



July 25, 2019

To: All Potential Bidders

From: Ken Discher, Issuing Officer

Subject: RFP1220379001 – CJIS System services and support

## Amendment Two

**Please amend the subject RFP to include answers to the following timely received questions. This Amendment One shall supersede, modify and/or change all requirements to the contrary in the RFP and associated documents.**

1. **Question 1 (Q1):** Do current exchanges on the ESB platform strictly follow NIEM or are there any deviations?  
**Answer 1 (A1):** Yes NIEM standards are followed.
  
2. **Q2:** Is transformation to and from NIEM a responsibility of the edge Agency applications or of the CJIS ESB platform?  
**A2:** CJIS and vendor are both responsible for conforming new exchanges to NIEM standards.
  
3. **Q3:** What is the governance and support model for an exchange between Agencies sharing information via the central CJIS ESB platform? Are MOAs and MOUs in place?  
**A3:** a) Agencies sharing or receiving information are free to enter into their own agreements; CJIS does not require these or sign as a party to them, if they exist.  
b) An MOU signed by the Governor and Chief Justice created CJIS. Otherwise, see (a) above.
  
4. **Q4:** Do you have automated mechanisms for data purging after the identified retention period? Does it also purge the ESB platform's metadata and audit information?  
**A4:** Yes, data from information exchanges is purged from the CJIS system after approximately 3 months.
  
5. **Q5:** Concerning RFP Section 1.5. Are the 25 exchanges already migrated to 12C or will that be a part of the new scope?  
**A5:** There are still a few legs of the system running on 11g but those are expected to be completed by the end of July. This migration is not in the scope of the RFP. The awarded Contractor would need to assist with any future migrations.

6. **Q6:** Concerning RFP Section 1.5. Do all 25 exchanges require 24\*7 support or only the 7 exchanges classified as High-Level Maintenance?  
**A6:** Only the 7 exchanges classified as high-level maintenance.
7. **Q7:** Concerning RFP Sec. 1.5. Can you elaborate on the scope of work involved in rolling out an exchange across the 56 county attorney offices? Does it require building separate logic for each office for any respective data transformation?  
**A7:** Yes, it will require separate logic and can also require data transformation.
8. **Q8:** Is there a reason that the RFP was released at this time being that some data exchanges are in the middle stages of implementation? Are there roadblocks, resource constraints, or other challenges that are preventing the current vendor from completing the work?  
**A8:** a) A new RFP process is required after a contract term and all available extension terms are expired.  
b) There is a roadblock on the Trial Information exchange, in that we have to wait for another company to complete work before we can proceed. There are no roadblocks for Public Defender Court Notice or Judicial Hotfile Queries, and those exchanges are actively being developed. Invariably there are roadblocks at times with various exchange projects. It will be important for the awarded Contractor to actively work with CJIS to determine whether to pause a project or work through a roadblock. CJIS seeks to have several projects in the active pipeline to help assure that any one roadblock does not stop work towards overall goals and other exchanges.
9. **Q9:** Is a Flex-model acceptable that would offer a fixed-cost for Support (24\*7) and T&M for Development?  
**A9:** No. See information in the attached REVISED Cost Proposal, REVISED Cost Proposal Supplement and Contract Points Overview documents.
10. **Q10:** Concerning RFP Sec. 1.5. Are the SSPs for identified interfaces already established or do they need to be established by the qualifying vendor?  
**A10:** SSPs are complete for the 3 exchanges in development. An SSP is also complete for the Sheriff Return of Service exchange. No SSP has been developed for Juvenile Complaints. More information about SSPs can be found in the attached documents titled, Contract Points Overview and URL CJIS agrment Amend #4.
11. **Q11:** Concerning RFP Sec. 1.5. Are different connectivity protocols like MQ, File/ ftp, Direct Database to be used for exchanges across various agencies?  
**A11:** These are not currently used or anticipated.
12. **Q12:** Are reference architecture(s) and guidelines already in place that need to be followed for new exchange development?  
**A12:** Yes. We use a Web-service SOA Architecture.

13. **Q13:** Is an SME or Point-Of-Contact established for each agency?  
**A13:** **Unofficially, yes, for all of the agencies we currently work with.**
14. **Q14:** How are system errors and business exceptions currently dealt with for current data exchanges?  
**A14:** **It depends on the exchange but system errors are retried N number of times and then go to human retry while business errors are propagated back to the original sender of the message through use of a separate async web-service.**
15. **Q15:** Are fault handling, monitoring & alerts, reporting mechanisms already in place or do they need to be built as part of new scope?  
**A15:** **For existing exchanges they are all already in place. For new exchanges they need to be implemented.**
16. **Q16:** Do you have a separate group for infrastructure, ODA and application server administration and maintenance?  
**A16:** **Yes. The CJIS ESB itself is maintained internally by CJIS staff. The Oracle support (refer to RFP page 7) is provided through a separate State of Iowa master contract with Zirus.**
17. **Q17:** Can you provide a Pre-Proposal Conference attendees list?  
**A17:** **Yes. The following companies participated: Analysts, Apex Systems, Epathusa, FivePoint Solutions, GCOM Software, NIC Solutions, Sierra-Cedar Inc., URL Integration, Zirus.**
18. **Q18:** Is there an approved budget for this project?  
**A18:** **No.**
19. **Q19:** Who (department/group/role) is the project sponsor?  
**A19:** **Department of Human Rights, Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning.**
20. **Q20:** Who is the incumbent vendor, is this RFP's purpose to find an alternative vendor?  
**A20:** **a) The incumbent vendor is URL Integration.  
b) The RFP is being posted per the State's Administrative Rules for procurement of goods and services (IAC 11-117 and 11-118).**
21. **Q21:** Concerning RFP Sec. 6.1. Will the State consider the use of a vendor's standard agreement as the basis for the Contract?  
**A21:** **No. Contractor may, if they choose, take exception to RFP T&Cs through following RFP Section 3.2.8 and Section 6.1 process.**
22. **Q22:** What Hub or Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) is Iowa currently using (Examples: Microsoft BizTalk, Software AG WebMethods)?  
**A22:** **Oracle OSB and SOA.**

23. **Q23:** Would you be open to replacing the existing exchanges to be on a newer, more modern, integration platform that could be leveraged for future uses such as Federated Queries?  
**A23: No.**
24. **Q24:** Are there any issues with the current platform or data exchanges that you would like to have fixed?  
**A24: Nothing specific at this time.**
25. **Q25:** Concerning RFP Attachment #1-Certification Letter. If a respondent checks "Contractor is not a 'retailer' or a 'retailer maintaining a place of business in this state'" box, will there be a negative impact or effect upon the respondent's proposal?  
**A25: Per directions within RFP Attachment #1, Contractor should check the applicable box. Contractor answer will not have an effect on their proposal.**
26. **Q26:** Concerning RFP Sec. 6.3. Is the Property Damage insurance referring to property in the Vendor's care/custody/control or general property damage?  
**A26: Contractor may, if they choose, take exception to RFP T&Cs through following the RFP Section 3.2.8 and Section 6.1 process.**
27. **Q27:** Concerning RFP Sec. 6.3. Is the Property Damage limit negotiable?  
**A27: No, it is not.**
28. **Q28:** Concerning RFP Sec. 1.4. Could you please share in use technical stack? i.e. Container/serve to deploy Java applications.  
**A28: Oracle web-logic Server 12c and 11G, Microsoft IIS, Apache.**
29. **Q29:** Concerning RFP Sec. 1.4. Has analysis been completed or in progress for new exchanges? Or, will vendor analyze these exchanges?  
**A29: a) There are some additional future exchanges on our radar that have been requested by agencies. We discuss potential future exchanges on a rolling basis as they are requested.**  
**b) Our vendor is expected to be part of these discussions about potential future exchanges, and to help with analysis regarding magnitude of work.**
30. **Q30:** Concerning RFP Sec. 1.4. Can vendor propose any software or open source app addition to in use technical stack?  
**A30: Yes.**
31. **Q31:** Concerning RFP Sec. 1.4. Could you please share technical architecture diagram?  
**A31: A diagram does not exist. Please refer to RFP Section 1.4 for further information.**

32. **Q32:** Concerning RFP Sec. 1.5. a. Please project the number of new exchanges for years 2-6. Supporting details that will help with the estimate include plans for the number of exchanges expected to be developed per year. b. Are there any established timeframes and deadlines for the 3 “active development” exchanges, and the 2 “next exchange priorities” exchanges?

**A32:** a) We anticipate putting approximately 2 new exchanges per year into production. Typically, we like to have 4 or 5 exchanges in development or planning stages at any given time, so that if a project gets stalled, we can keep moving other exchanges forward.

b) There is no exact deadline, however, our current plan envisions that the (3) exchanges currently in “active development” would be completed in year one and the (2) “next exchange priorities” exchanges would be completed in year two.

33. **Q33:** In the cost proposal (Attachment #5) of the RFP, the following is stated: “Per Hour Rate (For any additional required enhancements that the State determines are within the scope of the RFP but outside the scope of the base cost proposal and agreement)”

a. What is the definition of the above ‘within scope’ reference? b. What are examples of items that have been considered out of scope in the past?

**A33:** The above has been removed from the Cost Proposal. (The Cost Proposal Attachment #5 within the RFP is no longer to be used and should be discarded.) Please see attached REVISED Cost Proposal and REVISED Cost Proposal Supplement.

34. **Q34:** In order to provide a cost for this RFP, there needs to be some high-level parameters around the scope of the project. Are you expecting costs to be estimated on a projected number of new exchanges and maintenance per year? Or, are you expecting the vendor to bid costs projected for a number of FTEs provided for each year?

**A34:** Contractor’s Cost Proposal is expected to be based on a projected number of new exchanges each year (approx. 2) and maintenance of all exchanges. Costs should not be based on a projected number of FTEs. See attached REVISED Cost Proposal and REVISED Cost Proposal Supplement.

35. **Q35:** Please explain what is meant by high, moderate and low maintenance exchanges. Are they quantified in any way? For example, what is the average number of hours per week spent maintaining or supporting an exchange in each category?

**A35:** All exchanges will be expected to receive regular maintenance and support services as needed during normal business hours throughout the year. “High maintenance” exchanges may require monthly troubleshooting or maintenance and may, at times, require work outside of regular business hours (ie – 24/7). “Moderate maintenance” exchanges have required troubleshooting or maintenance a few times per year but this has not typically required work outside of regular business hours. “Low maintenance” exchanges have required troubleshooting or maintenance approximately once per year and can typically be done during regular business hours.

36. **Q36:** a. What percentage of the existing exchanges are developed using Microsoft IIS (.Net), Oracle, and Java? b. Please elaborate on what is meant by exchanges developed using Oracle, as referenced on the top of page 7 of the RFP document.

**A36:** a) **This information is not currently available. We would need the awarded contractor to be proficient in all of those systems interchangeably.**

b) **Everything on the CJIS system is Oracle. But, CJIS is totally platform-independent and language-independent, so the receiving endpoint's web services can be written in any programming language and run on any operating system they choose.**

37. **Q37:** Our understanding is that the vendor is responsible for 100% of the project lifecycle for each exchange developed. For example, requirements through testing, project management and coordination of interactions between CJIS, agencies, vendors etc. Is this the correct scope of the vendor's responsibility?

**A37:** **The CJIS Coordinator works with the vendor to coordinate interactions with agencies; that is not 100% the vendor's duty. The CJIS Coordinator and vendor project manager communicate to determine responsibilities for different project.**

38. **Q38:** Please explain in detail the requirements of the 24x7 availability mentioned on page 7 and page 8 of the RFP document. (e.g. expected initial response time, expected resolution timeline, expected frequency of high-availability issues on weekends/holidays/evenings, historical average time taken to resolve off-hours issues, etc.).

**A38:** **See answer to Q35.**

39. **Q39:** Does CJIS have availability or response time requirements built into their agreement with any agencies they are supporting?

**A39:** **Specific availability or response time requirements are not built into the agreement, however, the high-level maintenance exchanges do, at times, require 24/7 availability and support in emergencies.**

40. **Q40:** Please share the current, public facing contract with the incumbent vendor, and any historical contracts between the incumbent vendor and the State of Iowa.

**A40:** **Documents applicable to current agreement are attached and titled, URL-CJIS agrment-effective 070113-063015 and URL CJIS agrment Amend #4-070117-063019.**

41. **Q41:** What are the expected travel requirements to install, deploy, or otherwise support agencies across the state of Iowa connected to CJIS? (e.g. the Trial Information exchange under active development will need a full roll-out to 56 county attorney offices).

**A41:** **Contractor must travel to end points as needed. Typically this has not required traveling to all end point offices as generally most work can be done remotely depending on Contractor's developer skill sets.**

42. **Q42:** Should a new vendor be awarded the contract, will the incumbent vendor be retained for “knowledge transfer” support during turnover? If so, how long should we expect that support?

**A42: Unknown.**

43. **Q43:** Is the contract that is to be awarded from this RFP intended to augment the services of your current vendor – meaning the current vendor will continue to provide similar services along with the new vendor?

**A43: No. A new awarded Contractor would replace the current contractor.**

44. **Q44:** Is the contract that is to be awarded from this RFP intended to replace the services of your current vendor? If so, is the current vendor allowed to submit a bid in response to this RFP?

**A44: a) Yes.**

**b) Yes.**