

**RFP # 2229 South Dakota Statewide GIS and Managed Services
In Support of the State NG911
Written Inquiry Responses**

First Company:

General Questions:

1. It appears that LR Kimball and Weston assisted with the preparation of this RFP. Will this preclude either or both of them from submitting a proposal for this RFP.

L.R. Kimball has been contracted by the South Dakota State 9-1-1 Coordination Board to provide technical consulting in support of the South Dakota Statewide Geographic Information System Data and Managed Services project. As such, L.R. Kimball is precluded from responding to this proposal solicitation.

2. Will a preference be given to a responder providing a comprehensive solution over a responder providing a solution to one of the components (e.g. ECRF/LVF services only).

The State reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, waive technicalities and make award(s) as deemed to be in the best interest of the State of South Dakota.

3. Are there alternative guidelines the State wishes to follow in the absence of the NENA 71-003 NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model v1.0 published guidelines?

Relevant guidelines and standards are identified within RFP #2229 under Section 3.0 SCOPE OF WORK – Data Development Standards.

4. SCHEDULE – Pg. 1-5 Section 1.1 indicates the contract covers 5 years with the option of adding 5 years. Does the State have a desired timeframe for when the Statewide Dataset is to be delivered? 1 year, 2 years...?

The Offeror shall include an estimated timeframe (schedule of deliverables) based on their experience and expertise in delivering these types of projects.

General Information Section 1.0

RFP excerpt:

In addition to aggregating the GIS map data, the Offeror will also develop a system and process to ensure the data is kept as current as possible moving forward. Numerous key stakeholders will be involved in the development of the maintenance process, including local city and county GIS and Information Technology (IT) staff, tribal officials and vendors that maintain local GIS data for numerous cities and counties in the State.

1. Does the state intend to provide on-line edit access to the maintenance system and process referenced in the paragraph above?

It is the State's requirement that a system and process for maintaining the aggregated GIS data be developed and managed by the Offeror, which will meet at a minimum the criteria specified within the RFP document.

The Offeror shall describe in detail their proposed solution and services for specified maintenance system and process it is proposing.

RFP Excerpt:

The aggregation and maintenance of this GIS dataset must provide for near real time updates of the geospatial data and is expected to facilitate the following:

- Update receipt and integration of geospatial data from each 9-1-1 entity's GIS
- Provide the ability for authenticated users to upload daily GIS edits and changes through a secure browser-based portal
- Perform quality control and assurance on the data to meet accuracy standards
- Provide the ability to facilitate, coordinate and communicate resolution of conflicting geospatial datasets
- Execute live provisioning of the GIS map data into the NG9-1-1 ECRF/LVF system on a timely basis
- Assure dynamic (real time) changes to routing geospatial data

2. Does the last bullet imply that the State is looking for a routable roadway network (suitable to support emergency vehicle routing) as part of the project deliverable? If so, do you require a temporal component to the routing network (e.g. changes to impedances based on the time of day).

A routable roadway network (suitable to support emergency vehicle routing) is not a requirement of the Road Centerline deliverable. However, the Offeror may include such as a clearly delineated option within their proposal submission.

Scope of Work Section 3.0

RFP Excerpt:

Source Data

The Offeror shall utilize as the primary source of data for this project GIS data developed and maintained at the local level. These primary sources of data encompass PSAPs, Tribal entities, County and Municipal governments, and South Dakota state agencies..

A list of primary GIS data sources has been provided as Appendix A to this RFP. The State will make available to the successful Offeror an expanded matrix to include contact information for each of the PSAP locations, as well as any appropriate State Agencies. The GIS data typically available represents the following:

- Road centerlines
- Site/structure address points
- Emergency services boundaries (Fire, Police, Emergency Medical Services [EMS])
- Administrative boundaries (State, County, Municipal)

1. Does the State wish to have Structure *access points and structure location points* as part of the Site/Structure point data?

The Site/Structure Address Points shall represent structure location points only.

In the process of aggregating the statewide GIS map dataset, the Offeror will conduct a gap analysis in which they shall identify errors and discrepancies within the various local datasets. It is the State's expectation that the actual remediation of the identified errors and discrepancies will be conducted by the local entities. The Offeror shall provide sufficient information and guidance to the local entities for the remediation of their data.

2. Will the local entities be required to remediate the data?

It is the State's expectation that the actual remediation of the identified errors and discrepancies will be conducted by the local entities.

3. Will this remediation be done within the timeframe of this project?

The remediation of GIS data will be done within the timeframe of this project and shall be incorporated and reflected within the Offeror's project work plan, workflow, and schedule.

4. Will the State have a binding arbitration process setup to resolve discrepancies between the local entities data?

No binding arbitration process is expected to be instituted. Local entities will be advised of data discrepancies within and between neighboring entities. The State anticipates a collaborative environment to be established between the local entities, State representatives and the GIS data aggregation vendor, which will facilitate the efficient and timely remediation of data required for the overarching project.

5. What is the State's expectation for the frequency with which the new State Dataset is updated?

The aggregation and maintenance of this GIS dataset must provide for near real time updates of the geospatial data and is expected to facilitate the following:

- Update receipt and integration of geospatial data from each 9-1-1 entity's GIS
- Provide the ability for authenticated users to upload daily GIS edits and changes through a secure browser-based portal
- Perform quality control and assurance on the data to meet accuracy standards
- Provide the ability to facilitate, coordinate and communicate resolution of conflicting geospatial datasets
- Execute live provisioning of the GIS map data into the NG9-1-1 ECRF/LVF system on a timely basis
- Assure dynamic (real time) changes to routing geospatial data

6. Does the State currently use a form of database replication?

No.

3.7 Cell Sector Locations

The Offeror must describe the methodology used to create a statewide cell sector locations GIS data layer. The methodology description shall include how the Offeror will adhere to the NENA standard for NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model.

7. Does the state have a defined source (contact name and number) for the cell sector locations data for each of the cell service providers?

The State does not have a defined source for cell sector locations. The State will work with the Offeror on establishing contact and communications with respective cell service providers to collect available information (i.e. call routing sheets) describing the location of cell sites. Beyond this, the State is looking to the Offeror to define their methodology and process to developing this feature layer based on their demonstrated experience.

3.8 GIS Managed Services

- 3.8.1** The Offeror shall provide for a secure web portal for local 9-1-1 entities to submit GIS update/change requests and the Offeror to communicate error/discrepancy feedback.
- 3.8.2** The Offeror shall provide the means for web-enabled reports, performance measurements, discrepancy tracking, for GIS quality assurance and system status.
- 3.8.3** The Offeror shall provide the means for the State to view system and data metrics by means of a web-enabled viewer/dashboard.
- 3.8.4** The Offeror shall provide process and usage training of the change management process to the local 9-1-1 entities.
- 3.8.5** The Offeror shall provide 24x7x365 customer support

8. Does the State have a minimum requirement for the time it takes to update the GIS data files, once the complete information is received from the local entity?

The States expectation is for GIS data to be updated on a daily basis.

Data Source Table

1. Will the source data be provided by the source (Organization/vendor) at no cost to the State or selected vendor for this project?

Source data is expected to be made available at no charge to the Offeror.

2. Can the state provide the format and version of the existing source data (e.g. Esri .mdb v10.1, Esri .shp, Intergraph/Bentley .dgn, paper map) for each data resource?

The Offeror should anticipate the existing source data being in some format or version of ESRI.

3. Can the state provide a count of the records in each source file?

Specifics as to total record counts are unavailable at this time.

4. Is the selected vendor expected to create the required source data as part of this contract for areas where the source information is unknown or not available?

The Offeror will conduct a gap analysis in which they shall identify errors and discrepancies within the various local datasets. It is the State's expectation that the actual remediation of the identified errors and discrepancies will be conducted by the local entities. The Offeror shall provide sufficient information and guidance to the local entities for the remediation of their data.

The Offeror may wish to submit options to produce or update any missing data as a clearly delineated option within their proposal submission.

Second Company:

Relevant Passage

p. 3-1 The State acknowledges that the desired GIS solution may ultimately be provided by one or multiple providers. As such, Offerors to this RFP may wish to offer one, many or all of the services, functions and systems described herein...Any needed function or methodology not specifically identified in this RFP and not included in an Offerors response, but necessary for a functional/operational system meeting the States requirements, shall be cause for the State to reject the proposal. It is the State's intent to provide the basic information required in this RFP and the Offeror(s) responsibility to propose any single or all items needed to ensure delivery of a fully functional and operational system.

Question

1. Please clarify whether the State has provisions to award to multiple offerors under this contract. Could it, for example, potentially award GIS Map Data Aggregation and GIS Managed Services to one vendor, and ECRF / LVF Managed Services to another?

The State may award multiple Offerors. The State reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, waive technicalities and make award(s) as deemed to be in the best interest of the State of South Dakota.

Relevant Passages

p. 3-2 Required features are represented by the use of the words must, shall, requirement or required. Some features may be listed as desirable. These features are desirable but not required. They are represented by the words may, should, desired or desirable. Desirables will be considered when evaluating proposals, but only after requirements are addressed.

p. 3-7 3.9.1 – The Offeror shall (optionally) provide the NG9-1-1 ECRF as defined in the NENA 08-003 Detailed Functional and Interface Standards for the NENA i3 Solution.

p. 3-8 3.10.1 – The Offeror shall (optionally) provide the NG9-1-1 Location Validation Function (LVF) as defined in the NENA 08-003 Detailed Functional and Interface Standards for the NENA i3 Solution.

Questions

1. Do the passages from pages 3-7 and 3-8 of the RFP above mean that offerors may optionally propose ECRF and LVF solutions (§3.9 & §3.10), or do they

merely indicate that these solutions may optionally be compliant with applicable NENA interface standards?

§3.9 – The Offer may propose on providing an ECRF solution. If the Offeror proposes an ECRF solution, it shall be compliant as defined in the NENA 08-003 Detailed Functional and Interface Standards for the NENA i3 Solution.

§3.10 – Offer may propose on providing an LVF solution. If the Offeror proposes an LVF solution, it shall be compliant as defined in the NENA 08-003 Detailed Functional and Interface Standards for the NENA i3 Solution.

2. Is it therefore accurate to conclude that scope of work elements 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 are required, while elements 3.9 and 3.10 are desirable, and that offerors are eligible to submit proposals that address only scope elements 3.1 through 3.8, while omitting proposed solutions for 3.9 and 3.10?

Offerors are eligible to submit proposals on any one or multiples of the specified categories (GIS Map Data Aggregation, GIS Managed Services, or ECRF/LVF Managed Services). If an Offeror should choose to not propose on a given category, it shall clearly note this within its submission as a point of clarification.

The State may award multiple Offerors. The State reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, waive technicalities and make award(s) as deemed to be in the best interest of the State of South Dakota.

Relevant Passage

p. 3-4 In the process of aggregating the statewide GIS map dataset, the Offeror will conduct a gap analysis in which they shall identify errors and discrepancies within the various local datasets. It is the State's expectation that the actual remediation of the identified errors and discrepancies will be conducted by the local entities. The Offeror shall provide sufficient information and guidance to the local entities for the remediation of their data.

The Offeror must submit a database modeling specification document that outlines the database schema representing the GIS layers to be developed, to include fields, descriptions, field types, etc.

Questions

1. Please clarify whether the passage above indicates that the State is requesting submission of a proposed data model specification as a part of each offeror's RFP response, or whether the only selected vendor will be required to provide the State with the specification.

The inclusion of a database modeling specification document within the Offeror's proposal submission is not a requirement. A final data model specification document will be reviewed and finalized during negotiations with the selected Offeror.

2. If the expectation is the former, would the State consider modifying this prerequisite given that unanticipated modeling requirements will likely emerge from the gap analysis, dataset evaluations, and data aggregation planning; and that the *NENA Standard for NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model*, which was expected for release in Q4 2013, is not yet publicly available?

The inclusion of a database modeling specification document within the Offeror's proposal submission is not a requirement. A final data model specification document will be reviewed and finalized during negotiations with the selected Offeror.

Third Company:

1. Can the State provide an example of existing local GIS data? Or is there a place to download existing data?

A sample GIS dataset will be posted for download off the South Dakota Department of Public Safety website (http://dps.sd.gov/sd_911/).

Disclaimer: The sample GIS data is being provided for general information purposes only and should not be construed as a representative dataset of any one particular local entity or the entire State.

2. Is aerial photography available for the entire State? Can you please explain the resolution and year the photos were flown?

Statewide aerial photography is available from the South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources via free download from their website. 1 meter resolution NAIP imagery is available from the 2012 project. It should be noted that the imagery is rectified using DOQQs, thus horizontal accuracy is limited to that of the DOQQs.

Some of the available GIS source data may also be based on more accurate aerial photography or GPS data collection that has been conducted by the local entities. In such cases, the State will make every opportunity to provide this localized data, if possible.

Fourth Company:

1. If splitting a road segment, should the Offeror also re-assign address ranges?

The Offeror will conduct a gap analysis in which they shall identify errors and discrepancies within the various local datasets. It is the State's expectation that the actual remediation of the identified errors and discrepancies will be conducted by the

local entities. The Offeror shall provide sufficient information and guidance to the local entities for the remediation of their data.

2. As part of the Site/Structure Address Points deliverable, should the Offeror provide errors and discrepancies related to point location (rooftop, entrance, etc.)?

Yes. It is the State's desire that the Site/Structure Address Points be located on or in the near vicinity of the representative structure.

As an example, some address point data created at the localized level was created from parcel centroids and may not yet have been moved on top of structures shown in aerial photography. The State would expect this data to be flagged as needing more work.

It is the State's expectation that the actual remediation of the identified errors and discrepancies will be conducted by the local entities. The Offeror shall provide sufficient information and guidance to the local entities for the remediation of their data.

3. What Cell Sector information is available for the counties that do not have GIS boundaries available?

The State does not have a defined source for cell sector locations. The State will work with the Offeror on establishing contact and communications with respective cell service providers to collect available information (i.e. call routing sheets) describing the location of cell sites. Beyond this, the State is looking to the Offeror to define their methodology and process in developing this feature layer based on their demonstrated experience.

4. Could we receive a copy of the RFP in MS Word format?

A copy of the RFP in MS Word format has been posted to the South Dakota Department of Public Safety website (http://dps.sd.gov/sd_911/).

Fifth Company:

1. According to the Source Data Availability matrix at the end of the RFP, many local entities are missing one or more desired GIS data layers. Is missing GIS data to be developed as part of this project?
 - o If yes, will this data be developed by the local jurisdictions?

It is the State's desire that missing or inadequate GIS data will be developed during the course of this project.

The Offeror will conduct a gap analysis in which they shall identify errors and discrepancies within the various local datasets. It is the State's expectation that the actual remediation of the identified errors and discrepancies will be conducted by the local entities. The Offeror shall provide sufficient information and guidance to the local entities for the remediation of their data.

2. With local jurisdictions being responsible for data remediation (and potentially data development also) will the NG9-1-1 GIS Vendor be expected to accommodate or anticipate delays in the overall project schedule which may be caused by staffing and other issues with the local jurisdictions regarding the timely and successful completion of updates?
 - o Does the state plan to implement a deadline for GIS data development and/or remediation by local jurisdictions?

The Offeror is expected to work in partnership alongside the State and the local jurisdictions in the context of an overall project schedule to assure the entire process is expedited at a reasonable rate.

3. Will separate PSAP, fire, law and medical polygons be provided? Or will these layers be provided as combined emergency service zones from which the individual layers are extracted?

The Offeror should expect to see a mixture throughout the State of separate service provider polygons and combined emergency service zone polygons. Therefore, the Offeror should be prepared to deal with both scenarios.

Sixth Company:

Section 1.9 Proprietary Information: According to the Section 1.9, pricing and *service elements* are not considered proprietary. We are only concerned with our technical solution being proprietary, but we don't understand what the State means by "service elements."

1. Please define "service elements" in this context.

The term "service elements" in this sentence would be the pieces or parts or factors or elements or components in the Offeror's response that would result in the completion of the scope of work being successful.

Section 5.1.4.2 Detailed Response: Section 5.1.4.2 indicates that a specific point-by-point response to each requirement of the RFP is to be included in the proposal response.

2. Can we assume that in this instance "RFP" refers only to RFP Section 3.0 Scope of Work, and that point-by-point responses are not necessary for Sections 1.0 General Information; 2.0 Standard Contract Terms and Conditions; 4.0 Proposal Requirements and Company Qualifications; 5.0 Proposal Response Format; and 6.0 Proposal Evaluation and Award Process?

That is correct. The point-by-point response is in reference to Section 3 (Scope of Work) only.

Seventh Company:

- 1) Will a vendor be allowed to submit a proposal by itself, and also be used as a subcontractor for a different vendor?

Yes.

- 2) Will the State obtain county MSAG and 911 Customer Records databases from the corresponding providers, and if so, will these datasets be provided to the vendor for QA/QC purposes?

Additional source information that may be available to the selected Offeror includes MSAG and ALI databases for each PSAP jurisdiction, if available.

- 3) Will the vendor be expected to create a Road Name Alias table for counties that provide road centerline datasets that use multiple overlapping road segments with alias road names?

Yes. The Offeror must describe the methodology used to create a statewide road name alias table.