effective upon release. All other terms and conditions of this RFP not expressly amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.