



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Message Switch System (MSS) System Modernization Project

RFP 24000000001

Issued: April 30, 2024

Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
201 South Union Street
Montgomery, AL 36104
(334) 517-2800
www.alea.gov

Table of Contents

Glossary	3
Section I	Introduction 5
Section II	General Terms & Conditions 8
Section III	Scope of Work 15
Section IV	Instructions to Vendors, Proposal Preparation, & Selection Criteria 16
Section V	Vendor Proposal Content..... 21
Attachment A – MSS Implementation Statement of Work (SOW) 26
Attachment B – MSS Operations SOW 51
Attachment C – MSS Specifications 70
Attachment D – MSS Current Environment Overview 104
Attachment E – Vendor References Form 105
Attachment F – Cost Response Form 107

Glossary

This section presents a glossary of the acronyms used in this document.

Acronym	Definition
ALEA	Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
CCH	Computerized Criminal History
CJIS	Criminal Justice Information Services
COOP	Continuity of Operations
COTS	Commercial, Off-the-Shelf
FAT	Factory Acceptance Testing
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
IFFS	Identification for Firearm Sales
IMP SOW	Implementation SOW
IMS	Integrated Master Schedule
IOC	Initial Operational Capability
ISO	International Standards Organization
IT	Information Technology
LEA	Law Enforcement Agency
MSS	Message Switch System
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
OPMR	Operational Program Management Review
OPS SOW	Operations SOW
PDF	Portable Data Format
PMO	Program Management Organization

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Acronym	Definition
PMP	Project Management Plan
RFP	Request for Proposals
SAT	System Acceptance Testing
SID	State Identification Number
SLA	Service Level Agreement
SLP	Service Level Plan
SOW	Statement of Work
TEMP	Test and Evaluation Master Plan
UAT	User Acceptance Testing
UPS	Uninterruptable Power Supply

Section I Introduction

The Alabama Law Enforcement Agency (“ALEA”) announces this Request for Proposals (“RFP”) to all eligible and interested parties for the opportunity to submit a proposal, in accordance with the requirements herein, to solicit proposals from qualified vendors for an agreement (“Agreement”) with an organization (“Vendor”) that can provide a commercial off-the-shelf (“COTS”) based, provider hosted, Message Switch System (“MSS”) for the State of Alabama. All interested vendors are invited to submit a proposal in accordance with the requirements specified in this RFP.

1.1 Purpose of RFP

ALEA was created in 2015 through the merger of several independent state law enforcement agencies. As a result, official government functions related to criminal justice information systems, criminal records, the state automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS) and other technical and informational functions, which were spread across agencies, are now consolidated into a single Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the State Bureau of Investigation within ALEA.

ALEA has an existing MSS which is briefly described in Attachment D to this RFP.

This will be an open and competitive bid process. The capabilities of the selected vendor’s solution will include, but not be limited to, all hardware, software and maintenance and support services, including network management required to provide a MSS environment with a geographically separated disaster recovery/continuity of operations (DR/COOP) environment to serve ALEA and all users within the State of Alabama; on an MSS-as-a-service basis. System support and maintenance must be provided as a service by the selected vendor.

Vendors’ responses to the System Requirements and the Statements of Work, particularly regarding implementation, user experience, data migration and training, will be considered as part of this solicitation. It is the State of Alabama’s desire that this hosted solution service be implemented and accepted in a timeframe not greater than 18 months from contract signing.

Vendor responses to this RFP must include, but not be limited to, software licensing and implementation, MSS system solution (including a disaster recovery/continuity of operations site, project management, training, customizations, data migration, ongoing maintenance, support and reporting services, all based on a COTS MSS solution.

It will be important for the chosen vendor to have significant experience in Criminal Justice Information Services with state-level agencies and extensive knowledge of federal requirements for compliance and interaction with FBI CJIS by ALEA.

1.2 Scope of RFP

Through this RFP the State seeks to replace and enhance core MSS components and the criminal records management services that ALEA provides. Specific service elements sought from prospective Bidders include, but are not limited to, the needs described in:

- Attachment A - Implementation Statement of Work (SOW).
- Attachment B - Operations SOW.
- Attachment C - MSS Specifications.
- Attachment D - MSS Current Environment Overview

- Attachment E - References Form
- Attachment F - Cost Response Form

1.2.1 Implementation SOW

The Implementation SOW defines the scope of work required throughout the so-called developmental phase of the ALEA MSS replacement contract. The developmental phase is the period from contract award through completion of system acceptance. System acceptance includes successful user acceptance test (UAT). UAT is part of the Implementation SOW. The Implementation SOW is in Attachment A. Specifications stating that the proposed MSS solution “shall” meet are mandatory for the final solution design, while compliance with those stating that MSS “should” meet will be evaluated based on the vendors response.

1.2.2 Operations SOW

The Operations SOW defines the scope of work required throughout the so-called operational phase of the ALEA MSS replacement contract. The operational phase is the period from completed system acceptance through the completion of the contract. The Operations SOW also applies to any extension that may be negotiated under a contract. The Operations SOW is in Attachment B. Specifications stating that the proposed MSS solution “shall” meet are mandatory for the final solution design, while compliance with those stating that MSS “should” meet will be evaluated based on the vendors response.

1.2.3 MSS Specifications

The MSS Specifications document enumerates the functional and technical requirements of the solution that this RFP describes. The technical requirements include what is referred to as non-functional requirements. The MSS Specifications document is in Attachment C. Specifications stating that the proposed MSS solution “shall” meet are mandatory for the final solution design, while compliance with those stating that MSS “should” meet will be evaluated based on the vendors response.

The final Scope of Work for this project may change at the time of vendor selection, and any changes will be incorporated into the contract.

1.3 Minimum Mandatory Requirements

To be eligible to submit a proposal for this RFP, the Vendor, at a minimum, must meet all of the following minimum mandatory requirements:

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

ID	Minimum Mandatory Requirements
MMS-1	Vendor must be established prime providers of MSS systems with equivalent MSS installations (equivalent in terms of MSS functionality, database size, transaction throughput and accuracy) that are in current productive use in U.S. law enforcement installations. Proposals will not be accepted from third-party manufacturer representatives, system integrators or from manufacturers whose systems do not meet the equivalency requirements and productive use requirements established in this solicitation. Vendor must have begun or completed implementation of their solution in at least one (1) U.S. State level environment of similar complexity to that of The State of Alabama, within the last 5 years.
MMS-2	The RFP response must include a minimum of 3 qualified references for the provider’s solution as required in the RFP. 1 of the 3 must be for the solution proposed in response to this RFP, the 3 rd can be any current customer of the vendors’ products. All three references must be from the public sector.
MMS-3	The vendor must provide a fully integrated and managed solution. The proposed solution must utilize a commercial government cloud (preferably Azure ¹) model that is CJIS compliant and approved by the State of Alabama. The vendor will be responsible for managing all aspects of the service proposed.
MMS-4	The data must be solely owned by the ALEA and the State of Alabama.
MMS-5	The solution hosting platform, all solution components, data, database, disaster recovery site, or business continuity sites must be physically located in the United States and the transmission of data must not leave the continental United States.
MMS-6	All work performed to satisfy the requirements of the contract resulting from this Request for Proposal (RFP) must be performed in the United States.
MMS-7	The proposed solution must be compliant at the point of production with the most current version of the FBI CJIS Security Policy.
MMS-8	The proposal’s primary vendor must assume responsibility for the overall solution and all of its components.

Failure to meet these minimum mandatory pass/fail requirements will disqualify proposals.

¹ ALEA currently maintains a substantial Azure government cloud tenant housing most of ALEA’s agency IT tools and resources.

Section II General Terms & Conditions

2.1 Key Dates & Contact Information

The following key dates pertain to this RFP. Working days are Monday through Friday, excluding any State of Alabama holidays.

Event	Date/Time
RFP Released	Tuesday, April 30, 2024
Vendor Conference**	Wednesday, May 8, 2024
Vendor Final Questions Due	Friday, May 10, 2024
Answers to Vendor Questions Due	Tuesday, May 14, 2024
Close Date - RFP Responses Due	Tuesday, May 21, 2024
Bid Opening	Wednesday, May 22, 2024

For any questions or issues, please contact the RFP Coordinator

Beverly Anderson

(334) 676-6242

Email : Beverly.Anderson@alea.gov

Responses to this RFP must be received in the ALEA Accounting Office by 4:00 p.m., Central Standard Time, May 21, 2024. Packages must be clearly marked as:

ALEA RFP 2400000001: Purchasing (Beverly Anderson)
Sealed Bid DO NOT OPEN.

A mandatory virtual pre-bid **Vendor Conference will be held on Wednesday May 8, 2024, at 10 am central standard time. Interested providers should contact the above listed ALEA RFP Coordinator via email *prior* to May 8, 2024, to request an invitation to this Teams meeting. The invitations will then be forwarded via email to those named provider representatives upon request.

2.2 Responsibility to Read and Understand

By responding to this solicitation, the Vendor will be held to have read and thoroughly examined the RFP. Failure to read and thoroughly examine the RFP will not excuse any failure to comply

with the requirements of the RFP or any resulting contract, nor will such failure be a basis for claiming additional compensation.

2.3 Reservations

In addition to any other reservations made herein, ALEA reserves the following rights:

- a) to cancel this RFP.
- b) to reject any or all proposals.
- c) to reject individual proposals for failure to meet any requirement.
- d) to award by item, part or portion of an item, group of items, or total.
- e) to waive minor defects and/or seek additional proposals.
- f) to award one or more contracts that ALEA determines to be in the best interest of the state and ALEA.
- g) to award a contract to a vendor other than the lowest-priced vendor, if a higher-priced proposal provides the best value as determined by ALEA.

2.4 No Right to Selection or a Contract

The submission of a proposal confers on the Vendor no right of selection or to a subsequent contract. This process is for the benefit of the ALEA only and is to provide the ALEA with competitive information to assist in the selection process. All decisions on compliance, evaluation, terms, and conditions will be made solely at the discretion of the ALEA and made to favor the State.

2.5 Clarification/Supplementation Request from ALEA

ALEA may seek and receive necessary clarification/supplementation from Vendor within five (5) days of receiving responsive proposals and prior to awarding any contract. Clarification/supplementation during this period will be limited to ensuring compliance with requirements, forms, and certifications and is not an opportunity for Vendor to modify substantive terms or its monetary proposal.

2.6 Vendor Registered to do Business in Alabama

All responsive vendors must be registered through Alabama Buys to perform business with the State of Alabama. A copy of the **State Vendor Application** and information pertinent to doing business with the State is available online at: <https://procurement.staars.alabama.gov>. Applications should be submitted to the Division of Procurement. Additionally, vendors must be registered in the State of Alabama Accounting System (STAARS) to receive payment for services rendered.

General terms and conditions provided by the Alabama Department of Finance through the STAARS Purchasing System are hereby incorporated into this RFP by reference.

2.7 Vendor Contact

ALEA will consider the person who signs Vendor's proposal the contact person for all matters pertaining to the proposal unless Vendor expressly designates another person in writing.

2.8 Communications

From the date of publication of this RFP until such time as a binding contractual agreement exists with a Selected Vendor or until such time as ALEA rejects all proposals, Informal Communication **shall** cease and only Formal Communication will be allowed between any Vendor and ALEA. Failure to comply with this provision could result in disqualification of Vendor from continuing in this process.

Informal Communication **shall** include, but not be limited to, any communications from any Vendor to any facility, division, employee, agent, or representative of ALEA, with the sole exception being communications by vendors for information, comments, or speculation directed to ALEA's RFP Coordinator.

Formal Communication **shall** include Written Requests for Clarification/Information (pursuant to Section 2.5, **Clarification/Supplementation Request from ALEA**), Oral Presentations if requested by ALEA, or Negotiations with the Selected Vendor.

2.9 Cost of Preparation

ALEA is not responsible for, and will not pay any costs associated with, the preparation and submission of Vendor's proposal regardless of whether Vendor is selected for negotiations. Any costs associated with this RFP will be the responsibility of Vendor and will in no way be charged to the ALEA or the State of Alabama.

2.10 Proposal Conditions

All Vendor proposals will remain firm and unaltered for one-hundred and twenty (120) days after the proposal due date shown or until the contract is fully executed with any Vendor, whichever is earlier. An exception to this criterion will be if the Vendor is engaged in contract negotiations. That Vendor will then be allowed to make proposal modification(s), only in accordance with a request by ALEA. ALEA may accept Vendor's proposal at any time during the proposal firm time, subject to successful contract negotiations.

Proposal evaluations will be scored based on the response to the requirements of this RFP and held as the primary proposal. Alternative proposals will not be considered as the basis for the evaluation of the Selected Vendor. All proposals received will become the property of ALEA. ALEA further reserves the right to use for its benefit the ideas contained in proposals received.

Vendor must provide in the responsive proposal all applicable hourly rates and an itemized breakdown of costs (direct and indirect) based on the services that will be required. If multiple individuals may provide service under an executed contract, this information must be provided for each such individual. Failure to provide hourly rates for all services required in this RFP may result in a proposal being considered non-compliant.

Vendor must specify in the proposal the anticipated location(s) where the work will be performed. Vendor is not to use ALEA facilities or offices to provide services, unless specifically approved by ALEA.

All work performed and any ongoing services by Vendor procured through this RFP will comply with FBI Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Security Policy, Alabama Justice Information Commission Policy, ALEA policies and procedures, and industry standard best practices.

2.11 Vendor Certifications Based Upon Proposal Submission

By submitting a proposal:

- a) Vendor warrants acceptance and agreement with all terms and conditions presented in this RFP and that all statements contained in the proposal are true and correct. The Vendor further certifies that Vendor is legally authorized to conduct business within the State of Alabama and capable of providing the services described. Any exceptions to the specified terms and conditions must be clearly set forth within Vendor's proposal and are subject to the acceptance of ALEA. Vendor may be deemed non-responsive if its proposal contains exceptions to the terms and specifications of the RFP.
- b) Vendor warrants that neither Vendor nor any Vendor trustee, officer, director, employee, agent, servant, volunteer, subcontractor, or assign, is a current employee of ALEA and that no such individuals have been employed by ALEA within a two (2) year window preceding the issuance of this RFP. During the term of any awarded contract, Vendor **shall** be responsible for ensuring compliance with this requirement.
- c) Vendor certifies that neither Vendor nor any Vendor representative, trustee, officer, director, employee, agent, servant, volunteer, subcontractor, or assign is affiliated with or has publicly or privately colluded with any other vendor or any representative, trustee, officer, director, employee, agent, servant, volunteer, or assign of ALEA.
- d) Vendor certifies that it has disclosed and agrees it is obligated to continue to disclose financial and other interests (public or private, direct or indirect) that may pose a potential conflict of interest or which may conflict, in any manner, with Vendor's obligations and performance of an awarded contract. Vendor certifies it **shall NOT** employ any individual with a conflict of interest to perform any service described in this RFP.
- e) Vendor warrants it read and thoroughly examined the RFP and acknowledges failure to read and thoroughly examine the RFP will not excuse any failure to comply with the requirements of the RFP or any resulting contract, nor will such failure be the basis for any claim for additional compensation.

2.12 Opening Date

Vendor proposals will be opened on May 22, 2024, at (4:00 pm) in the ALEA Accounting Conference Room located at 301 South Ripley Street, Montgomery, AL 36104. Proposals shall not be open publicly per 355-4-3.03(12).

Properly identified proposals will be securely kept and will remain unopened until the time of the proposal's opening. ALEA does not accept responsibility for premature openings of proposals, which were not properly identified, or which arrived late for whatever reason. Proposal opening is not to be construed as meaning any vendor meets all specifications as set out in the proposal.

2.13 Evaluation and Selection

ALEA will designate a Proposal Evaluation Committee to be made up of members of ALEA Staff and Senior Staff. ALEA reserves the right to include a qualified expert with relevant experience to participate in proposal evaluations. The Proposal Evaluation Committee will evaluate all proposals using the criteria outlined in Section 4.10, **Evaluation Criteria**, and make a recommendation to the Secretary of ALEA. The Secretary of ALEA will then make an award recommendation to the Chief Procurement Officer (CPO) will make the final award decision.

ALEA may make such reasonable investigations as deemed proper and necessary to determine the ability of Vendor to perform the services as proposed, and Vendor **shall** furnish to the State all such information and data for this purpose as may be requested. The State further reserves

the right to reject any proposal if the evidence submitted by, or investigations of, such Vendor fails to satisfy the State that such Vendor is properly qualified to carry out the obligations of the awarded contract.

Vendor selection will be based on the proposal that meets or exceeds the requirements set forth in this RFP. Proposals will be evaluated based on the quality and completeness of the information provided. Vendors must provide comprehensive statements that illustrate their understanding of the proposed contract requirements.

Upon the award of, or the announcement of the decision to award a contract, ALEA will inform the Selected Vendor in writing. See **Section 4.11, Selection Posted** for more details.

2.14 Contract Negotiations

The Selected Vendor may be required to enter into contract negotiations at the discretion of ALEA. If an agreement cannot be reached to the satisfaction of ALEA, it may reject the Vendor's proposal or revoke the selection and begin negotiations with another qualified and responsive vendor.

This RFP does not, by itself, obligate ALEA; such obligation **shall** commence only upon the execution of any properly approved contract. However, part or all of this RFP may be incorporated into any executed contract, along with Vendor's proposal. ALEA hereby reserves the right to add terms and conditions during contract negotiations, within the scope of this RFP.

2.15 Cost of the Resulting Contract

Per each proposed service listed in Section III Scope of Work, the Vendor **shall** state the cost for each service, whether it be a total cost of the accomplished service or a fixed rate for the personnel needed to accomplish the service. If a fixed rate is submitted, then the Vendor **shall** provide a rate per type of position necessary to accomplish the service.

2.16 Resulting Contract General Terms

- a) A standard contract will be required. Upon acceptance of Vendor's proposal by ALEA, the parties will execute a formal contract, in writing, duly signed by the proper parties thereto (including CPO signature), which **shall** be subject to review by the Legislative Contract Review Oversight Committee of the State of Alabama and to approval and signature of the Governor of the State of Alabama. The executed contract will not be effective until it has received all requisite state government approvals. Vendor will assume responsibility for providing services under the executed contract on the effective date of the contract, which will be the date of approval and signature of the Governor of Alabama or her designee. Vendor **shall NOT** begin performing services thereunder until notified by ALEA. Vendor will not be entitled to compensation for work or services performed prior to the effective date of the contract.
- b) The anticipated initial contract term for this RFP is a two (2) year period. ALEA reserves the right, however, to include up to three (3), one-year renewal options, at its discretion, in any initially awarded contract. To be effective, any renewals must also be submitted and approved by the Alabama Legislative Contract Review Oversight Committee and require the approval and signature of the Governor of the State of Alabama (including CPO signature).
- c) The resulting contract will be comprised of negotiated standard contract terms, this RFP, the Successful Vendor's proposal, and any changes or modifications made during the negotiation process, limited to the scope of this RFP and the Successful Vendor's proposal. The contract, including any attachments, will constitute the entire contract between Selected Vendor and ALEA. The executed contract and any renewals thereof are subject to review and approval by

the Legislative Contract Review Committee and the Governor of the State of Alabama (including CPO signature). Modifications and waivers must be in writing and signed or approved by authorized representatives of Selected Vendor and ALEA to be binding. Amendments or modifications are also subject to review and approval, in accordance with State Law.

- d) A contract **shall not** be assignable by Vendor.
- e) Selected Vendor **shall** be an independent contractor. Selected Vendor, its agents, sub-vendor(s), and employee(s) **shall not** be considered to be agent(s), distributor(s), or representative(s) of ALEA. Further, neither Selected Vendor nor any employees of Selected Vendor will be entitled to participate in any retirement or pension plan, group insurance program, or other programs designed to benefit employees of ALEA or under the Alabama State Merit System Act.
- f) Selected Vendor, who executes the awarded contract for service, is contractually responsible for the total performance of the contract. Subcontracting may be allowed, at the sole discretion of ALEA, but must be disclosed as a part of the proposal or otherwise approved in advance by ALEA.
- g) ALEA reserves the right to recommend to the CPO to cancel and terminate any resulting contract, in part or in whole, without penalty, upon ninety (90) days written notice to Selected Vendor. Any contract cancellation notice **shall not** relieve Selected Vendor of the obligation to return any and all documents or data provided or generated as a result of any resulting contract.
- h) If the State terminates for convenience, it will pay Selected Vendor only for authorized expenses delivered satisfactorily and incurred up to the time of termination.
- i) ALEA reserves the right to provide additional terms within the scope of original RFP in the negotiation stage.

2.17 Billing

- a) Vendor **shall** provide an invoice pursuant to a services contract.
- b) Vendor will not bill for any taxes unless a statement is attached to the bill identifying the tax and showing why it is legally chargeable to ALEA. If it is determined that taxes are legally chargeable to ALEA, ALEA will pay the tax as required. State and federal tax exemption information is available upon request. ALEA does not warrant that the interest component of any payment, including installment payments to Vendor, is exempt from income tax liability.
- c) Vendor will comply with applicable tax requirements and will timely pay such taxes. Vendor will be responsible for the payment of any and all applicable state, county, municipal, and federal taxes, including sales tax and any other taxes so authorized.
- d) Payments delayed by ALEA at the beginning of the fiscal year because of the appropriation process will not be considered a breach.
- e) Payments will be made to conform to State fiscal year requirements notwithstanding any contrary provision in the contract. This may include prorating payments that extend beyond the end of the fiscal year for ALEA.

- f) Vendors must be registered in the State of Alabama Accounting System (STAARS) to receive payment. To register visit the State of Alabama Vendor Self Service (VSS) web site, <https://procurement.staars.alabama.gov>.

2.18 Confidentiality and Use of Work Product

Any documents or information obtained by Vendor from ALEA in connection with this RFP or the resulting contract will be kept confidential and will not be provided to any third party unless ALEA approves disclosure in writing. All work products produced under the RFP including, but not limited to, documents, reports, information, documentation of any sort, and ideas, whether preliminary or final, will become and remain the property of ALEA. Any patent, copyright, or other intellectual ideas, concepts, methodologies, processes, inventions, and tools (including computer hardware and software, where applicable) that Selected Vendor previously developed and brings to ALEA in furtherance of performance of the resulting contract will remain the property of Selected Vendor. Selected Vendor grants to ALEA a nonexclusive license to use and employ such software, ideas, concepts, methodologies, processes, inventions, and tools solely within its enterprise.

Section III Scope of Work

The goal of this project is to provide ALEA and the State of Alabama with a complete and comprehensive MSS solution as a provider-hosted service. The State of Alabama will provide a point of presence for the MSS in Montgomery. The solution must provide and maintain connectivity to the point of presence during the life of the contract.

The final Scope of Work may change at the time of selection and any changes will be incorporated into the final contract. Each Service listed below should be separately addressed in corresponding section numbers in the proposal.

3.1 Services Required

The Vendor's proposal *shall* include a sufficiently detailed plan to provide any and all services at ALEA's exclusive discretion. These services are detailed in the following Attachments: A – MSS Implementation Statement of Work, B – MSS Operations Statement of Work, and C – MSS Specifications.

3.2 Milestones and Deliverables

Required milestones and deliverables are detailed in the following Attachments: A – MSS Implementation Statement of Work, B – MSS Operations Statement of Work, and C – MSS Specifications. The Vendor's responses to Attachments A, B, and C will be incorporated into the final contract.

Section IV Instructions to Vendors, Proposal Preparation, & Selection Criteria

4.1 Deadline for Receipt of Proposal by ALEA

Proposals must be **received** in the ALEA Accounting Division by the date and time listed in Section 2.1 to be considered. All proposals received after the appointed date and hour for receipt, whether by mail or otherwise, will be returned unopened. The time of receipt **shall** be determined by the time received in the ALEA Accounting Division and **shall** be date and time stamped accordingly. Vendors are solely responsible for assuring that proposals are received by the designated date and time.

4.2 Proposal Delivery

Proposals must be delivered through the US Postal Service, an express delivery service, such as FedEx or UPS, or hand-delivered to the following address:

State of Alabama
Alabama Law Enforcement Agency Accounting Division
Attn: Beverly Anderson
301 South Ripley Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Hand delivered proposals must be delivered in ample time to allow for security check-in at the front desk of the Criminal Justice Center and delivery to the ALEA Accounting Division prior to the designated deadline.

4.3 Identification of Proposal Envelope

Envelope(s)/box(es) containing proposals **shall** be sealed and marked in the lower left-hand corner of the external packaging with the solicitation number, "ALEA RFP 24000000001," "4:00 pm, CST, May 21, 2024" of the proposal and "Sealed Bid DO NOT OPEN". This format should be used on your proposal packaging. It is further suggested that, if you submit your proposal by a courier such as FedEx or UPS and place your sealed envelope inside the courier's envelope, you clearly mark the courier's envelope with the same information.

No other correspondence or other proposals should be placed in the envelope.

Envelopes that are prematurely opened due to Vendor's failure to comply with this Section will not be considered. ALEA assumes no responsibility for the premature opening of any envelope not properly identified.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

A sample of a return mailing label for identifying the package as a sealed proposal.

Vendor's Name	
Vendor's Address	
	State of Alabama Alabama Law Enforcement Agency Accounting Division Attn: Beverly Anderson 301 South Ripley Street Montgomery AL 36104
ALEA Accounting RFP 24000000001 RFP Hour and Due Date: 4:00 p.m. CST, May 21, 2024	Sealed Bid DO NOT OPEN

4.4 Unacceptable Proposals

Faxed or oral proposals will not be accepted.

4.5 Exemption from Public Records Law

If the Vendor considers any portion of the documents, data, or records submitted in response to this solicitation to be confidential, trade secret, or otherwise not subject to public disclosure, Vendor must also provide ALEA with a separate, redacted copy of its proposal in portable document format (PDF), on a USB marked clearly as a "REDACTED COPY," and briefly describe in a separate writing, as to each redacted item, the grounds for claiming exemption under Code of Alabama 1975, § 36-12-40.

This redacted copy **shall** be provided to ALEA at the same time Vendor enters its proposal and must only exclude or redact those exact portions that are claimed confidential, trade secret, or otherwise not subject to disclosure.

Vendor **shall** be responsible for defending its determination that the redacted portions of its proposal are confidential, trade secret, or otherwise not subject to disclosure. Furthermore, Vendor **shall** protect, defend, and indemnify ALEA for any and all claims arising from or relating to Vendor's determination that the redacted portions of its proposal are confidential, trade secret, or otherwise not subject to disclosure. All of the above **shall** be acknowledged in Vendor's separate written "Acknowledgment" that must accompany the REDACTED COPY.

If Vendor fails to submit the REDACTED COPY and the Acknowledgment with its proposal, the ALEA is authorized to produce the entire proposal, as submitted, in response to any public records request.

4.6 Submission Requirements

The Vendor **shall** provide one (1) electronic copy of each volume (including all attachments), detailed in Section 5.3, on a USB drive; in a searchable, unlocked format (unlocked source files). The Vendor **shall** also provide one (1) PDF version of the *complete* proposal. Graphics containing text **shall** be in a searchable format. No file **shall** be password protected. USBs **shall** be labeled to indicate the Provider name, solicitation number, date of submission, and proposal volume number. The Provider **shall** screen all USBs for computer viruses prior to submittal and attach a letter certifying each of them to be virus free. The Volume 4 - Cost Response **shall** be submitted on a separate, properly labelled, USB drive; again, both as a PDF and in a searchable, unlocked format (unlocked source files). No spreadsheet or Word document to be submitted **shall** contain a macro. The proposal package with all USBs must be fully sealed and properly labelled with Vendor's name, proposal opening date, and RFP number. Failure to submit the required volumes

and file in the requested format may prevent a vendor’s proposal from being evaluated. The proposal **shall** be electronically (e-sign) signed by an authorized representative of Vendor and must be notarized.

If the Vendor submitting a proposal intends to outsource or subcontract any work to meet the requirements contained herein, such must be clearly stated in the proposal and details must be provided, including a name and description of the organization(s) being contracted. All forms and requirements of Vendor per this RFP **shall** equally pertain to any subcontractor(s).

Any vendor whose proposal does not meet the mandatory requirements and does not provide a primary proposal meeting all the required specifications of the RFP will be considered non-compliant.

The proposal must address all requirements of this RFP and provide all information requested. Failure to comply with the requirements of the RFP will result in the disqualification of Vendor’s proposal. Proposals submitted on reduced and/or mutilated forms will be rejected.

A list of required forms and other information related to RFPs for ALEA can be found at <http://www.alea.gov/RFP>.

4.7 Vendor Demonstration Presentation

ALEA may, at its sole option, elect to require oral presentation(s) by Vendors being considered for award. This provides an opportunity for ALEA to ask questions and for Vendors to clarify or elaborate on their proposals. This is a fact finding and explanation session only and does not include negotiation. ALEA will schedule the time and location of these presentations, if required. If requested, the oral presentations **shall** be considered part of the proposal and assessment as provided in Section 4.10, **Evaluation Criteria**.

4.8 Request to Modify or Withdraw Proposal

Vendor may make a written request to modify or withdraw the proposal at any time prior to opening. No oral modifications will be allowed. Such requests must be addressed and labeled in the same manner as the original proposal and plainly marked Modification to, or Withdrawal of, Proposal. Only written requests received by ALEA prior to the scheduled opening time will be accepted. ALEA will supplement original proposals received with accepted written modification requests.

4.9 Suspected Errors/Clarification

If Vendor suspects an error, omission, or discrepancy in this RFP, Vendor must notify the RFP Coordinator via e-mail and such notification must be received by the ALEA by 4:00 p.m., Central Standard Time, on May 10, 2024. The subject line of the e-mail should read “RFP 2400000001”. If appropriate, the ALEA will issue written instructions and make any necessary changes available to all interested parties by posting the same on ALEA’s website, <http://www.alea.gov/RFP>. It is the responsibility of all interested vendors to monitor this webpage for announcements regarding this RFP.

If Vendor considers any part of the RFP unclear, Vendor is expected to make a written request for clarification by no later than 4:00 p.m., Central Standard Time, on May 10, 2024. The subject line of the e-mail should read “RFP 2400000001”. In ALEA’s response, it will provide the request for clarification followed by a statement of clarification by posting the same on ALEA’s website, <http://www.alea.gov/RFP>. It is the responsibility of all interested vendors to monitor this webpage for announcements regarding this RFP.

Amendments to this RFP, if issued, will be made available to all interested vendors registered through the Alabama Department of Finance’s Division of Procurement as required and by posting the same on ALEA’s website, <http://www.alea.gov/RFP>. The amendment(s) will incorporate the clarification or change and provide a new date and time for new or amended proposals. It is the responsibility of all interested vendors to monitor this webpage for announcements regarding this RFP.

4.10 Evaluation Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated by ALEA using the following criteria:

Criteria	Vendor Response	Percentage
Vendor Experience, Expertise, and References	Business - Management	5%
Approach to Project Management, Implementation, Customer Support/Warranty, and Maintenance	Business - Management	5%
Response to Specifications: MSS Design	Business – Technical	20%
Response to Specifications: MSS Requirements	Business – Technical	
Response to SOW – Implementation	Business - Management	25%
Response to SOW – Operations	Business - Management	25%
Cost	Cost	20%
TOTAL		100%

Column headings are defined as follows:

- *Scoring Category* – The defined and specific areas to be addressed by the proposer responses.
- *Vendor Response* – The vendor response section for each scoring category.
- *Weight* – The scoring weight to be given to each category.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, ALEA reserves the right to accept or reject any or all bids if it is determined to be in the best interest of the State.

Proposals found to be technically or substantially non-responsive at any point in the evaluation process may be rejected and not considered further.

4.11 Selection Posted

After the evaluation of proposals received and a Vendor selected, written notice (Intent to Award) will be sent by the Division of Procurement to the selected Vendor and the Intent to Award will be posted on ALEA’s website, <http://www.alea.gov/RFP>. Notice letters sent or posted during

proposal firm time, or during any extension thereof, will extend the proposal firm time until ALEA signs a contract or determines negotiations with the Selected Vendor have failed. Receipt or posting of a notice of award is not the equivalent of a contract with ALEA.

Section V Vendor Proposal Content

Failure to complete and provide the following with the proposal submission will result in rejection of your proposal. For any portions for which no response is necessary, please mark the response as “N/A.”

5.1 Purpose of the Response Section

This section provides a recommended form and manner for the format and organization of Vendor proposals in response to the MSS RFP, for inclusion as instructions in the MSS RFP. To have their proposals evaluated, Vendors in submitting their responses to this RFP must comply with the content, sequence, format, and other proposal requirements as set forth below in this section, including key dates, activities and instructions to Vendors regarding preparation and submission of proposals.

5.2 General Submission Requirements

Proposal submissions **shall** follow the order of information requested in **Section 5.3 - Proposal Format and Organization**. Vendors **shall** submit only one proposal. Information contained in earlier sections was intended for informational purposes.

5.3 Proposal Format and Organization

The following sub-sections outline the specific proposal content, format, and organization sought by the State for the MSS Project.

The State requires Vendor responses in order, as listed in four primary and distinct volumes as follows:

- 1) Volume 1 - Business Response
 - a. Implementation Statement of Work Response
 - b. Operations Statement of Work Response
- 2) Volume 2 - MSS Functional Requirements Specifications
- 3) Volume 3 - MSS Technical Requirements Specifications
- 4) Volume 4 - Cost Response

5.3.1 Volume 1 – Business Response Instructions

Vendors **shall** follow the outline below for the Business Response section of the overall proposal. A more detailed explanation of the information sought by the State in each subsection is also provided.

- 1) Required Forms
- 2) Administrative
- 3) Table of Contents
- 4) Executive Summary
- 5) Overall Solution Approach
- 6) Value-added Services
- 7) Vendor References
- 8) Vendor Strength and Stability
- 9) Conflict of Interest

- 10) Project Oversight Acknowledgment
- 11) Statements of Work (SOWs) Response

5.3.1.1 Required Forms

A list of required forms and other information related to RFPs for ALEA can be found at <http://www.alea.gov/RFP>. These completed forms must be included with the Vendor Proposal:

- 1) Cover Sheet
- 2) Vendor Authorization to Submit Proposal
- 3) Vendor Disclosure Statement
- 4) Corporate Acknowledgement
- 5) Certificate of Authority - Sample
- 6) Certificate of Compliance - Act 2016-312
- 7) Certificate of Compliance - Beason-Hammon
- 8) Immigration Status
- 9) E-Verify MOU
- 10) W-9

5.3.1.2 Administrative

- 1) Submit the RFP Confirmation of Offer form (attachment labeled Confirm), signed in ink by the Vendor or an Officer of the Vendor who is legally authorized to bind the Vendor to the proposal.
- 2) Identify the point-of-contact for any questions or concerns relative to this response. Provide name, title, address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address.
- 3) Identify the name, title, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address of the single point-of-contact for all matters pertaining to the contract.
- 4) Provide a statement indicating whether proprietary information has been included in the proposal and ensure that each identified occurrence has been clearly marked at the top or bottom of each applicable page.
- 5) Provide the following certification statement:

“I/we agree to furnish the services as set forth in this proposal and guarantee that the services to be provided will meet or exceed all specifications, terms, conditions, and requirements herein. The undersigned offers and agrees to comply with all terms, conditions, and certifications as stated in this RFP and furnish the services at the prices provided with this signed proposal, or as mutually agreed upon after subsequent negotiation.”
- 6) Provide a list of exceptions, as applicable. Any exceptions must be stated on a separate page labeled “Exceptions,” with references to the corresponding terms or provisions of this solicitation. All exceptions must be noted in the proposal in order for them to be subject to negotiation.
- 7) Provide a statement certifying that the proposal *shall* remain valid for a minimum period of 120 days after the Proposal Submission Deadline. See Section 2.1 – Key Dates and Contact Information.
- 8) After the contract process is complete, how soon could you have staff assigned and available to work on the project?
- 9) The identification of any and all questions, comments, or concerns with regard to the contract terms and conditions. Absent any such attachment, the State will assume Vendor’s full acceptance of the contract terms and conditions must be included in the Vendor’s response.

Exceptions requested, or alternative language suggested, will be treated as a “Counter-offer”. The willingness and/or ability of the State to accept or negotiate such suggested changes will be considered on a case-by-case basis. If your company normally seeks legal review of contract terms, this process should occur prior to submission of your offer and your offer must identify any term or condition you are questioning and how you would suggest it be resolved.

- 10) The identification of your processes for resolving any vendor/client disagreements for all matters, with the exception of technical issues, relative to and for the life of any contract engagement must be explained in your response.
- 11) The successful Vendor may be required to provide an audited financial statement for the three most recently completed fiscal years, and quarterly financial statements for the current fiscal year. In lieu of an audited statement, a financial statement that has preferably been compiled and reviewed by an independent accounting firm may be substituted for a privately held business.

5.3.1.3 Table of Contents

A table of contents *shall* be included as a part of the overall proposal, with cross-references between each RFP requirement and the specific page of the response to the requirement.

5.3.1.4 Executive Summary

The executive summary *shall* condense and highlight the contents of the Business Response in such a way as to provide the State management and the evaluation groups with a broad understanding of the entire proposal including all requirements identified in the SOW (all hardware, software, design, installation, maintenance, etc.).

5.3.1.5 Overall Solution Approach

The Overall Solution Approach subsection of the Business Response section *shall* provide a comprehensive written description of the Vendor’s solution, project approach, and business continuity strategy. This should include a discussion of the Vendor’s understanding of the State’s vision, an explanation of how the solution will specifically address this vision, and a definition of all services to be provided. Specific emphasis must be placed on the following:

- 1) A description of the proposed solution and a discussion regarding how this solution addresses the goals and requirements of the target ALEA MSS environment.
- 2) A description of the proposed business continuity solution and capability and a discussion of how this solution addresses the goals and requirements of the target ALEA MSS environment.
- 3) An explanation of how the Vendor will accomplish the required interfaces.
- 4) A description of the extent to which the proposed solution adheres to national standards.
- 5) A discussion of how the Vendor will perform risk management, as well as mitigation and issues management.
- 6) Identification of any known/anticipated implementation and operational risks in the near and long term.
- 7) A description of how user agencies will interact with the message switch (licenses, installs, third-party compatible software, etc.).

Any proposal that does not adhere to these requirements may be deemed nonresponsive and rejected on that basis.

Vendors may attach other materials that they believe may improve the quality of their responses. However, these materials should be included as items in a separate appendix and identified as to which specification they relate.

5.3.1.6 Value-Added Services

Vendors are encouraged to provide descriptions of any other value-added services that are not already referenced by specifications included within this RFP and identified as to how they are value-added and to which specification to which they relate. (e.g., existing partnerships, interfaces, products.)

5.3.1.7 Vendor References

Vendors **shall** provide three references and contact information for the qualifying experience of the proposed solution implementations by using the Vendor References Form, located in Attachment E of the RFP.

The State's Evaluation Committee will call and/or visit the Vendor references to confirm information. Vendors must have satisfactorily begun or completed the qualifying project, as verified by the references, in order to receive evaluation points for this requirement.

5.3.1.8 Conflict of Interest

The following are the conditions relevant to conflict-of-interest matters:

- 1) By signing the proposal, Vendors certify that no assistance in preparing the response was received from any current or former employee of the State of Alabama whose duties related to this RFP (unless such assistance was provided by the State employee in his/her official public capacity) and that neither such employee nor any member of his/her immediate family has any financial interest in the outcome of this RFP.
- 2) The proposal must state whether the Vendor or any employee of the Vendor is related by blood or marriage to a State of Alabama employee or resides with a State of Alabama employee. If there are such relationships, list the names and relationships of said parties. Include the position and responsibilities in the Vendor's organization of such Vendor employees. The proposal must state the employees' titles and start dates of employment.

Disclosure of a conflict of interest does not merit automatic disqualification of the proposal, but it will be reviewed.

5.3.1.9 Project Oversight Acknowledgment

By submitting a proposal in response to this RFP, Vendors agree to and acknowledge the approach wherein participation in the Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) oversight process is required and acknowledge and assure that any required IV&V participation is covered within the cost proposal.

NOTE: The successful Vendor's proposal in response to the ALEA MSS RFP will be incorporated into the contract.

5.3.1.10 SOW Responses

Response to MSS Implementation SOW Requirements

The Vendor **shall** describe its understanding of the State requirements as expressed in the System Implementation phase of the Implementation SOW and its approach to satisfying those requirements. The Vendor **shall** address methodology and tools, assumptions, risks, applicable standards, deliverables, and deliverable content. The Vendor **shall**, in this section, provide their proposal response to the Implementation SOW per the response instructions provided in Attachment A to the RFP.

Response to MSS Operations SOW Requirements

The Vendor **shall** describe its understanding of the State’s requirements as expressed in the System Operations phase of the SOW and its approach to satisfying those requirements. The Vendor **shall** describe the services to be provided, the level of service, assumptions, risks, applicable standards, deliverables, and deliverable content. The Vendor **shall**, in this section, provide their proposal response to the Operations SOW per the response instructions provided in Attachment B to the RFP.

Following the Vendor's complete response to the MSS SOWs referenced above, the Vendor will then proceed with its response to the MSS System Requirements Specifications as instructed below.

5.3.2 Volume 2 - MSS Functional Requirements Response

The Vendor **shall** describe its understanding of the State’s functional requirements provided in the Functional Requirements subsection of the MSS Specifications, which is located in Attachment C of the RFP. Instructions for responding to the requirements tables are detailed in the attachment.

5.3.3 Volume 3 - MSS Technical Requirements Response

The Vendor **shall** describe its understanding of the State’s technical requirements provided in the Technical Requirements subsection of the MSS Specifications, which is located in Attachment C of the RFP. Instructions for responding to the requirements tables are detailed in the attachment.

5.3.4 Volume 4 - Cost Response Instructions

The State is interested in understanding the Vendor’s proposed cost associated with the delivery of the MSS system solution under each of the following three options. The Vendor **shall** provide the cost response using the cost form provided in Attachment F of the RFP.

Attachment A – MSS Implementation Statement of Work (SOW)

Offerors **shall** read all sections of this attachment and **shall** prepare their response to this MSS Implementation Statement of Work (SOW) for inclusion with their proposal regarding the ALEA MSS RFP, for their proposed system solution. Offeror’s response will be incorporated into the final contract.

It is the State’s desire that this solution be implemented and accepted in a timeframe not greater than 18 months from contract signing.

Section 1 - MSS Implementation SOW Response Instructions

The Offeror **shall** describe its understanding of the State of Alabama’s requirements as expressed in the Implementation Statement of Work (IMP SOW) and its approach to satisfying those requirements. The Offeror **shall** address methodology and tools, assumptions, risks, applicable standards, deliverables, and deliverable content. The Offeror **shall** address, at a minimum, the following areas:

Requirements Definition. The Offeror **shall** describe its understanding of the MSS Requirements Specification and its approach to satisfying these requirements of the MSS IMP SOW, including deliverables, descriptions of deliverable content, and methods and tools to be used.

Design and Development Approach. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the design and development approach requirements of the MSS SOW. The Offeror **shall** describe the process by which it intends to evolve the proposed design solution into a fully detailed design solution required for system implementation. The Offeror **shall** describe proposed activities, deliverables, descriptions of deliverable content, and methods and tools to be used.

The Offeror **shall** discuss risks associated with its proposed design solution and describe plans for mitigating those risks. The Offeror **shall** describe the methods to be used to identify engineering alternatives, quantify cost-performance trade-offs, and select preferred engineering approaches for subsequent development. The Offeror **shall** describe the engineering tools, including models, simulations, and prototypes, to be used in support of the Studies and Analyses efforts.

The Offeror **shall** discuss plans for conducting the System Design Review and how it intends to substantiate the viability of its detailed design solution to satisfy the MSS requirements.

Offeror Test. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the Offeror test requirements of the MSS IMP SOW. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to test planning. What test plans will be developed and what are their relationship to one another and to other documentation (e.g., specifications, standards, test descriptions, and test reports)? How will traceability (e.g., from requirements to test cases) be established, maintained, and controlled throughout the test and evaluation process?

The Offeror **shall** describe the types of testing that will be performed in each developmental phase and level of system assembly. The Offeror **shall** identify the objectives of each type of test and identify the associated test and evaluation documentation and reviews. Is the proposed testing formal (used to demonstrate satisfaction of requirements for purposes of system acceptance) or informal? What tools (e.g., load simulators, interface simulators) and databases will be used for each test type? Standards to be followed for test cases, test procedures, and test results must be identified.

The Offeror **shall** describe how the satisfaction of requirements associated with performance (e.g., capacities, timeliness, and selectivity), interfaces, safety, security, and standards will be tested. The Offeror **shall** identify the tools to be used (e.g., load simulators, interface simulators) and the test

databases to be used and describe how the tools and databases will be used.

The Offeror **shall** provide substantiation of its understanding and the viability of its testing approach. The Offeror **shall** identify the risks inherent in the proposed test and evaluation approach and discuss its strategy for mitigating these risks.

The Offeror **shall** describe proposed activities, deliverables, descriptions of deliverable content, and methods and tools to be used.

The selected Offeror will also be required to provide initial training, data extraction/conversion, data migration, optional customizations, and hosting services as part of the tasks outlined in this Statement of Work. The Offeror must provide responses that clearly state that it will meet the Minimum Mandatory Specifications of this project and how its Solution is a best match to provide State's requirements.

System Tests. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the System Test (including System Acceptance Test) requirements of the MSS IMP SOW, including proposed activities, deliverables, descriptions of deliverable content, and methods and tools to be used. The approach and system testing plan must acknowledge that all functionality and modules/components must be tested successfully before go-live.

Migration. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the migration requirements of the MSS IMP SOW, including proposed activities, deliverables, descriptions of deliverable content, and methods and tools to be used.

The Offeror **shall** describe the technical and management approach for Site Installation, Legacy Data Conversion, and Data Load. The Offeror **shall** indicate how the project activities and control gates identified in the MSS IMP SOW will be iteratively applied for these deployments. The Offeror **shall** indicate the methods, with minimal use of ALEA personnel or resources, to be used for migration of deliveries to operations. Identify migration issues related to deployment and cutover from the legacy system (Existing System). The Offeror **shall** discuss how the proposed technical and management approach to deployment mitigates those issues.

The Offeror **shall** identify and create the interfaces with State or other alternative sites that will be necessary to accomplish migration to the MSS replacement. The Offeror **shall** propose: 1) the responsibility for developing existing interfaces; 2) the approach to integration of new interfaces; and 3) how interoperability and continuity of operations will be maintained before, during, and after migration.

The Offeror **shall** provide substantiation of its understanding and the viability of its migration approach.

The Offeror **shall** identify the risks inherent in the proposed migration approach and discuss its mitigation strategies.

Training. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the training requirements of the MSS IMP SOW subsection, including proposed activities, deliverables, descriptions of deliverable content, and methods and tools to be used.

The Offeror **shall** identify the risks inherent in the training approach and discuss its mitigation strategies.

Configuration Management. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the configuration management requirements of the MSS IMP SOW, including proposed activities, deliverables, descriptions of deliverable content, and methods and tools to be used.

Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) Planning. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the COOP requirements of the MSS IMP SOW, including proposed activities, deliverables, descriptions of deliverable content, methods, and tools to be used, and operational concepts for continuity and

availability as they relate to the system design.

The Offeror **shall** describe its approach for determining and evaluating the facilities, equipment, software, data, records, documents, personnel, and other assets that are critical to maintaining continuity, quality, and level of service. The Offeror **shall** also describe the constraints, assumptions, and overall approach used in deriving the COOP Plan.

The Offeror **shall** provide substantiation of its understanding and the viability of its approach.

The Offeror **shall** identify the risks inherent in the COOP approach and discuss its mitigation strategies.

Program Organization. The Offeror **shall** describe the proposed Program Management Organization (PMO) and how it satisfies these requirements of the MSS IMP SOW. The Offeror **shall** discuss how the proposed PMO (including subcontractors and offerors) is organized (an organizational chart should be included); how it fits into the Offeror’s overall corporate structure (an organizational chart **shall** be included); indicate how the proposed PMO will interface with State; and discuss the responsibilities of key persons. The Offeror **shall** identify and discuss the principal interfaces and reporting mechanisms internal to and external to the PMO as well as elements of the Offeror’s support organization.

Reporting and Reviews. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the reporting and review requirements of the MSS IMP SOW, including proposed activities, deliverables, descriptions of deliverable content, and delivery media.

Data and Property Management. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the data and property management requirements of the MSS IMP SOW, including proposed activities, deliverables, descriptions of deliverable content, and delivery media.

Audits. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the audit requirements of the MSS IMP SOW, including proposed activities, deliverables, descriptions of deliverable content, and delivery media.

Response to MSS Security

The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the security requirements of the MSS System Implementation SOW and the MSS System Operation SOW (SOWs).

The Offeror **shall** state how the security requirements of the MSS SOWs will be met. The Security Proposal **shall** demonstrate both a full comprehension of the security requirements and the intention to comply with these requirements. The security element of the Proposal **shall** indicate how the Offeror will comply with all personnel, physical, and technical requirements of the solicitation.

The Offeror **shall** describe its management structure and procedures for protecting State data, information, materials, equipment, and facilities to which prime, and subcontractor personnel may have access. The Offeror **shall** describe the Offeror’s security organization, showing lines of communication to corporate management and explaining why this organization is appropriate for the project.

The Offeror **shall** describe the pre-screening procedures to be used prior to submitting potential employee candidates for facility and/or information access approvals – to include submitting fingerprints to State.

Additional Attachments to the Business Proposal

In addition to the description of the Vendor’s overall approach to providing MSS services to the State as instructed in **Section 5.4.1.5 - Overall Solution Approach** in the body of the MSS RFP, Vendors **shall** also introduce and provide the elements described below in the order presented as follows:

Attachment A – Project Management Plan (PMP). The Offeror **shall** submit with the Business Proposal a

PMP.

Attachment B – Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP). The Offeror **shall** submit with the Business Proposal a TEMP.

Attachment C – Integrated Master Schedule (IMS). The Offeror **shall** submit as an exhibit to the Business Proposal a resource (staff) loaded IMS. The IMS **shall** include, at a minimum, all activities required by the MSS SOW, including Management and Technical Reviews. The IMS **shall** identify any schedule margin/reserve. The IMS **shall** provide sufficient detail to demonstrate confidence that the proposed schedule is complete and realistic. There is no minimum degree of detail required; however, Offerors are advised that, all else being equal, the greater the detail, the greater the confidence evaluators will have in the proposed schedule.

Attachment D – Deliverable Descriptions. The Offeror **shall** submit with the Business Proposal a specification of the proposed format, content, and level of detail for each Deliverable item required by the MSS SOWs, and any other deliverable items proposed by the Offeror. While the State has chosen to leave the content, format, and level of detail of individual Deliverables to the discretion of Offerors, the Offerors are to follow the format and content of Appendix B or C (Implementation and Operations Statements of Work).

Attachment E – Service Level Plan (SLP). The Offeror **shall** submit with the Business Proposal their proposed SLP. For the services required by the SOW, the SLP **shall** address the goals and objectives of the service levels; identify the parties (stakeholders) to the service levels; specify the effective dates of the agreement; specify the purposes, processes, performance measures, and frequencies of periodic reviews; specify the scope of service, customer requirements, service Offeror requirements, and service assumptions; specify the penalties for failure to maintain the required service levels; and specify the service availability, contacts, escalation procedures, and response to service requests. Offerors must ensure that their proposed SLP includes all the required service level performance and capacity specifications outlined in the Technical Specifications section of Appendix A (MSS Specifications) to the RFP.

Section 2 – MSS Implementation Statement of Work

This section of Attachment A provides the implementation statement of work expected for the MSS solution. Following the instructions provided in Section 1 above, vendors are to respond to this SOW below providing detail as to their approach for accomplishing this SOW.

1 – Scope of Work

This document sets forth the Statement of Work (“SOW”) for the implementation of the new Message Switch System (“MSS”) for the State of Alabama (“State”) during the term of the resultant Contract/Agreement (hereinafter: Agreement). The SOW consists of the of tasks, subtasks, deliverables, goods, services and other work the selected Contractor will be responsible for performing in response to the RFP. In addition to the other requirements of this SOW, Contractor **shall** provide the Deliverables identified in Exhibit IMP SOW 1 – **PROJECT DELIVERABLES** called out explicitly in this SOW.

The mandatory requirements in this SOW are denoted by the word “**shall**” in bold italics to call attention to each of them.

All Work performed under the Agreement **shall** be performed within the territory of the United States

and **shall** be performed by United States citizens or Lawful Permanent Residents of the United States. No State data (including without limitation MSS data, identity history data, biographic data, property data and case/incident history data, as defined in Section 4.1 of the CJIS Security Policy, listed under in 1.3.2 – Specifications, Standards, and Guides (below), or information **shall** be communicated to anyone who is not a United States citizen or Lawful Permanent Resident of the United States. State data **shall not** be stored, accessed from, or transmitted to outside of the United States without State’s written permission provided in advance. State retains the right, from time to time, to designate certain subsets of State data as being subject to additional storage, access, or transmission restrictions at its sole discretion.

1.1 OVERVIEW

The Alabama Law Enforcement Agency (ALEA) desires to procure via an open and competitive solicitation an MSS solution (Solution) to ensure that the State is getting the best value for the required Work, which includes replacing its existing Message Switch System (MSS).

This will be a Contractor managed Solution, which **shall** include all hardware and software including maintenance releases. Contractor **shall** supply all levels of technical support set forth in the Contractor developed Service Level Plan, which **shall** meet all service level requirements, and additionally include the provision and maintenance of all network connectivity from the State of Alabama point of presence (Montgomery) to the primary system facility as well as to the DR/COOP site.

The scope of work to be provided by the Contractor under the Agreement consists of two phases: System Implementation and System Operation, each detailed in its own SOW. It is the State’s desire that this solution be implemented and accepted in a timeframe not greater than 24 months from contract signing.

This Statements of Work will be the basis for a Project Management Plan and a Project Schedule

Also defined herein are those Tasks and Subtasks that involve participation of both Contractor and State. Unless otherwise specified as an obligation of the State, the Contractor **shall** perform all Tasks and Subtasks and provide all Deliverables as defined herein. Deliverables will only be deemed complete upon State’s approval and acceptance, irrespective of the number of attempts it takes Contractor to provide a successful Deliverable.

Contractor **shall** be responsible for furnishing all personnel, facilities, equipment, material, supplies, and support and management services and **shall** perform all functions necessary to satisfy the requirements of this SOW and the MSS Requirements set forth in Attachment A (MSS Specifications) of the RFP. All of the System Requirements, whether specifically referenced or not in this SOW, **shall** apply to Contractor’s deliverables under the resultant Agreement.

The following Exhibit is attached to and form a part of this Statement of Work:

Exhibit IMP SOW 1 – PROJECT DELIVERABLES

1.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

1.2.1 SCOPE OF WORK

The objective of the RFP is to select a Contractor who will be able to provide, implement and support the State a MSS technology solution (MSS) with the following goals:

- Provide MSS and web service standards based on open architecture that:
 - Enables implementation of state-of-the-art MSS applications and workflows including integration with the current Automated Biometric Identification System (ABIS).

- Enables the incremental enhancement/addition/replacement of applications and workflows for any added functionality made available by the FBI, NCIC and III.
 - Allows selection of best-of-breed applications from different offerors; if appropriate, and provides for use of non-proprietary hardware, database software and open-standards application software interfaces.
 - Stores integrated subject arrest, charge and disposition data that enable online inquiries and reporting based on integrated subject criminal history data.
- Be sized for planned growth.
 - Utilizes ANSI/NIST/FBI/NIEM record constructs.
 - Conforms to any applicable federal MSS standards.
 - Uses Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) hardware and software.
 - Provides configurable administrative controls.
 - Manages the orchestration and transaction integrity of all sub-components of the MSS Solution.
 - Manages and controls person data using subject state and transaction (and other) identifiers as keys.
 - Provides efficient and cost-effective storage and retrieval.
 - Detects and notifies when systems, applications, equipment, or networks are interrupted or when there is a loss of power.
 - Provides an operational State-approved disaster recovery site or option.
 - Provides for migration of MSS data from already existing legacy State systems, wherein limited State resources will be available for this effort.
 - Provides management of the necessary network between the vendor data centers and the ALEA point of presence (ALEA MSS Datacenter).
 - The following sections of this document define the specific Statement of Work elements to achieve the above outlined operational goals.

1.2.2 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Vendor **shall** provide full project management, planning, monitoring, supervision, tracking and control of all project activities during the term of the resultant Agreement. Vendor **shall** employ project management industry standards and practices in the performance of all Work.

1.3 DOCUMENT REFERENCES

1.3.1 COMPLIANCE DOCUMENTS

Referenced or applicable documents cited within the resultant Agreement, including this SOW, **shall** be considered compliance documents for the purpose of the Agreement. Vendor will continue to provide sustainment upgrades and support during the life of the agreement to reasonably ensure the solution is up-to-date and meets CJIS and standards compliance. The State and vendor recognize that some of the compliance documents and their associated data items listed below (notably in section 1.3.2 - Specifications, Standards and Guides) may change. Throughout the term of the Agreement, Vendor or State shall propose compliance with newer documents and their associated data items that replace or supersede those identified in this list. To substitute newer documents and their associated data items, in order to analyze and assess the potential impact and cost of these modifications, Vendor **shall** perform all of the following, in the order as listed for the document or standard under consideration:

1. Identify existing standards and data items to be replaced.
2. Identify new documents and associated data items proposed for use.
3. Provide/present an analysis and rationale for making any/all changes using the new items including cost, schedule, performance, and supportability impact; and
4. Receive State approval.

1.3.2 SPECIFICATIONS, STANDARDS AND GUIDES

The following documents identified in this section below constitute the specifications, standards and guides serving as the core reference materials for the MSS:

- MSS Current Environment Overview, included as Attachment D to the RFP
- MSS Specifications, included as Attachment C to the RFP
- FBI Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) CJISD-ITS-DEL-08140-5.9.3, CJIS Security Policy, Version 5.9.3.

2 – System Implementation Tasks and Deliverables

This section of the SOW, together with Exhibit IMP SOW 1 – Project Deliverables, provides a detailed description of the Scope of Work to be performed by Contractor throughout the System implementation phase (“System Implementation Phase” or “Phase 1”) of the Agreement, including MSS development, implementation, and testing.

Task 1 – Project Administration

The provisions of this

Task 1 – Project Administration describe the requirements for the project management functions to be performed by Contractor during the System Implementation phase of the Agreement. Contractor **shall** document management organization, roles and responsibilities, resources, processes, and other pertinent management information in project plans (“Project Plan(s)”), including a Project Management Plan [DEL-01] and Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) [DEL-03] and **shall** maintain such plans current as necessary throughout the System Implementation phase.

SUBTASK 1.1 – DEVELOP PROJECT PLANS

Contractor **shall** review the System Requirements with State’s Project Manager. Based upon that review, Contractor **shall** have the primary responsibility of preparing a project plan document (“Project Management Plan”) [DEL-01] and submitting it for written approval to State’s Project Manager. The State **shall** work closely with Contractor during the preparation of the Project Management Plan. State **shall** reserve the right of approval / rejection in requiring an order of tasks and deliverables and/or a dependency of certain tasks and deliverables to other related tasks and deliverables.

Note: It is the State’s desire that this solution be implemented and accepted in a timeframe not greater than 24 months from contract signing.

Additionally, Contractor **shall** develop an IMS [DEL-03]) and keep it current throughout the System Implementation phase of the Agreement. The IMS **shall** be resource-loaded and **shall** include, at a

minimum, all activities required under this Statement of Work, including all management and technical reviews. The IMS **shall** identify activities by applicable Site (Primary Site and COOP Site). The IMS **shall** identify any schedule margin/reserve. The IMS **shall** provide sufficient detail to demonstrate confidence that the schedule is complete and realistic. The IMS **shall** identify due dates associated with any State-furnished items (e.g., information, data, facilities access) and due dates associated with all Contractor Deliverable items.

DELIVERABLE 1.1 – PROJECT PLANS

Contractor **shall** provide 30 days for State’s approval of the Project Management Plan [DEL-01] in a format in which the State can review, which **shall**, at a minimum, include the following:

1. All Work described in this Statement of Work and elsewhere in the Agreement including:
 - a. All Deliverables, including those referenced in the Pricing Schedule,
 - b. All Tasks, Subtasks, Deliverables, and other Work,
 - c. Associated dependencies, if any, among Tasks, Subtasks, Deliverables, and other Work,
 - d. Resources assigned to each Task, Subtask, Deliverable and other Work,
 - e. Start date and date of completion for each Task, Subtask, Deliverable and other Work,
 - f. Proposed State review period for each Deliverable,
 - g. Proposed Milestones.
2. Identification of all Contractor Key Personnel and Contractor Key Staff; including a resource management plan and the number of years of experience by role for each member of the team along with complete resumes.
3. A Deficiency management plan, documenting the approach to Deficiency management, including methodology, recommended tool(s) and escalation process.
4. Approach to project communications.
5. A risk management plan, documenting the approach to risk analysis (e.g., the evaluation of risks and risk interactions to assess the range of possible project outcomes), risk mitigation (e.g., the identification of ways to minimize or eliminate project risks), risk tracking/control (e.g., a method to ensure that all steps of the risk management process are being followed and, risks are being mitigated effectively) and clearly establishing a process for problem escalation, to be updated, as needed, throughout the term of the Agreement;
6. Initial identification of risks that may impact the timely delivery of the Solution.
7. Configuration and change management plan. Changes, in this context, refer to changing the functionality of, or adding additional functionality (e.g., changes to the project scope) to, any Solution component. The approach **shall** ensure that the impact and rationale for each change are analyzed and coordinated prior to being approved.
8. Deliverable Acceptance Criteria which **shall** be based on the terms of the resultant Agreement, including the Statement of Work and the actual tasks being completed, and **shall** include all documentation, whether stated in the SOW or not, that is consistent with good analytical practices, as determined by State.

Contractor **shall** prepare and provide to State a finalized Project Management Plan pursuant to Subtask 1.1 – Develop Project Plans. The Project Plan may be modified only if such modification has been approved

in advance in writing by the State’s Project Manager. The Project Management Plan **shall** be the basis for the Project Schedule, which **shall** be updated upon finalization of the Project Management Plan and **shall** be attached to the resultant Agreement as an exhibit (Project Schedule).

Contractor **shall** also develop an IMS, which **shall** include the activities required under this Statement of Work, as provided in Subtask 1.1 – Develop Project Plans.

The Deliverables required to be provided by Contractor under this Deliverable 1.1 – Project Plans **shall** include:

- DEL-01: Project Management Plan
- DEL-03: Integrated Master Schedule
- DEL-07: Agenda
- DEL-08: Presentation Materials
- DEL-09: Minutes.

Table 1 – Management and Technical Reporting and Reviews

Review	Location
Project Kickoff Meeting	State Facility
System Requirements Review	State Facility
System Design Review	State Facility
Product Test Readiness Review	To Be Determined (TBD)
Pre-Ship Review	TBD
System Test Readiness Review	State Facility
Operational Readiness Review	State Facility
Final Acceptance Review	State Facility
Project Management Reviews	State Facility

SUBTASK 1.2 – PREPARE STATUS REPORTS AND CONDUCT CONFERENCES

Contractor **shall** provide ongoing project administration, which **shall** include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Monthly written Project Plan update reports.
2. Weekly status update conference calls.
3. Attending meetings with State Executives and Management as needed.
4. Updates to the Project Management Plan and the Project Schedule.

Contractor’s Project Manager **shall** provide full project management and control of project activities.

Contractor's Project Manager **shall** present to State's Project Manager written status reports documenting project progress, plans and outstanding issues. Contractor's Project Manager **shall** meet with or conduct a status update conference with State's Project Manager on a weekly basis, or as otherwise agreed to by State and Contractor, to review project status reports and any related matters. All variances **shall** be presented to State for approval or corrective action at the status meetings. The first report **shall** be presented to State's Project Manager one (1) week following the Effective Date of the Contract (Agreement) in a format approved by State. This Subtask 1.2 – Prepare Status Reports and Conduct Conferences **shall** include, but not be limited to:

1. Project planning and direction.
2. Contractor staffing and personnel matters, including management of Contractor technical staff.
3. Evaluation of results and status reporting.
4. Incorporation of the State's System Requirements, including, but not limited to, all business, functional and technical requirements.
5. Incorporation of required software modification, if any.
6. Management and tracking of all issues and their resolution.

Contractor's Project Manager **shall** report project status on a regular basis to the State's Project Manager and **shall** participate in monthly status meetings with the State's Project Manager. The project and reporting system **shall** include, but not be limited to, the following components:

1. Kick off meeting.
2. Updated Project Plan.
3. Status reports and meetings or teleconferences.

The project status reports prepared by Contractor's Project Manager pursuant to this Subtask 1.2 – Prepare Status Reports and Conduct Conferences **shall** be used as the mechanism for Contractor to report any project risks or problems identified as part of the implementation process.

DELIVERABLE 1.2 – COMPLETE STATUS REPORTS AND CONFERENCES

Contractor's Project Manager **shall** prepare and present to State's Project Manager written status reports documenting project progress, plans, and outstanding issues in accordance with Subtask 1.2 – Prepare Status Reports and Conduct Conferences. Contractor's Project Manager **shall** meet with or conduct a status update conference with the State's Project Manager, as agreed to by State and Contractor, to review project status reports and any related matters. All variances **shall** be presented for approval by the State at the status conferences. The first report **shall** be presented to the State's Project Manager one (1) week following the Effective Date of the contract, in a format approved by State.

Task 2 – System Setup

The Subtasks below provide for the setup and security of the future MSS environment.

SUBTASK 2.1 – PROVIDE DATA AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

Contractor **shall** develop, document, and implement comprehensive procedures for the management of data, documentation, and State property (equipment, hardware and software that belongs to State). Data management **shall** encompass all data and documentation produced by Contractor under the Agreement, procured by Contractor under the Agreement, and received from State for use on the Agreement.

DELIVERABLE 2.1 – DATA AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Subtask 2.1 – Provide Data and Property Management the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-32: Data and Property Management Plan

SUBTASK 2.2 – IMPLEMENT SYSTEM SECURITY

Contractor **shall** implement a security program in compliance with the CJIS Security Policy referenced in 1.3.2 – Specifications, Standards, and Guides above. All Contractor supplied facilities or systems **shall** provide protection and control of all State information and equipment. Contractor **shall** document in accordance with Subtask 2.2 – Implement System Security its security program in an In-Plant Security Plan, as provided in the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-10: In-Plant Security Plan.

Task 3 – System Implementation

Contractor **shall** implement, test and support State’s Acceptance of the technology to be utilized in the provision of Work as provided in the System Requirements. All products, services and systems developed and/or delivered by Contractor **shall** comply with the System Requirements and the standards and guides set forth in 1.3.2 – Specifications, Standards, and Guides.

Contractor **shall** provide all equipment and software necessary to satisfy the System Requirements at the proposed State operational Primary Site and the proposed Continuity of Operations Disaster Recovery site (“COOP Site”). Contractor **shall** provide all necessary software licensing (including all software that can be operated on authorized devices outside or remote to the headquarters building to access the MSS system) to provide an equal level of service and functionality as replacement of all Existing Equipment under the Current Maintenance Agreement, including, as applicable, servers, communications gear, workstations, printers and other equipment identified in the System Requirements.

Contractor **shall** provide State with a comprehensive set of user, system and management documentation. Contractor **shall** deliver those items identified in the list of Deliverables set forth in Exhibit IMP SOW 1 – PROJECT DELIVERABLES to this Appendix B. Contractor **shall** provide the documentation in both electronic and hard-copy formats. All Deliverables **shall** be subject to State approval and Acceptance in order to satisfy the terms and conditions of the Agreement.

SUBTASK 3.1 – CONDUCT SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS REVIEW

Contractor **shall** conduct a System Requirements Review (“SRR”). Upon completion of the SRR, based on the results of the System Requirements definition activity, Contractor may recommend changes to the State System Requirements Specifications for consideration by State.

Contractor **shall** analyze State’s System Requirements and validate the requirements of the specifications. Contractor **shall** document the deficiencies in State’s System Requirements, if any, and recommend changes to the areas in which those changes would correct deficiencies or otherwise benefit the State (e.g., enhance the overall functionality, performance or reliability of systems or services; reduce costs; shorten the schedule; or reduce project risk).

Contractor **shall** document any recommended changes to State’s System Requirements Specifications and support these recommendations (e.g., with cost-benefit analyses).

Contractor **shall** provide to State a baselined System Requirements Specifications and label it [DEL-02]

and the rationale for any recommended changes. Contractor **shall** update State’s System Requirements Specifications with any changes resulting from actions assigned by State as a result of the SRR and all approved changes.

DELIVERABLE 3.1 – SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS SPECIFICATIONS

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Subtask 3.1 – Conduct System Requirements Review the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-02: System Requirements Specifications
- DEL-07: Agenda
- DEL-08: Presentation Materials
- DEL-09: Minutes.

SUBTASK 3.2 – PERFORM SYSTEM DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

Contractor **shall** design and develop the System to satisfy the System Requirements Specifications [DEL-02] and meet the required standards specified in 1.3.2 – Specifications, Standards, and Guides. Contractor **shall** design, develop, and produce or procure all hardware, software, and data components of the System, with the exception of the operational data that is to be provided by State.

Contractor **shall**, to the maximum extent possible, use non-proprietary hardware and software in developing and implementing the MSS. To the maximum extent possible, equipment for authorized devices outside or remote to the headquarters building to access the MSS system recommended by Contractor must be available commercially from third-party offerors as well as through Contractor, subject to installation of MSS Software, which **shall** be controlled by provider alone.

Contractor **shall** conduct a System Design Review (“SDR”) and present it to State for approval. The System Design [DELS – 12, 13, 14, & 15] **shall**:

- Be complete down to the line replaceable unit (“LRU”) level for all hardware items and through the computer software unit (“CSU”) level for all developed software;
- In the case of commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software, be complete through the level of licensed software products (“LSP(s)”);
- Identify the functions performed by, performance required of and interfaces supported by each CSU (for developed software) and each LSP (for COTS software);
- Document the number and interconnection of all LRUs and identify the software components loaded on each LRU;
- Document the bandwidth, memory and throughput of each LRU;
- Describe the interfaces supported by each CSU, LSP and LRU;
- Specify any standards with which each CSU, LSP and LRU complies; and
- Include complete workflows for all operational user and administrative functions.

As part of the SDR, Contractor **shall** present evidence (e.g., results of analyses, computer model and simulation results, benchmark results and offeror-supplied specifications) to demonstrate that the design satisfies the requirements of State’s System Requirements Specifications [DEL-02] and the required standards set forth in 1.3.2 – Specifications, Standards, and Guides. Contractor **shall** deliver a Requirements Verification Traceability Matrix [DEL-30] documenting mapping between (i) the requirements contained in the System Requirements Specifications and the major subsystems or

components of the design, and (ii) the requirements contained in the System Requirements Specifications and the methods of verification indicated in Contractor's response to the System Requirements Specifications set forth in Appendix C (System Requirements Specifications and Response forms) to the RFP.

Upon successful conclusion of the SDR and written approval of the design by the State, Contractor may begin development and/or procurement of System software and hardware.

DELIVERABLE 3.2

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Subtask 3.2 – Perform System Design and Development the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-05: Migration Plan
- DEL-07: Agenda
- DEL-08: Presentation Materials
- DEL-09: Minutes
- DEL-12: Database Design Document
- DEL-13: Interface Design Document
- DEL-14: System Design Document
- DEL-15: Bill of Materials
- DEL-17: Training Plan
- DEL-18: Installation Drawings
- DEL-22: COOP Plan
- DEL-30: Requirements Verification and Traceability Matrix.

Task 4 – Conduct Acceptance Tests

The MSS is a complex software-based system that has many attributes that must be tested. Of critical concern is the appropriate test regimen to follow to ensure that all appropriate aspects are tested in a reasonable sequence. In order to understand the MSS testing area, there is a need for a common vocabulary. The purpose of testing will be to verify that Contractor's product meets or exceeds all System Requirements Specifications [DEL-02].

Contractor **shall** develop and execute a comprehensive test program, spanning all phases of development and all levels of assembly of the system(s). Contractor **shall** develop a Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP) [DEL-04], which **shall**:

- Govern all levels of testing, from the unit level through the fully assembled and integrated (with external systems) system;
- Govern all phases of testing, from unit testing through completion of system acceptance;
- Govern formal user acceptance testing; and
- Include the coordinated and complete testing with existent interfaces with the new MSS, understanding that acceptance testing at each stage from Factory Acceptance Test through to

User Acceptance Test will not be considered by the State to have been completed until MSS and State Message Switch (SMS) components are successfully tested together.

For unmodified COTS hardware and software, COTS offeror-supplied test results may be substituted for verification of requirements below the level of the fully integrated system.

The purpose of the Factory Acceptance Test (“FAT”) is to ensure that the basic capabilities are available and work in a factory setting, and that the documentation associated with the System reflects the design and is usable (e.g., one typically uses the start-up and shut-down procedures to verify that they can be used, as written, to perform the intended function). These tests are oriented toward verifying as much functionality, hardware, interface requirements, performance requirements, accuracy requirements and documentation as possible.

FAT is typically run with scripts to ensure agreement among the stakeholders on the input and expected results and that the tests are repeatable. After successful passage of the FAT at Contractor’s facility, Contractor will be given permission to ship the System to the Operational Site(s).

The converted MSS database will be audited as part of the primary site configuration FAT.

SUBTASK 4.1 – CONDUCT FACTORY ACCEPTANCE TEST

Contractor **shall** conduct FAT for the fully assembled and integrated System for both the Primary Site and the COOP Site (disaster recovery site) levels. FAT **shall** include all tests necessary to confirm that all requirements of the System Requirements Specifications [DEL-02] have been satisfied and to demonstrate compliance with required standards listed in 1.3.2 – Specifications, Standards, and Guides. FAT **shall** also include all tests necessary to demonstrate satisfaction of those requirements from any (provider-developed) subordinate specifications.

Contractor **shall** prepare a FAT Plan [DEL-28] and FAT Procedures [DEL-21] and submit them for approval. Contractor will prepare the FAT Plan in cooperation with State. The Contractor **shall** conduct FAT in accordance with the approved FAT Plan [DEL-28] and FAT Procedures [DEL-21]. FAT may be conducted as a part of integration testing or as a separate phase of the test program, subject to State approval. Contractor **shall** conduct Product Test Readiness Reviews (“PTRR(s)”) prior to the conduct of FAT. State will witness the execution of all FAT activities.

The results of FAT **shall** be documented in a FAT Report(s) [DEL-06]. Contractor **shall** conduct a Pre-Ship Review [PSR] to demonstrate the FAT success, to determine the readiness of the system(s) for delivery first to State’s Primary Site and then secondly to the COOP Site and to secure State authorization to ship the System components and configurations.

DELIVERABLE 4.1 – FACTORY ACCEPTANCE TESTING

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Subtask 4.1 – Conduct Factory Acceptance Test the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-06: FAT Test Report
- DEL-07: Agenda
- DEL-08: Presentation Materials
- DEL-09: Minutes
- DEL-16: Installation Plan
- DEL-18: Installation Drawings

- DEL-19: Training Materials
- DEL-21: FAT Test Procedures
- DEL-22: FAT COOP Plan
- DEL-26: Version Description Document
- DEL-28: FAT Test Plan.

SUBTASK 4.2 – CONDUCT SYSTEM ACCEPTANCE TEST

The purpose of the System Acceptance Test (“SAT”), which is also known as System-level Integration Test (“SIT”), is:

- To demonstrate that the equipment was installed correctly and operates at the functional and performance levels verified at FAT;
- To verify the requirements that could not be verified at the factory acceptance testing;
- To verify the performance requirements (throughput, accuracy, and reliability) with the full initial data load, multiple workstations, etc., to the extent that they have not already been signed off on at FAT; and
- To verify that the integrated sum is at least as functional as the sum of the individual parts and to verify that end-to-end workflows execute as anticipated – the actual verification of the correctness of the end-to-end workflows, to include all the processing at each step, is normally deferred to UAT.

The SAT is also script-based, with scripts built up from those used at FAT, ensuring that all additional requirements are allocated to specific test scenarios and that the scripts still ensure repeatability. Repeatability often requires cleaning out files and buffers that were changed as the result of a test step when the changed data is no longer needed by the system.

The SAT will include COOP activities. The minimum COOP activities that must be demonstrated include backing up and restoring data as well as using the COOP Site for primary processing, then restoring the entire system, ensuring that the repositories and matchers are current and identical across the two sites. Verification of the COOP related procedures will be a critical part of the SAT.

Contractor will prepare the SAT Plan in cooperation with State. Contractor **shall** prepare SAT Procedures [DEL-21] and submit them for State approval. Contractor **shall** conduct the SAT in accordance with State approved SAT Plan and approved SAT Procedures [DEL-21]. Contractor **shall** conduct a System Test Readiness Review (“STRR”) prior to the conduct of the SAT. State will witness the execution of all SAT(s) and retain the right to determine the success / failure status of individual SAT tests.

Contractor **shall** document the results of the SAT in the SAT Report(s) [DEL-06]. Upon completion of the SAT, Contractor **shall** conduct an Operational Readiness Review (“ORR”) to permit the State to determine the readiness of the system(s), facilities and personnel to initiate the UAT and to secure State authorization to initiate operations.

DELIVERABLE 4.2 – SYSTEM ACCEPTANCE TESTING

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Subtask 4.2 – Conduct System Acceptance Test the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-06: SAT Test Report

- DEL-07: Agenda
- DEL-08: Presentation Materials
- DEL-09: Minutes
- DEL-15: Bill of Materials (for documentation purposes)
- DEL-16: Installation Plan
- DEL-17: Training Plan
- DEL-18: Installation Drawings
- DEL-19: Training Materials
- DEL-21: SAT Test Procedures
- DEL-22: SAT COOP Plans
- DEL-26: Version Description Document
- DEL-28: SAT Test Plan

SUBTASK 4.3 – CONDUCT USER ACCEPTANCE TEST

The purpose of UAT is final validation of the required business functions and flow of the system, under real-world usage of the System by demonstrating that the delivered products and services are adequate for their intended purpose. UAT procedures will include both scripts and normal operations to see how the end-to-end workflows operate across the entire system, to include the interfaces to the FBI. UAT will be planned to provide a realistic and adequate exposure of the System to all reasonably expected events. This includes things that might not happen in a normal period, such as a full backup and restore, switchover to the COOP Site and a full suite of report generation events.

By this point in the project, State and Contractor will have verified most or all of the accuracy, performance and capacity requirements. UAT will not be focusing on System problems (e.g., reporting misspellings or software crashes), as those issues will be required to have been corrected by then.

Contractor **shall** prepare a UAT Plan. The UAT Plan will be reviewed and approved by the State. State staff will conduct UAT. Contractor **shall** provide the facilities, equipment and personnel to support the services identified in Phase 2 of this MSS SOW during UAT. Contractor **shall** provide the facilities, equipment, and personnel to analyze results of concurrent operations, to identify discrepancies between results of the legacy system(s) and results of Contractor delivered MSS system(s), to resolve those discrepancies and, when those discrepancies result because of a failure of Contractor-delivered system(s), to meet the requirements, and to perform corrective maintenance.

DELIVERABLE 4.3 – USER ACCEPTANCE TESTING

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Subtask 4.3 – Conduct User Acceptance Test the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-06: UAT Test Report
- DEL-07: Agenda
- DEL-08: Presentation Materials
- DEL-09: Minutes

- DEL-21: UAT Test Procedures
- DEL-22: UAT COOP Plan
- DEL-26: Version Description Document
- DEL-28: UAT Test Plan

Task 5 – System Migration

The Subtasks below in this Task 5 – System Migration describe the migration requirements for the MSS Operational Environment.

SUBTASK 5.1 – INSTALL SITES

Contractor **shall** conduct site surveys and analyses to determine the facilities requirements (e.g., heating, air-conditioning, lighting, electrical power, structural loading and physical access) for the facilities housing the replacement equipment at the Primary & COOP Sites. Contractor **shall** document any incompatibilities between the MSS equipment to be installed and the facilities or networks and identify in an Installation Survey Report [DEL-27] any required facilities or network modifications to be made by State.

Contractor **shall** prepare a Version Description Document with the complete instructions necessary to install and configure all hardware, software and data associated with each deployment. The document will include site-specific installation information [DEL-27].

Contractor **shall** prepare an Installation Plan [DEL-16] to document the necessary installation tasks, responsibilities, schedule, resource requirements, equipment layout, cabling and testing to verify correct installation of equipment and software at the Primary Site and COOP Site. Contractor **shall** prepare Installation Drawings [DEL-18] to define equipment layout and cabling.

Contractor **shall** (subject to State approval) deliver and install the equipment and software deliveries at the Primary Site and COOP Site. Contractor **shall** check the installation and perform the necessary data conversions to prepare the equipment and software to support all testing and operations.

DELIVERABLE 5.1 – INSTALL SITES

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Subtask 5.1 – Install Sites the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-16: Installation Plan
- DEL-18: Installation Drawings
- DEL-26: Version Description Document
- DEL-27: Installation Survey Report

SUBTASK 5.2 – CONVERT AND LOAD DATA

Production of the Operational Database will involve: (1) the conversion of the legacy database and (2) the loading of this data into the Operational Database.

SUBTASK 5.2.1 – CONVERT EXISTING DATA

Contractor **shall** ingest and process all existing electronic records and load them to the appropriate internal database format. All offerors **shall** affirmatively state their understanding of this note.

DELIVERABLE 5.2.1 – CONVERTED EXISTING DATA

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Subtask 5.2.1 – Convert Existing Data the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- 2 copies of converted Existing Data.
- A Data Dictionary of the converted data and new production database.

SUBTASK 5.2.2 – LOAD DATA

The contractor **shall** load all of the records into the appropriate databases onto the System at the Primary Site and the COOP Site.

Contractor **shall** deliver two (2) copies of the output media for future use by State in any system or process of its choosing. As part of this task, Contractor **shall**:

At the end of the initial data load, Contractor **shall** produce a detailed report in accordance with the following requirements:

- The number of records converted, to include a count of the converted records.
- Any problems encountered, by record number, problem type, and resolution.
- All records not successfully converted by record number.
- The results of a conversion audit.

DELIVERABLE 5.2.2 – LOADED DATA

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Subtask 5.2.2 – Load Data the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- Copies of data as noted above, to include the loaded files.

SUBTASK 5.3 – CONDUCT MIGRATION PLANNING

Contractor **shall** develop a Migration Plan [DEL-05] that identifies the activities, events and resources (tools, data, facilities, personnel and other resources) required to migrate from the legacy MSS System to the replacement MSS environment provided under the Agreement. The plan will identify the sources (i.e., Contractor, State Site) of all resources and specify when those resources will be required, bearing in mind that ALEA has limited resources available for the purposes of data migration or conversion.

DELIVERABLE 5.3 – MIGRATION PLAN

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Subtask 5.3 – Conduct Migration Planning the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-05: Migration Plan (initiated above).

Task 6 – Conduct System Training

Contractor **shall** develop User Manuals [DEL-11] addressing all user functions for all user types (e.g., data entry staff, system administrators, maintenance personnel). User documentation **shall** describe the components, functions and operations of each server and workstation type. Operations descriptions **shall** include a list and description of all error conditions, as well as the associated error messages displayed and the action required of the operator for each error condition. Each MSS workstation **shall** be provided with online user documentation that will be resident on the workstation or accessible via the agency's

internal networks as well as a paper-based copy.

DELIVERABLE 6 – SYSTEM TRAINING AND MATERIALS

Contractor **shall** prepare a Training Plan [DEL-17] and Training Materials [DEL-19] in accordance with Task 6 – Conduct System Training, including, via example, computer-based training, videos, guides and manuals, and conduct on-site user training as required to support testing, deployment and operations.

Contractor **shall** minimally conduct four (4) types of courses as follows:

- Message Switch Administrator – This course will provide in-depth training for creating and managing workstations, modifying message keys, modifying security roles, overall management of the message switch solution, etc. The desire for this role is to reduce agency reliance on the provider for agency management of the system.
- Managers and Supervisors – This course will cover MSS management functions. The course will provide hands-on instruction regarding how to access and produce management reports, create user accounts, and perform audits and inquiries using the tools provided by the system. The course should be designed to handle at least 20 participants.
- Staff – This course will cover the functionality of the MSS system. The course will provide instruction on the day-to-day operational functionality of the system, including entering and verifying data, updating MSS records, and producing MSS reports. The course should be designed to handle at least 20 participants.
- Information Technology Services (ITS) Help Desk – This course will provide an overall view of technical aspects of the MSS and provide methods to manage and resolve minor incidents quickly and effectively. This course will need to accommodate approximately 12 participants initially and will need to be conducted at least once yearly for the duration of the agreement, for approximately 25 participants, to accommodate new help desk personnel and to keep existing staff up to date.

Should the State reasonably require additional training beyond that outlined above, contractor shall describe what options are available for additional training (i.e., per person or event).

Task 7 – Conduct Remaining Migration Tasks

The Subtasks below provide the remaining elements that need to be addressed during System Implementation in order to complete the migration to the System.

SUBTASK 7.1 – MANAGE SYSTEM CONFIGURATION

Contractor **shall** document and implement plans [DEL-29] for performing configuration control. Configuration control performed by Contractor **shall** accomplish the following:

- Establish a controlled configuration for each hardware and software component at the Primary Site and the COOP Site;
- Maintain current copies of the deliverable documentation and code;
- Give State access to the documentation and code under configuration control; and
- Control the preparation and dissemination of changes to the master copies of the deliverable software and documentation placed under configuration control so that they reflect only approved changes.

Contractor **shall** generate management records and status reports on all products composing the controlled configuration for each hardware and software component at the Primary Site and the COOP Site. The status reports **shall**:

- Make changes to controlled products traceable;
- Serve as a basis for communicating the status of configuration identification software; and
- Serve as a vehicle for ensuring that delivered documents describe and represent the associated software.

Contractor **shall** participate in State configuration control meetings. State configuration control meetings will establish and control the requirements baseline [DEL-02] throughout the performance of the Agreement and will control the operational baseline (deployed hardware, software, databases and documentation) once the MSS becomes operational.

DELIVERABLE 7.1 – SYSTEM CONFIGURATION PLAN

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Deliverable 7.1 – System Configuration Plan the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-29: Configuration Management Plan.

SUBTASK 7.2 – CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLANNING

Contractor **shall** perform the necessary planning; deliver a COOP Plan [DEL-22]; provide or utilize the necessary facilities, equipment, supplies, data, and documentation; and conduct the training necessary to establish a viable COOP Plan capability that ensures the performance of Contractor’s essential functions during any emergency or situation that may disrupt normal operations and leave the Primary Site facilities damaged or inaccessible.

The purpose of COOP planning is to assure that the capability exists to continue essential provider functions across a variety of potential emergencies as well as when maintenance or upgrade activities might impact MSS system use. A COOP Plan should account for:

- Ensuring the continuous performance of State’s essential functions/operations during an emergency;
- Protecting essential facilities, equipment, records and other assets;
- Reducing or mitigating disruptions to operations; and
- Achieving a timely and orderly recovery from an emergency and resumption of full service to customers.

The COOP capabilities provided by Contractor under this Agreement **shall** be:

- Maintained as an active-active site;
- Capable of providing 100 percent of the MSS services (in the event of the loss of the Primary Site) both with and without warning/scheduling; and
- Continuously operational in a load-balanced environment during normal operations.

At a minimum, the COOP Plan provided by Contractor **shall** contain the following:

- Plans and procedures
- Identification of essential functions
- Alternate facilities
- Interoperable communications
- Vital records and databases
- Tests, training and monthly exercises/drills.

The COOP Plan should be developed and documented to ensure that, when implemented, it will provide for continued performance of essential State functions under all reasonably foreseen circumstances. At a minimum, the COOP Plan **shall** also:

- Delineate essential functions and activities.
- Outline a decision process for determining appropriate actions in implementing COOP plans and procedures.
- Establish a roster of fully equipped and trained emergency provider and State personnel with the authority to perform essential functions and activities.
- Include procedures for employee advisories, alerts, and COOP Plan activation, with instructions for relocation to predesignated facilities, with and without warning, during duty and non-duty hours. This includes providing for personnel accountability throughout the duration of the emergency and providing for continuous operational status in an active-active environment.
- Establish reliable processes and procedures to acquire resources necessary to continue essential functions and sustain operations similar to that of the primary site for up to 30 days.

Essential functions are defined as those functions that enable Contractor to provide vital services, under all circumstances.

DELIVERABLE 7.2 – COOP PLAN

Contractor **shall** provide in accordance with Subtask 7.2 – Continuity of Operations Planning the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-22: COOP Plan.

Upon the successful completion of Tasks 4.3 (UAT) through 7.2 (COOP Plan), the State will conduct a Final Acceptance Review (“FAR”) to determine whether Contractor has satisfied the terms and conditions of this SOW and to Accept the System into operations. The determination will be based upon the delivery of deliverables and plan items that comply with the requirements of the Agreement, the satisfactory performance of all SOW activities and the successful demonstration (through the FAT, SAT, and UAT process) that the delivered systems and data satisfy the requirements of the System Requirements Specifications [DEL-02].

Exhibit IMP SOW 1 – Project Deliverables

During the System Implementation Phase of the Agreement, Contractor **shall** deliver those Deliverables identified and listed in the Deliverable Table below. All Deliverables **shall** be subject to State approval and Acceptance in order to satisfy the terms and conditions of the Agreement.

During the System Operation Phase of the project, Contractor **shall** provide State with a comprehensive set of user, system, training, and management documentation. Contractor **shall** supply documentation in both electronic and hard-copy formats. User documentation **shall** describe the components, functions and operations of each workstation type. Each MSS workstation **shall** be provided with online user documentation that is resident on the workstation or accessible via the agency’s internal networks.

In addition, Contractor **shall** deliver those items identified in Deliverable Table below.

Document No.	Deliverable/Plan Title	Delivery Dates
DEL-01	Project Management Plan	With proposal and with update – within 30 days after the Effective Date of the Agreement.
DEL-02	System Specifications	At System Requirements Review.
DEL-03	Integrated Master Schedule	With proposal and with update at Project Management Reviews.
DEL-04	Test and Evaluation Master Plan	With proposal and with update – within 30 days after the Effective Date of the Agreement.
DEL-05	Migration Plan	At System Design Review.
DEL-06	Test Report – several sets, each corresponding to the outcomes of Factory Acceptance Test, System Acceptance Test and User Acceptance Test	For each increment, at Pre-Ship Review and Operational Readiness Review.
DEL-07	Agenda	Prior to a meeting.
DEL-08	Presentation Materials	Draft – five (5) Business Days prior to a meeting, with updates – at the meeting and final – as part of DEL-09.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Document No.	Deliverable/Plan Title	Delivery Dates
DEL-09	Minutes	Draft – two (2) Business Days after the meeting, with final – five (5) Business days after receipt of State comments.
DEL-10	In-Plant Security Plan	With proposal and with update – within 30 days after the Effective Date of the Agreement.
DEL-11	User Manuals	At each training session and for online reference.
DEL-12	Database Design Document	Draft – five (5) Business Days prior to System Design Review, with updates – at the review, and Final as part of DEL-09.
DEL-13	Interface Design Document	Draft – five (5) Business Days prior to System Design Review, with updates – at the review, and final – as part of DEL-09.
DEL-14	System Design Document	Draft – five (5) Business Days prior to System Design Review, with updates – at the review, and final – as part of DEL-09.
DEL-15	Bill of Materials	At System Design Review with updates – at Pre-Ship Review.
DEL-16	Installation Plan	For each delivery, at Product Test and Readiness Review or 12 weeks prior to installation, whichever is earlier, with updates – at Pre-Ship Review.
DEL-17	Training Plan	At System Design Review with updates – at Pre-Ship Review.
DEL-18	Installation Drawings	At System Design Review with updates – at Pre-Ship Review.
DEL-19	Training Materials	For each delivery, at Product Test and Readiness Review or 12 weeks prior to installation, whichever is earlier, with updates – at Pre-Ship Review.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Document No.	Deliverable/Plan Title	Delivery Dates
DEL-20	<i>Reserved-unused.</i>	Reserved-unused.
DEL-21	Test Procedures	Draft – 30 working days prior to Product Test and Readiness Review and System Test and Readiness Review, with updates – at the review, and final – as part of DEL-09.
DEL-22	COOP Plan	At System Design Review with revision – at Pre-Ship Review.
DEL-23	System Hardware	Prior to Operational Readiness Review.
DEL-24	Software Licenses	Prior to Operational Readiness Review.
DEL-25	System Data	Prior to Operational Readiness Review.
DEL-26	Version Description Document	At Pre-Ship Review with updates – at Operational Readiness Review and Final Acceptance Review.
DEL-27	Installation Survey Report	At completion of each site survey.
DEL-28	Test Plan	At System Design Review with revision – at Test Readiness Review.
DEL-29	Configuration Management Plan	Within 30 days after the Effective Date of the Agreement.
DEL-30	Requirements Verification and Traceability Matrix	Draft – five (5) Business Days prior to System Design Review, with updates – at the review, and final – as part of DEL-09.
DEL-31	System Performance Report	Periodic logs of all transaction and System activity necessary to evaluate Agreement performance and to facilitate trend analysis, support system and other transactional analysis as specified in Phase 2 of the SOW.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Document No.	Deliverable/Plan Title	Delivery Dates
DEL-32	Data and Property Management Plan	Contractor shall develop, document and implement comprehensive procedures for the management of data, documentation and State property (equipment, hardware or software that belongs to State).
DEL-33	Service Level Plan	Contractor shall develop a Service Level Plan (“SLP”) that will govern the MSS and Contractor’s performance during the System Operation Phase of the project, as outlined in the Operations SOW, which shall include all Service Level Requirements set forth by the offeror in their response to the Implementation and Operations SOWs, and any other requirements specified elsewhere in the Agreement. The SLP must also report performance through DEL-31 above.

Attachment B – MSS Operations SOW

Offerors **shall** read all sections of this attachment and **shall** prepare their response to this Message Switch System (MSS) Operations Statement of Work (SOW) for inclusion with their proposal regarding the Alabama Law Enforcement Agency (ALEA) MSS RFP, for their proposed system solution. Offeror's response will be incorporated into the final contract.

Section 1 – MSS Operations SOW Response Instructions

The Offeror **shall** describe its understanding of the State's requirements as expressed the Operations Statement of Work (OPS SOW) and its approach to satisfying those requirements. The Offeror **shall** describe the services to be provided, the level of service, assumptions, risks, applicable standards, deliverables, and deliverable content. The Offeror **shall** address, at a minimum, the following areas:

System Performance. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to providing the performance services required in the MSS OPS SOW, including the capacities and response times to be supported (average and peak hour), throughput of services, and any assumptions, risks, or constraints. The Offeror **shall** address the required services and any additional services the Offeror proposes to provide.

System Interfaces. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the interface requirements of the MSS OPS SOW. The Offeror **shall** identify interfaces with justice information repositories and other relevant law enforcement systems; identify applicable interface standards; discuss any limitations in its implementation of those standards, interface capacities (average and peak hour), and any assumptions, risks, or constraints.

Message Switch and Hot files Management. The Offeror shall describe its approach to satisfying the message switch and hot files management requirements of the MSS OPS SOW. The Offeror shall describe the procedures for maintaining the system(s) and for ensuring the integrity, confidentiality, and accessibility of the contents.

Report Generation. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the report generation requirements of the MSS OPS SOW. The Offeror **shall** identify the data to be collected or made available; the frequency at which data is collected; and special circumstances under which data is collected. The Offeror **shall** discuss how data will be stored, accessed, queried, and how long it will be retained. Procedures for ensuring data integrity will be described. Standard reports will be identified, their contents described, the frequency of reporting described, and the recipients (organizations) of the reports specified. The flexibility for State personnel and MSS management to generate ad-hoc reports as well as export data (as needed) will be identified and discussed.

Support Services. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the support services requirements of the MSS OPS SOW. The Offeror **shall** identify and describe the support services to be provided, staffing, and availability (e.g., 24 hours per day, 7 days per week). The Offeror **shall** describe its approach for ensuring the operational software is kept current with respect to its latest software releases and applicable justice information standards.

Service Level Performance. The Offeror **shall** submit a Service Level Proposal which **shall** describe the Offeror's approach to satisfying the service level performance requirements of the MSS OPS SOW. The Offeror **shall** identify the proposed services and the proposed levels of service associated with each.

Training. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the ongoing training requirements of the MSS OPS SOW, including proposed activities, training schedule, deliverables, descriptions of deliverable

content, and methods and tools to be used. As a note, post implementation training will be incorporated into the training plans of the Data Entry Unit Managers for future hires.

The Offeror **shall** identify the risks inherent in the training approach and discuss its mitigation strategies.

Program Organization. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the program organization requirements of the MSS OPS SOW. The Offeror **shall** describe the proposed Program Management Organization (PMO). The Offeror **shall** discuss how the proposed PMO (including subcontractors and offerors) is organized (an organizational chart should be included); how it fits into the Offeror’s overall corporate structure (an organizational chart should be included); indicate how the proposed PMO will interface with the State; and discuss the responsibilities of key persons. The Offeror **shall** identify and discuss the principal interfaces and reporting mechanisms internal to and external to the PMO as well as elements of the Offeror’s support organization.

Management and Technical Reporting and Reviews. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the management and technical reporting and review requirements of the MSS OPS SOW. The Offeror **shall** identify proposed reviews, their purpose, frequency, participants, and any associated deliverables. Standard reports will be identified, their contents described, the frequency of reporting described, and the recipients (organizations) of the reports specified.

Technology Refresh and Enhancement. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the technology refresh and enhancement requirements of the MSS OPS SOW. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach for maintaining an awareness of the state of the art in justice and criminal history data and other relevant technologies and for identifying and evaluating new commercial software products and product upgrades for insertion into the MSS baseline. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to planning and executing the introduction of new standards, products, and product upgrades into the MSS baseline.

Facilities. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the facilities requirements of the MSS OPS SOW.

Personnel. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the personnel requirements of the MSS OPS SOW.

Security. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the security requirements of the MSS OPS SOW.

Maintenance Services. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the maintenance requirements of the MSS OPS SOW. The Offeror **shall** describe its plans for periodic maintenance (inspection, adjustment, and replacement of defective parts) at the primary site, and the COOP secondary site. The description **shall** include the frequency of visits, estimated required machine time, and proposed working hours. The Offeror **shall** describe the procedures to be used to log problem reports, to notify State of problems and their status, and to escalate problem reporting.

Configuration Management. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the configuration management requirements of the MSS OPS SOW.

Continuity of Operations. The Offeror **shall** describe its approach to satisfying the COOP requirements of the MSS OPS SOW.

Section 2 – MSS Operations Statement of Work

This section of Attachment B provides the operations statement of work expected for the MSS solution. Following the instructions provided in Section 1 above, offerors are to respond to this SOW below

providing detail as to their approach for accomplishing this SOW.

1 System Operation

This section of the SOW, together with Exhibit IMP SOW 1 – Project Deliverables, provides a detailed description of the scope of Work to be performed by Contractor throughout the operational and support phase (“System Operation Phase” or “Phase 2”) of the Agreement as part of the Service Level Requirements. Contractor **shall** submit to State for approval a Service Level Plan (“SLP”), based on its Service Level Proposal, which **shall** satisfy all Service Levels Requirements specified in System Operation of the SOW, including this 1.1 – Scope of Services.

1.1 – Scope of Services

Contractor **shall** provide for State’s Primary Site and COOP Site a suite of Services that will satisfy the Service Level Requirements based on the SLP developed by Contractor. Contractor **shall** provide all facilities, equipment, software and personnel required to deliver the Services identified in this 1.1 – Scope of Services and to satisfy the SLRs for State’s Primary Site and COOP Site.

The sections outline under this 1.1 – Scope of Services below set forth the required Services identified for the MSS Operational Environment.

1.1.1 – FEDERAL INTERFACES

Contractor **shall** maintain Interfaces with state and national services such as with the ALEA ABIS, the FBI NGI (via ABIS), Nlets, and the NCIC/III systems as well as any interfaces developed for implementation.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-33: Service Level Plan.

1.1.2 – STATE SYSTEM INTERFACES

Contractor **shall** maintain Interfaces with all requisite criminal justice information data repositories and systems and with networks that in turn connect to other criminal justice systems. These Interfaces, required for the successful implementation of the System during Phase 1 of this SOW, are documented in the Current Environment (Attachment D – Current AL MSS Environment).

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-33: Service Level Plan.

1.1.3 – MESSAGE SWITCH AND HOT FILE SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

Contractor shall maintain access to a well-maintained and indexed message switch and hot file transactions, stored and retrievable in standard formats. The ability to transmit, update, delete, retrieve data, and print appropriate reports and other forms, shall be provided.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-33: Service Level Plan.

1.1.4 – REPORT GENERATION

Contractor **shall** maintain access to State staff, FBI auditors and other authorized personnel to inspect the repository, the log of transactions and performance/throughput rates, and user-level access history in order to allow State to generate predefined (canned) reports as well as ad hoc reports.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-33: Service Level Plan.

1.2 – Support Services

During the System Operation Phase of the Agreement, as part of System Maintenance, Contractor **shall** support the operation of the System (“Support Services”), as further provided in this 1.2 – Support Services below.

1.2.1 – SCOPE OF SUPPORT

Contractor’s Support Services responsibilities **shall** include responding to and tracking problems reported, resolving Deficiencies and controlling configuration of software and hardware baselines, on-site and remotely as necessary.

Contractor **shall** backup (data and system configurations) daily for COOP considerations. Copies of the backup media **shall** be stored off site from the primary site and disaster recovery site to increase the likelihood of their availability in case of a natural or man-made disaster.

Contractor **shall** be responsible for all upgrades to the installed operating system(s), database management systems, and application software to ensure that the services conform to future approved FBI exchange/interface specifications and that no service is running on a suite of software no longer supported by the licensing Contractor.

The Contractor **shall** manage its services to include reports on the status of the system, the services provided, and repository and transaction volumes.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-33: Service Level Plan.

1.2.2 – CUSTOMER SUPPORT

As part of its Support Services, Contractor **shall** provide operational support for the Solution 24 hours per day, 7 days per week (24/7) (“Support Hours”), which **shall** include without limitation providing a point of contact for all System problems by maintaining a system for customer support (“Customer Support”). Such operational support **shall** include Support Services to correct any failure of the Solution and to remedy Deficiencies in accordance with 1.5 – Correction of Deficiencies of the SOW to ensure that the Solution operates in accordance with the Specifications, including System Requirements, warranties and other requirements under the Agreement. Requests for Customer Support will be submitted by State’s technical support via telephone and/or Contractor’s web-based trouble ticketing system. In the event that the Contractor’s web-based trouble ticketing system is not available, State may use email or any other reasonable means to request Customer Support.

In addition to the requirements specified in the System Requirements Specifications, Contractor’s Customer Support service level requirements **shall** also include, but not be limited to, those listed below, as follows:

- State designated staff **shall** have access to Contractor’s Customer Support through the web-based trouble ticketing system and via telephone. The trouble ticketing system **shall** provide for State a simple method to submit, track and update issues that require escalation to Contractor’s Customer Support. The authorized State contacts will each receive an account and training on the ticketing system. This does not prohibit other State contacts from calling Customer Support to report an issue or problem.
- Contractor **shall** provide a telephone number for State staff to call 24/7/365. This telephone number **shall** quickly connect State staff with the appropriately qualified Customer Support

personnel.

- Contractor **shall** disclose if non-contractor employees or a sub-contractor will be utilized for any portion of Customer Support Services including initial intake of reported problem calls from the State.
- Priority Levels for the Deficiencies **shall** be assigned according to definitions specified in 1.5.2 – Deficiency Priority Levels.
- Contractor **shall** respond within the period specified in 1.5.2 – Deficiency Priority Levels depending on the Priority Level of the Deficiency.
- Contractor’s Customer Support **shall** be made available to State on a 24/7/365 basis.
- Contractor’s Customer Support **shall** work with State’s Project Manager and State’s technical support staff on correcting Deficiencies and keep State personnel informed regarding the updates and scheduled timeframes to ensure that all maintenance windows are clearly communicated, and the requirements of this SOW are met.
- Deficiency correction, timeframes, and Service Credits for failure to timely correct any Deficiencies as specified herein **shall** be as specified in 1.5 – Correction of Deficiencies.

1.2.3 – SERVICE LEVEL PERFORMANCE

Contractor **shall** ensure that, during the term of the Agreement, the MSS **shall** provide at least 99.8 percent (99.8%) availability for all Services, measured monthly, and in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, including all Service Level Requirements set forth herein.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-33: Service Level Plan.

1.2.4 – TRAINING

Contractor, in conjunction with third parties and cooperation from State, will develop those Training Plan(s) and materials and will conduct those training activities identified as Contractor responsibilities [DEL-17] of the System Implementation Phase of this SOW.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-17: Training Plan.

1.3 – Program Management

The sections under this 1.3 – Program Management below describe the required program management functions to be performed by Contractor throughout the System Operation Phase of the Agreement.

Contractor **shall** document management organization, roles and responsibilities, resources, processes, and other pertinent management information in a Project Management Plan [DEL-01] and maintain that plan current throughout the System Operation Phase of the Agreement.

1.3.1 – PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

Contractor **shall** establish a formal Contractor PMO responsible for executing the total effort required under the Agreement. A clear line of program authority **shall** exist among all organizational elements, including subcontractors. Roles, responsibilities, authority structures and reporting requirements **shall** be established for each organizational element.

Contractor **shall** appoint a Contractor’s Project Manager or Program Project Manager (“PPM”) who **shall** be responsible for accomplishing all tasks to be performed under the Agreement. The PPM **shall** be responsible for Contractor’s technical, cost and schedule performance. The PPM **shall** have full authority

over all Contractor program activities and resources. The PPM **shall** be the principal interface between the program and Contractor's corporate organization, between the program and its associated contractors, and between Contractor and State for all matters relating to the Agreement. The PPM, or designee, **shall** be available to State management on a 24/7/365 basis, as appropriate.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-01: Project Management Plan.

1.3.2 – MANAGEMENT AND TECHNICAL REPORTING AND REVIEWS

Contractor **shall** conduct management and technical reviews and provide management and technical reports throughout the System Operation Phase of the Agreement. Contractor is cautioned that the content of reviews **shall** be limited to that which is sufficient to establish the adequacy of the products and services required under the Agreement. Sales presentations, new product demonstrations and other promotions are discouraged unless expressly requested by State. Contractor **shall** log all transaction and system activity necessary to evaluate Agreement performance, facilitate trend analysis and support system and other transactional analysis [DEL-31]. Contractor **shall** supply appropriate quality assurance and audits to ensure logs are complete and accurate.

Contractor **shall** participate in a program kickoff meeting at a State facility 30 days prior to the scheduled date for declaring State's Initial Operational Capability (IOC). The purpose of the meeting is to introduce key State and Contractor operations and operations support personnel, discuss plans, examine the status of any risks or issues and address any other issues that State and/or Contractor may wish to discuss.

State and Contractor **shall** meet monthly in person, by telephone or through the provision of e-mail updates exchanged between their respective Program Managers unless the parties otherwise mutually agree in writing via their respective Program Managers. Attendees at the meetings will include State and its staff and Contractor and subcontractor's personnel, as determined by State and Contractor management. The objectives of the monthly meetings are (i) to confirm that the program is not encountering technical problems that would cause the program to fail to maintain the agreed-upon service levels, (ii) to provide immediate feedback to the parties to permit any issues to be resolved on a timely basis, (iii) to provide a contemporaneous record showing that the parties have acted to ensure that the program is progressing in accordance with prior agreements, and (iv) to ensure that parties are proactively identifying and addressing issues that could adversely affect service levels.

Contractor **shall** conduct semi-annual Operational Program Management Reviews (OPMR(s)). Attendees at the OPMRs will include State and its staff and Contractor and subcontractor's staff, as necessary. The first OPMR **shall** be held within 60 days after the IOC. Each OPMR **shall** address:

- Performance against SLAs
- Financial and schedule status
- Planned activities
- Action item status
- Problem report status
- Configuration management and quality assurance reporting
- Issues and risks
- Other service level shortfalls and plans for corrective action.

The OPMRs **shall** also address selected technical and programmatic topics as directed by State.

It should be assumed that all OPMRs are to occur at ALEA or State sites. However, if the OPMR is held at Contractor's location, any costs to the state associated with travel will have to be incurred as expenses

to the contractor, and Contractor **shall** furnish facilities both for conducting the OPMR and for State-only meetings and side meetings. Contractor **shall** make available the key personnel necessary to carry out an efficient and effective agenda and **shall** provide presentation materials and supporting data. Contractor **shall** furnish agendas, presentation materials and minutes. Contractor **shall** attend and participate in required meetings as necessary.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-07: Agenda
- DEL-08: Presentation Materials
- DEL-09: Minutes
- DEL-20: Technical Report
- DEL-31: System Performance Report.

1.3.3 – FACILITY PERSONNEL

Contractor **shall** be responsible for all Primary Site and COOP Site personnel and exercise all rights, responsibilities and prerogatives associated therewith, as necessary to provide Work under the Agreement. Contractor's personnel **shall** be subject to the security provisions outlined in 1.3.4 – System Security below.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-01: Project Management Plan
- DEL-22: COOP Plan
- DEL-33: Service Level Plan.

1.3.4 – SYSTEM SECURITY

Contractor **shall** take reasonable security precautions approved by State, by providing among others the necessary Software Updates, to ensure the MSS, including its related hardware, software, data and third-party components, are maintained in accordance with contemporary best business practices, including performing antivirus updates, software updates, configuration management, backup/restore/recovery, system logging and report generation. Contractor **shall** take reasonable security precautions as approved by State to ensure State's Primary Site and COOP Site physical security.

Contractor **shall** comply with all provisions of the FBI CJIS Security Policy as cited in the Implementation SOW.

Contractor **shall** take reasonable precautions to prevent the loss of or alteration to State's data. Accordingly, Contractor **shall** keep backup copies of all of State's data in a safe and secure off-site facility approved by State.

Contractor **shall not** utilize, or provide to third parties, State's database without prior written approval of State.

Contractor **shall** be responsible for ensuring appropriate encryption or other security methods are implemented to guarantee the secure transmission of data in the MSS, as further provided elsewhere in the Agreement including the System Requirements Specifications.

Contractor **shall** afford State the opportunity to interview and investigate the personnel proposed by Contractor prior to granting them security access to State systems and sites, and State reserves the right to reject their access to MSS equipment, files or site locations whenever Contractor personnel fail to maintain a clean criminal record or pass a background update procedure administered by and satisfactory to State, as further provided elsewhere in the Agreement including the System

Requirements Specifications.

Contractor **shall** work with the State to achieve end-to-end security for all components that make up the MSS. Contractor **shall** document its security program in an In-Plant Security Plan [DEL-10].

Contractor **shall** also give verbal notification to the State immediately, and then in writing within four (4) hours of Contractor's knowledge of the existence and explanation of any intrusions or other security problems or breaches that may affect the integrity of the System Data or any other State data, subject to the provisions of Paragraph 18 (Confidentiality and Security) of the Base Agreement.

Contractor **shall** provide the State access to the system as deemed appropriate by the State for system security reviews, penetration testing or other security matters. Contractor **shall** also provide the State with access to any system logs as deemed appropriate by the State for ongoing security monitoring.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-10: In-Plant Security Plan.

1.4 – Maintenance Services

During the System Operation Phase of the Agreement, as part of System Maintenance, Contractor **shall** provide maintenance of the System, including the provision of Software Updates and Hardware Upgrades, as further provided in this 1.4 – Maintenance Services below.

Contractor **shall** provide, for any meetings related to maintenance services, the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-07: Agenda
- DEL-08: Presentation Materials
- DEL-09: Minutes.

1.4.1 – TECHNOLOGY REFRESH AND ENHANCEMENTS

As part of Maintenance Services, Contractor **shall** propose functional and processing requirements for, and implement, future upgrades. Contractor **shall** also identify and make recommendations concerning the operation of the Existing System, including but not limited to ensuring that the Service Levels are maintained, and that Contractor is performing other duties as agreed to by State and Contractor under the Agreement.

Contractor and State **shall** conduct periodic joint technology reviews, no less frequently than every six (6) months, to guarantee that the hardware and software and system security are adequate for State purposes and are consistent with then-current technology used in similar systems. Such evaluations **shall** include reviewing the available technology applicable to the MSS, both from Contractor and third parties, and reviewing pending and implemented changes in NIST, EBTS, NCIC and other standards applicable to the State. As may be required from time to time, Contractor and State **shall** determine any hardware or software changes that are needed to respond to such developments and to provide migration paths for such functional or technology updates. Such changes **shall** be provided at no cost to State beyond the Service Fees payable by State to Contractor.

As part of Maintenance Services, if the Contractor includes any hardware as part of the MSS solution, the Contractor **shall** provide, as appropriate and applied, a hardware refresh no later than 3 years after acceptance of the system solution at no additional charge to State beyond the contractually established Service Fees. Prior to commencing hardware refresh, Contractor **shall** submit for State approval technology refreshment specifications, which **shall** incorporate technological upgrades that are necessary to maintain MSS performance at the requisite Service Levels and to improve such

performance, including through additional functionality or in response to changes in technology, regulations or standards promulgated by the FBI, Alabama Justice Information Commission (AJIC), or otherwise as required by state or federal law. Contractor **shall** furnish agendas, presentation materials, minutes, and technical reports.

Contractor **shall** provide, for any meetings related to technology refresh and enhancement, the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-07: Agenda
- DEL-08: Presentation Materials
- DEL-09: Minutes
- DEL-20: Technical Report.

1.4.2 – SOFTWARE UPDATES

Contractor **shall** provide Software Updates to the Software to keep current with Contractor's hosting technology standards, industry standards, Third Party Software upgrades, enhancements, updates, patches, bug fixes, etc., the System Requirements and as provided to Contractor's general customer base, all in accordance with this SOW and in coordination with State's Project Manager. By definition, such Software Updates **shall** include, but not be limited to, enhancements, version releases and other improvements and modifications to the Software, including Application Software.

Maintenance Services additionally include maintaining compatibility of the Solution Software with any and all Interfaces provided by Contractor under this Agreement. Prior to the installation of any Third-Party Software, or any update thereto, Contractor **shall** test and ensure such Third-Party Software's compatibility with the then current version of the Software. Contractor **shall** ensure that the Software is compatible with all required or critical updates to Third Party Software, including without limitation, service and compatibility packs and security patches, promptly upon their release.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, any Third-Party Application that may be incorporated by Contractor into the Application Software **shall** be subject to the same Maintenance Services obligations and requirements as the Application Software components that are owned by, or are proprietary to, Contractor.

1.4.3 – SYSTEM ENVIRONMENT

As part of Maintenance Services, Contractor **shall** also provide maintenance of the Server Software that is part of the Server Environment for the Solution, including but not limited to operating software, database software and other software installed in the Server Environment that is not Application Software. Contractor **shall** update, upgrade, replace and/or maintain such Server Software components during the term of the Agreement to comply with the System Requirements and the warranties specified in this Agreement and to be compatible with the Application Software, including any Application Modifications provided by Contractor under the Agreement.

Contractor **shall** provide Software Updates to the Server Software to keep current with Contractor's hosting technology standards, industry standards, Software Updates to the Application Software and other Application Modifications, all in coordination with State's Project Manager.

As part of Maintenance Services, Contractor **shall** also provide maintenance of the Server Hardware components surrounding the Software, including but not limited to all equipment and networking components and other Hardware Upgrades at no additional cost to State beyond the applicable contractually established Service Fees. Contractor **shall** repair, upgrade, replace and/or maintain these Server Hardware components during the term of the Agreement to comply with the System Requirements and the warranties specified in this Agreement and to be compatible with the Software

including any Application Modifications provided by Contractor under the Agreement.

Furthermore, Contractor **shall**, during the term of the Agreement, maintain the Solution’s compatibility with State’s Client Environment by providing, among others, Software Updates to the Software and Hardware Upgrades to the Solution Hardware. Additionally, Contractor **shall** be responsible for maintaining all network connectivity from the State of Alabama point of presence (Montgomery) to the primary site as well as the DR/COOP site.

1.4.4 – SCHEDULED DOWNTIME AND PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE

Unless agreed to otherwise in advance by State and Contractor, Contractor **shall** provide all Maintenance Services, including installation of Software Updates and Hardware Upgrades, during Scheduled Downtime, during late evening hours or early morning hours in order to avoid times when users need to use the System, as agreed to by State. Scheduled Downtime for performing Preventive Maintenance or other Maintenance Services at any site **shall not** exceed two (2) hours for each site in any month, unless agreed to in advance by State.

Any Downtime outside of the above window of time without prior State approval **shall** be considered Unscheduled Downtime and **shall** entitle State to remedies as specified in this SOW. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Contractor may request Scheduled Downtime for the provision of an emergency correction to the Solution. Such Downtime **shall** be deemed Scheduled Downtime, provided that it has been approved by State’s Project Manager.

State and Contractor **shall** agree on Scheduled Downtime as part of IMS.

Contractor will perform a documented Preventive Maintenance procedure for all equipment and software they provide. Contractor **shall** periodically dispatch maintenance personnel to clean, inspect and adjust the equipment and replace defective or worn parts thereof at the manufacturer’s recommended frequency in order to keep the equipment in good operating condition. Contractor **shall** carry out periodic maintenance tasks on all electronic components they provide to ensure they are operating at maximum capability. Such maintenance **shall** be scheduled to be performed, at a minimum, once a month during hours agreed to by State.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-33: Service Level Plan.

1.4.5 – RESPONSE TIME MONITORING

Contractor **shall** be responsible for monitoring Response Time of the System to ensure compliance with the System Requirements including System Performance Requirements set forth in this SOW with all Attachments. The contractor **shall** also provide the state with monitoring tools that allow state to view the current status of the system (dashboard-type functionality, etc.) as well as understanding particular performance measures.

Contractor **shall** perform Response Time monitoring at regular intervals and in sufficient detail to detect problems. Contractor **shall** provide State with direct access at any time to the data collected as a result Response Time monitoring. Whenever requested by State, Contractor **shall** provide State with reports and/or download that data along with all applicable documentation that may be necessary for State to independently monitor the Response Time of the System.

State reserves the right to periodically revisit the Response Time Baselines for resetting to ensure that the Response Time of the Solution does not restrict or delay State’s operations.

1.5 – Correction of Deficiencies

During the System Operation Phase of the Agreement, as part of System Maintenance, Contractor **shall** correct the Deficiencies in the System, as further provided in this 1.5 – Correction of Deficiencies below.

Contractor **shall** provide corrective maintenance for any Deficiency in Contractor provided equipment or software that, when used as delivered, fails to perform in accordance with the Specifications specified in the Agreement, including System Requirements. The period for the provision of corrective Maintenance coverage for all hardware and software **shall** be defined as 24/7.

Contractor **shall** maintain an electronic report log that indicates the problem report number, problem description, the time that the problem call was received, the priority assigned, all actions taken and the time that the problem was corrected. The problem report log **shall** be maintained in a database that is remotely accessible by State personnel.

Contractor **shall** offer one central point of contact for support of hardware and software. Contractor support personnel **shall** address all problems reported by State. Contractor’s support personnel **shall** acknowledge problems reported via telephone or by e-mail within two (2) hours and respond according to the protocols listed below.

1.5.1 – IDENTIFICATION OF DEFICIENCIES

The Deficiencies under this Agreement may be identified either as a result of Contractor’s use of its own monitoring system or discovered by State. Upon discovery of a Deficiency by State, State will report the Deficiency to Contractor’s Customer Support for resolution in accordance with this SOW.

The Priority Level of a Deficiency **shall** be assigned according to the Priority Level definition set forth in 1.5.2 – Deficiency Priority Levels. Based on Contractor’s proposed solution and/or a workaround for the Deficiency, State may reevaluate and escalate or downgrade the Priority Level of such Deficiency.

1.5.2 – DEFICIENCY PRIORITY LEVELS

State **shall** assign the Priority Level to each Deficiency reported by State to Contractor’s Customer Support. Contractor **shall** assign Priority Levels to Deficiencies discovered by its own problem monitoring system as detailed in Table 1 – Deficiency Priority Levels below. Following report of a Deficiency from State, Contractor **shall** respond back to State within the prescribed “Response Timeframe” specified below and resolve each such Deficiency within the specified “Resolution Time”. Resolution Time for correction of Deficiencies **shall** start tolling when State first notifies Contractor of a Deficiency by telephone or otherwise as specified herein, including Contractor’s Customer Support, and **shall** end when State determines that the Deficiency has been resolved.

Table 1 – Deficiency Priority Levels

Priority Level	Description of Deficiency	Response Timeframe	Resolution Time
1 – Critical	System is down (Unscheduled Downtime) or is practically down (e.g., extremely slow Response Time) or does not function at all, as determined by State. There is no way to circumvent the problem; a significant number of State users are affected. A production business system is inoperable.	One (1) hour	Eight (8) consecutive hours
2 – Severe	A component of the Solution is not performing in accordance with the Specifications (e.g., slow Response Time), creating significant State business impact, its core functionality is not available or one of System Requirements is not met, as determined by State.	Four (4) hours	One (1) Day
3 – Moderate	A component of the Solution is not performing in accordance with the Specifications; there are unexpected results, moderate or minor operational impact, as determined by State.	One (1) day	Two (2) weeks
4 – Low	This is a low impact problem and is not significant to operations or is related to education (e.g., general “how to” and informational Solution Software questions, Documentation requests, understanding of reports or general “how to” create reports), as determined by State.	Two (2) days	Next version release or six (6) months unless otherwise agreed to by State and Contractor

1.5.3 – PROBLEM RESOLUTION AND PROTOCOLS

Contractor **shall** assign Priority Levels to Deficiencies discovered by its own problem monitoring system. Following report of a Deficiency from State, Contractor **shall** respond back to State within the prescribed “Response Timeframe” specified below and resolve each such Deficiency within the specified “Resolution Time”. Resolution Time for correction of Deficiencies **shall** start tolling when State first notifies Contractor of a Deficiency by telephone or otherwise as specified herein, including Contractor’s Customer Support, and **shall** end when State determines that the Deficiency has been resolved.

Problems requiring an immediate response (Priority Level 1) are system or component failures preventing records from being entered or updated, searched or responses from being delivered. This includes all equipment supplied by Contractor associated with the System.

Contractor may attempt to correct the problem by phone or remote access. If Contractor is unable to correct the problem in this manner, Contractor must begin on-site repair within four (4) hours of the time Contractor was initially notified, depending on the availability of the site where the equipment resides. All situations preventing the initiation of on-site repair within such four (4) hours will be documented in Contractor's electronic report log and reported to State's Help Desk.

All other Major Deficiencies (Priority Level 2) will be corrected within one (1) Day from the time the problem was reported.

Contractor **shall** inform State within 1 hour of any service interruptions and then notify the State within eight (8) hours of any hardware or software problems that Contractor has identified and resolved.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-33: Service Level Plan.

1.6 – Configuration Management

Problem reporting, testing, diagnosis, deployment of patches and revisions are key aspects of configuration management. Configuration management plans and processes must address these unique problems efficiently and effectively.

Contractor **shall** document and implement a Configuration Management Plan [DEL-29] and processes that **shall** address these unique problems efficiently and effectively. Configuration management performed by Contractor **shall** accomplish the following:

- Establish a controlled configuration for each operational hardware and software component at the Primary Site and the COOP Site
- Maintain current copies of the deliverable documentation and code
- Give State access to the documentation and code under configuration control
- Control the preparation and dissemination of changes to the master copies of the delivered software and documentation placed under configuration control so that they reflect only approved changes.

Contractor **shall** generate management records and status reports for all hardware and software products at the Primary Site and the COOP Site, including the controlled operational configurations. The status reports **shall**:

- Make changes to controlled products traceable
- Serve as a basis for communicating the status of configuration identification software and associated software
- Serve as a vehicle for ensuring that delivered documents describe and represent the associated software.

Contractor **shall** participate in State configuration control meetings. State configuration control meetings will establish and control the requirements baseline [DEL-02] throughout the performance of the Agreement and will control the operational baseline, including deployed hardware, software, databases and documentation, once the MSS becomes operational.

Contractor **shall** prepare a Version Description Document [DEL-26] comprising the complete instructions necessary to install and configure all hardware, software and data associated with each deployment, including site-specific installation information for the duration of the term of the Agreement.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-02: System Requirements Specifications
- DEL-26: Version Description Document
- DEL-29: Configuration Management Plan.

1.7 – Continuity of Operations

As part of System Maintenance, Contractor **shall** also be responsible for the provision of COOP Services in accordance with the COOP Plan provided by Contractor.

Contractor or State may declare an event a Disaster. As part of COOP Services, Contractor **shall** perform the functions; provide or utilize the facilities, equipment, supplies, data, and documentation; and conduct the training and exercises/drills specified in the COOP to maintain a viable COOP capability ensuring the performance of Contractor’s essential functions during any emergency or situation that may disrupt normal operations and leave Contractor facilities damaged or inaccessible. Contractor **shall** be subject to the following Service Level Requirements as part of COOP, which **shall** be contained in and are incorporated into the COOP Plan:

- Contractor **shall** have complete responsibility for restoration of the Solution.
- In the event of a Disaster declaration, Contractor **shall** be required to maintain regular and consistent communication with State about the event/condition and steps taken to restore the Solution.
- Contractor **shall** be required to make a declaration of a Disaster and invoke the Disaster Recovery Plan within four (4) hours from the disruption of the normal Operational Environment or precipitating event. Such declaration will signal that system operations will continue on the remaining site without COOP until the event has ended and the full system has been restored. Contractor **shall** also indicate its plan for the restoration of full COOP operations after the declaration of the event.
- Contractor **shall** ensure the System Data to a point no greater than Thirty (30) minutes prior to the declaration of the Disaster by State or Contractor.
- State **shall** be able to logon to the secondary system at the Disaster Recovery/COOP site immediately and seamlessly as a function of the load-balance system design from the declaration of the Disaster event by State or Contractor.
- Contractor **shall** have 100% capacity of the operational system (as a function of the load-balanced system design) regardless of the declaration of the Disaster by State or Contractor.
- Contractor’s failure to make a declaration of a Disaster within four (4) hours **shall** result in any system downtime as a result of this incident being deemed as Unscheduled Downtime.

Contractor **shall** provide the following Deliverable(s) for this component of the SOW:

- DEL-22: COOP Plan.

2 Remedies

2.1 – General

Credits **shall** accrue for Unscheduled Downtime, including Contractor’s failure to meet the System Availability requirements and/or Response Time requirements (hereinafter “Service Credit(s)”). For purposes of assessing Service Credits and this SOW, “Unscheduled Downtime” **shall** mean the total amount of time during any calendar month, measured in minutes, during which the System has a Major

Deficiency that is unresolved by Contractor, excluding Scheduled Downtime.

2.2 – Service Credits

Without limiting any other rights and remedies available to State, either pursuant to this Agreement, by law or in equity, State **shall** be entitled to Service Credits calculated based on the length of Unscheduled Downtime as provided in Table 2 – Service Credits below, and only for issues/disruptions that are directly attributable to and are within the scope of responsibility of the Contractor. Service Credits will not be assessed for Scheduled Downtime.

Table 2 – Service Credits

Length of Continuous Unscheduled Downtime	Service Credits
1 to 4 hours	1 day of Service Credits equal to 1/30th of Monthly Fees
4 to 48 hours	2 days of Service Credits equal to 1/15th of Monthly Fees
48 to 96 hours	5 days of Service Credits equal to 1/6th of Monthly Fees
Each additional block of 96 hours thereafter	Additional 5 days of Service Credits equal to 1/6th of Monthly Fees

Service Credits **shall** be calculated separately for each applicable incident of a Deficiency and **shall** be added up to be assessed at the end of each month of System Maintenance. Service Credits, in any amounts, are not and **shall not** be construed as penalties and, when assessed, will be deducted from State’s payment due to Contractor.

2.3 – System Response Time Deficiencies

A Response Time Deficiency fitting the definition of a Major Deficiency as a Priority Level 1 or Priority Level 2 **shall** be deemed to cause Unscheduled Downtime and **shall** entitle State to assess Service Credits as provided in 2.2 – Service Credits above. In addition, the System **shall** be deemed to be experiencing Unscheduled Downtime after thirty (30) days of any Response Time Deficiency unresolved by Contractor, entitling State to assess Service Credits.

Exhibit OPS SOW 1 – Project Deliverables

During the System Operations Phase of the Agreement, Contractor **shall** deliver those Deliverables identified and listed in the Deliverable Table below, as appropriate during the Operations phase of the project. All Deliverables **shall** be subject to State approval and Acceptance in order to satisfy the terms and conditions of the Agreement.

During the System Operation Phase of the project, Contractor **shall** provide the State with a comprehensive set of user, system, training, and management documentation. Contractor **shall** supply documentation in both electronic and hard-copy formats. User documentation **shall** describe the components, functions, and operations of each workstation type. Each MSS workstation **shall** be provided with online user documentation residing on the workstation or accessible via the agency’s internal networks.

In addition, Contractor **shall** deliver those items identified in Deliverable Table below.

Document No.	Deliverable/Plan Title	Delivery Dates
DEL-01	Project Management Plan	With proposal and with update – within 30 days after the Effective Date of the Agreement.
DEL-02	System Specifications	At System Review.
DEL-03	Integrated Master Schedule	With proposal and with update at Project Management Reviews.
DEL-04	Test and Evaluation Master Plan	With proposal and with update – within 30 days after the Effective Date of the Agreement.
DEL-05	Migration Plan	At System Design Review.
DEL-06	Test Report – several sets, each corresponding to the outcomes of Factory Acceptance Test, System Acceptance Test and User Acceptance Test	For each increment, at Pre-Ship Review and Operational Readiness Review.
DEL-07	Agenda	Prior to a meeting.
DEL-08	Presentation Materials	Draft – five (5) Business Days prior to a meeting, with updates – at the meeting and final – as part of DEL-09.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Document No.	Deliverable/Plan Title	Delivery Dates
DEL-09	Minutes	Draft – two (2) Business Days after the meeting, with final – five (5) Business days after receipt of State comments.
DEL-10	In-Plant Security Plan	With proposal and with update – within 30 days after the Effective Date of the Agreement.
DEL-11	User Manuals	At each training session and for online reference.
DEL-12	Database Design Document	Draft – five (5) Business Days prior to System Design Review, with updates – at the review, and Final as part of DEL-09.
DEL-13	Interface Design Document	Draft – five (5) Business Days prior to System Design Review, with updates – at the review, and final – as part of DEL-09.
DEL-14	System Design Document	Draft – five (5) Business Days prior to System Design Review, with updates – at the review, and final – as part of DEL-09.
DEL-15	Bill of Materials	At System Design Review with updates – at Pre-Ship Review.
DEL-16	Installation Plan	For each delivery, at Product Test and Readiness Review or 12 weeks prior to installation, whichever is earlier, with updates – at Pre-Ship Review.
DEL-17	Training Plan	At System Design Review with updates – at Pre-Ship Review.
DEL-18	Installation Drawings	At System Design Review with updates – at Pre-Ship Review.
DEL-19	Training Materials	For each delivery, at Product Test and Readiness Review or 12 weeks prior to installation, whichever is earlier, with updates – at Pre-Ship Review.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Document No.	Deliverable/Plan Title	Delivery Dates
DEL-20	Technical Report	As specified in 1.3.2 – Management and Technical Reporting and Reviews and 1.4.1 – Technology Refresh and Enhancements above or as required or requested by State.
DEL-21	Test Procedures	Draft – 30 working days prior to Product Test and Readiness Review and System Test and Readiness Review, with updates – at the review, and final – as part of DEL-09.
DEL-22	COOP Plan	At System Design Review with revision – at Pre-Ship Review.
DEL-23	System Hardware	Prior to Operational Readiness Review.
DEL-24	Software Licenses	Prior to Operational Readiness Review.
DEL-25	System Data	Prior to Operational Readiness Review.
DEL-26	Version Description Document	At Pre-Ship Review with updates – at Operational Readiness Review and Final Acceptance Review.
DEL-27	Installation Survey Report	At completion of each site survey.
DEL-28	Test Plan	At System Design Review with revision – at Test Readiness Review.
DEL-29	Configuration Management Plan	Within 30 days after the Effective Date of the Agreement.
DEL-30	Requirements Verification and Traceability Matrix	Draft – five (5) Business Days prior to System Design Review, with updates – at the review, and final – as part of DEL-09.
DEL-31	System Performance Report	Periodic logs of all transaction and System activity necessary to evaluate Agreement performance and to facilitate trend analysis, support system and other transactional analysis as specified in Phase 2 of the SOW.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Document No.	Deliverable/Plan Title	Delivery Dates
DEL-32	Data and Property Management Plan	Contractor shall develop, document and implement comprehensive procedures for the management of data, documentation and State property (equipment, hardware or software that belongs to State).
DEL-33	Service Level Plan	Contractor shall develop a Service Level Plan (“SLP”) that will govern the MSS and Contractor’s performance during the System Operation Phase of the project, as outlined in System Operation of the SOW, which shall include all Service Level Requirements set forth in offeror’s response to the Operations Implementation and Operations SOWs, and any other requirements specified elsewhere in the Agreement. The SLP must also report performance through DEL-31 above.

Attachment C – MSS Specifications

Requirements Framework

This section introduces the recommended framework in which requirements for the future ALEA MSS are presented for the purposes of competitive solicitation. Requirements for this system will be presented in the following way:

- *Functional Requirements* – Those requirements that support the functionality, processes, business rules, inputs, and products needed in the future ALEA MSS solution.
- *Technical Requirements* – Those requirements that describe the State of Alabama’s and ALEA’s information technology (IT) policies and standards, infrastructure, user interface, interfaces to other systems, and security specifications for the future ALEA MSS system.

Following is a discussion of how requirements are presented to prospective proposers and how the proposers are instructed to respond to the solicitation.

Requirements Presentation

Requirements for the ALEA MSS system will be presented in the table format shown below. Functional and technical requirements will be listed in a separate but similar format. Each requirement will be listed under its own ID number.

ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
1	Requirement Detail 1				
2	Requirement Detail 2				
3	Requirement Detail 3				

Vendors will be instructed to complete their responses to each requirement as described below. The definition for each of the response types above is also explained in the following section.

The following table provides the definition for and understanding of each of the response options in the table above. In responding to these requirements regarding functions, features, and reporting capabilities, each vendor will be instructed to mark a response box that accurately indicates its current or future ability to provide each requirement. In addition, each vendor will be instructed to explain in detail how and where its solution meets the requirement. Vendor responses will be balanced against the system

approach and architecture model proposed.

Response Box	Definition
Current Capability or Configurable Item	Requirement will be met by the proposed future ALEA MSS solution that is installed and operational in other states and can be demonstrated to the ALEA. <i>The cost of requirements receiving this response must be included in the cost of the base package, and the requirements must be delivered with the baseline solution at installation.</i>
Future Release	Requirement will be met by a future release of the product. The cost of requirements receiving this response must be included in the cost of the base package, and the requirements must be delivered within one year of baseline solution installation.
Custom Development	Requirement will be met by package software currently under development, in beta test, or not yet released. The cost of requirements receiving this response must be included in the cost of the base package, and the requirements must be delivered with the baseline solution at installation.
Not Available	Requirement cannot be provided either as part of the baseline solution or future enhancement.

Responding to Requirements

This section calls on the vendors to group together, in order, all of the requirements and responses by response type (for example, all of those marked Current Capability or Configurable Items in order, with detailed descriptions, followed by those marked as Future Release, etc.). Vendors must follow the outline below for the ALEA MSS requirements response section of the overall proposal.

In their proposals, the vendors **shall** provide a comprehensive written description of their approach to all requirements in the specification. Vendors must first use and insert the requirement specifications tables, as provided in the solicitation, into their proposals and respond directly to each specification entry by placing an “X” in the applicable column in each row. The definition of each column heading in the requirement specification table is provided below and in the RFP section related to instructions for preparing provider responses.

For each requirement, in requirement ID order, providers are to:

Place an “X” in the appropriate column in the response form, per the definitions below.

- Add two rows after each requirement ID, providing the following information:
 - » In the first of these two rows, for each requirement ID, provide a detailed explanation for their responses to each requirement ID, according to the format outlined in the table below.

- » In the second of these two rows, for each requirement ID, provide information on the section and/or pages(s) in the proposal where requirement is addressed or other method(s) of verification.

Requirement ID	Response Explanation
Current Capability or Configurable Item	
List <i>each requirement ID</i> , so marked, in the same order as in the specifications tables.	For each requirement ID listed, vendors must provide a <i>detailed explanation</i> of how the specification is met.
Future Release	
List <i>each requirement ID</i> , so marked, in the same order as in the specification’s tables.	For each requirement ID listed, vendors must provide a <i>detailed explanation</i> of when and how the specification will be met within 1 year of installation.
Custom Development	
List <i>each requirement ID</i> , so marked, in the same order as in the specification’s tables.	For each requirement ID listed, vendors must provide a <i>detailed explanation</i> of how the specification will be customized, implemented, and maintained. Vendors may also note whether the associated custom development will be provided as part of the base package without additional cost.
Not Available	
List <i>each requirement ID</i> , so marked, in the same order as in the specification’s tables.	For each requirement ID listed, vendors must provide a <i>detailed explanation</i> of why they chose not to provide the specified feature.

NOTE: Each functional specification in the proposal must be addressed directly or it will be assumed that vendors cannot accomplish the specification and/or deliverable. ALEA prefers vendor systems that meet all specifications with minimum customization required.

Functional Requirements

This section includes the baseline set of functional business requirements for the future ALEA MSS system environment. These baseline requirements are broken down into the functional areas of criminal records management, including business process, analysis, action and decision, and workflow.

Business Process Requirements

The table below presents the core functional business components of the future MSS environment and includes the functionality necessary to meet business processing needs such as data entry, query, response, and messaging.

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
Business Process					
MBP-1	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> minimally provide all of the functionality of the current MSS environment and further detailed in the Detailed Design Document.				
MBP-2	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> provide transaction-level/group user authorization capabilities.				
MBP-3	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> provide a means for real-time end-user notifications regarding system availability.				
MBP-4	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> process batch transactions from user agencies (e.g., processing a group of inquiries on a batch of data items or processing groups of record entries or modifications).				
MBP-5	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> handle message header and destination errors (both user and application) in a consistent manner with the return of a message that indicates the problem.				
MBP-6	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> provide editing capabilities for correction of errors in data.				
MBP-7	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> allow users to receive priority messages (to be defined by ALEA administrators) first, regardless of what other information is queued.				
MBP-8	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> utilize compression techniques for data, message, and image packets to maximize system performance, including an explanation of the compression method used.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MBP-9	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> utilize encryption techniques to maximize protection from unauthorized access or monitoring, including an explanation of the encryption technique utilized, as required by the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI’s) Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Security Policy.				
MBP-10	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> accommodate network elements that may already be encrypted at the originating source, including hardware encryption.				
MBP-11	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> , when appropriate, automatically route National Crime Information Center (NCIC) response transactions to ALEA MSS for update (e.g., \$ msgs).				
MBP-12	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> utilize nonsequential message and response return techniques to improve performance and timeliness of information.				
MBP-13	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> enable integration with the Peak Performance user certification program.				
MBP-14	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> provide timely updates to NCIC and ALEA MSS code tables in consultation with ALEA prior to implementation.				
MBP-15	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> print any of the reports or other outputs at administratively configurable locations/printers (e.g., as an applet or function).				
MBP-16	The solution <i>shall</i> provide that many components of the MSS are highly configurable and can be modified, as necessary, by the solution provider to meet changing federal and state standards, without the need to contract with a vendor to make changes.				
MBP-17	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> support the linking of all responses to the queries that triggered them.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MBP-18	The proposed solution shall enable users to recall a previous hot file entry (recent) form, to update as necessary, and to reenter the record as a new entry (e.g., frequent reentry of habitual runaways/missing persons, etc.).				
MBP-19	The proposed solution shall enable users to fill out a form that generates a message switch message in the correct format.				
MBP-20	The proposed solution shall enable users to copy information that has previously been entered (e.g., stolen vehicle broadcast message) so that it may be pasted into another place.				
MBP-21	The proposed solution shall be capable of providing automated processing for Alabama Board of Pardons and Parole.				
MBP-22	The proposed solution shall be capable of automated processing of monthly NCIC validations.				
MBP-23	The proposed solution shall be capable of providing automated processing the quarterly Ill Sync (criminal history files).				
MBP-24	The proposed solution shall be capable of processing an annual file purge after the FBI has completed their purges.				

Analysis Requirements

The table below presents the components required of the future ALEA MSS system relative to the use of the data captured for subsequent analytical decision making, including various types of online and hard copy reporting specifications.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
Analysis					
MAN-1	The proposed solution shall log every inbound and outbound transaction and messaging action. Images shall be cited without including the image file in the log, unless specified by the user. Logging shall be configurable by MSS administrators.				
MAN-2	The proposed solution shall provide all reports in a format that is viewable on screen.				
MAN-3	The proposed solution shall provide the capability to print any report.				
MAN-4	The proposed solution shall have online detailed transaction logs for an ALEA- configurable period of time, which aligns with ALEA retention schedules.				
MAN-5	The proposed solution shall provide the capability to export log data into any of the standard and commercially available software/report packages or formats such as: .xls, .csv, .txt, Portable Document Format (PDF), and Extensible Markup Language (XML).				
MAN-6	The solution shall provide non-technical end users with the ability to create/generate custom or ad hoc reports on any of the data elements in the MSS log, without vendor intervention. The proposed solution shall provide the ability to modify report headers, exclude columns, sort by and/or filter on any key data field (including filtering on date range, and using point-click query capability), and save any modified report format for subsequent use.				
MAN-7	The solution shall provide standardized daily, weekly, and monthly system management and quality assurance reports, modifiable by ALEA.				
MAN-8	The solution shall provide the ability to generate NCIC validation reports, on demand and modifiable by ALEA.				

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MAN-9	The proposed solution shall have the ability to query the log data based on specific search criteria.				
MAN-10	The proposed solution shall provide reports defined by MSS auditors. These standard or ad hoc reports shall be made available in real time and authorized via the user provisioning screen.				
MAN-11	The proposed solution shall provide a set of standard system and data reports for message switch operations, regardless of format, minimally including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of transaction types (warrants, missing, etc.) for various agencies run over a user-defined period. List of all transactions for a certain originating agency identifier (ORI), organized by message key or record type. Ability to schedule reports. 				
MAN-12	The proposed solution shall allow the operator to produce daily activity reports as needed.				
MAN-13	The proposed solution shall provide access to audit trails for authorized users, based on configurable security roles. These audit logs shall come with robust reporting and search tools.				
MAN-14	The proposed solution shall be capable of supporting a reporting function that can, at a minimum, provide data by reporting jurisdiction.				

Action and Decision Requirements

The table below includes the components required to allow users of the future ALEA MSS system to render business decisions based on the analytical information presented. These decisions should have a downstream effect on other system users. For example, an authorized agency may request background information for an applicant and receive subsequent criminal history updates regarding that applicant.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
Action and Decision					
MAD-1	The proposed solution shall assist in enforcement of the “10-minute rule”. Upon receipt of an urgent request for hit confirmation, the entering agency shall provide a substantive answer within 10 minutes. If no confirmation is received, the system prompts the sending agency to send a second request to the agency and to the designated state control point. If no response is received within 10 minutes of the second request, a third request is sent to the agency, NCIC, and ALEA. If the request is to another state, the control point for that state and NCIC quality control also receive the request.				
MAD-2	The proposed solution shall provide a record validation process by which responsible parties are automatically notified in advance of the need to validate within a specific time frame, and when records are deleted, appropriate parties are notified of the deletions.				
MAD-3	The proposed solution shall provide subscription and notification capabilities (e.g., receiving notification that the status of a previous record inquiry has changed).				

Workflow Requirements

The table below describes specifications related to the routing, processing, verification, and storage of information in the future ALEA MSS environment.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
Workflow					
MWF-1	<p>The proposed solution shall ensure that administrative messages can be sent or routed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All users, specific users and groups of users. • Agencies and groups of agencies. • Defined devices. • Computer interfaces. • Any of the above within a defined geographic area or defined group. 				
MWF-2	The proposed solution shall allow for the maintenance of user-defined, reusable group destination codes or lists of users.				
MWF-3	The proposed solution shall enable configurable routing based on message or transaction type and content. For example, a hit on a wanted person destined for a mobile device is automatically “copied” to a dispatch center device.				
MWF-4	The proposed solution shall provide guaranteed message and transaction delivery, including an explanation of how this is accomplished.				
MWF-5	The proposed solution shall provide for optional message and transaction escalation and alternative delivery. For example, Agency A experiences a power outage, so Agency B is designated to receive Agency A’s messages (set by ALEA).				
MWF-6	The proposed solution shall provide queuing that allows messages and transactions to accumulate for subsequent delivery (guaranteed delivery) in the event of connectivity or system downtime; such queues are to be configurable by ALEA by both duration and message type.				
MWF-7	The proposed solution shall allow group queues with the option to delete messages on first read or require that messages be deleted manually.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MWF-8	The proposed solution shall allow messages to queue and present them based on message priorities.				
MWF-9	The proposed solution shall handle the delivery of all messages and responses from all sources to the appropriate end user.				
MWF-10	The message switching application shall have the ability to accurately time- and date-stamp all transactions processed based on the operating system clock.				
MWF-11	The proposed solution shall provide a visual and/or auditory mechanism for making users aware that messages or responses have been received.				
MWF-12	The proposed solution shall provide for confidential transaction-processing capability; for example, allow an authorized ALEA administrator to designate an inquiry as “confidential” such that subsequent viewing of messages relating to the inquiry/response can be restricted, including writing audit trail information to a confidential or restricted audit log.				
MWF-13	The proposed solution shall handle the delivery of all messages and responses from all sources to the appropriate end user.				
MWF-14	The proposed solution shall provide the ability for control terminal agency ORIs to utilize ORIs for other agencies for training, diagnostics, or other reasons.				
MWF-15	The proposed solution shall provide options for the ability to forward unsolicited messages that are sent to a mobile terminal to a non-mobile terminal in case the mobile terminal is turned off.				

Hot Files Requirements

Hot files are formal data stores associated with particular types of common information, including vehicles, guns, persons, and articles. The term originated as a reference to stolen items, but hot files databases have expanded to include information beyond stolen items (e.g., missing persons).

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

ALEA currently sends and maintains all hot files at NCIC. NCIC maintains a central database of hot file information that typically includes fewer categories than individual states are required to maintain. The individual states provide hot file information to and retrieve information from NCIC.

The following table identifies the list of NCIC hot files currently maintained by ALEA.

People	Items
Wanted Persons	Vehicle Files
Missing Persons	Boat Files
Unidentified Persons	Parts Files
Supervised Release	Gun Files
Identity Theft	License Plate File
Sex Offenders	Securities Files
Gang Affiliation	Stolen Article Files
Known or Suspected Terrorist	
Protection Orders	
Foreign Fugitive	
Immigration Violator	
NICS Denied	
Protective Interest	
Violent Person	
Extreme Risk Protection Order	

The table below describes requirements related to collecting, maintaining, and disseminating hot file information. In addition, the table designates each requirement as pertaining to NCIC hot files, Alabama hot files, or both.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
Hot Files					
HF-1	The hot file solution shall be compliant with requirements identified in the NCIC 2000 Operating Manual.				
HF-2	The hot file solution shall fully support all NCIC 2000 transaction types (e.g., entry, modify, query, cancel, clear, and locate).				
HF-3	The hot file solution shall support standard NCIC data exchanges (e.g., NIEM XML).				
HF-4	The hot file solution shall provide validation of hot file records.				
HF-5	The hot file solution shall support configurable response formats.				
HF-6	The hot file solution shall provide robust database search capabilities.				
HF-7	The hot file solution shall include tools that support Alabama reporting and state and federal audit support requirements.				

Technical Requirements

This section includes the baseline set of technical requirements for the future ALEA MSS system environment. These baseline requirements are broken down into the technical areas of criminal records management, including infrastructure, applications, publication, integration, and management and administration.

Infrastructure Requirements

The table below describes elements that provide technology systems and deliver secure and reliable systems. These elements are primarily hardware and networking components.

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
Infrastructure					
MIN-1	The proposed solution shall minimally provide the operational capacity of the current MSS environment, including the transmission of photos, other images or other file types.				
MIN-2	The proposed solution shall utilize a system architecture that is open, nonproprietary, and portable.				
MIN-3	The proposed solution shall be adaptive and use extensible architecture for future expansion and scalability without the need for major architectural modifications.				
MIN-4	The proposed solution shall provide system diagnostics and regular, automated reporting, including, but not limited to, error correction and detection.				
MIN-5	The proposed solution shall provide production, test, training, and development environments. The user’s access level shall allow him/her to select the system desired.				
MIN-6	The proposed solution’s internal processing time shall be 1 second or less, unless the operation is external to MSS; the vendor shall include a description of how the solution will meet this response requirement as well as methods for verification of performance.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MIN-7	The hardware shall provide the capability for remote maintenance and troubleshooting.				
MIN-8	There shall be no hardware or software/application restrictions limiting the number of users capable of using the MSS.				
MIN-9	The proposed solution shall be a cloud-based or other similarly hosted solution.				
MIN-10	The proposed solution shall allow the addition of third-party hardware and software components (e.g., certification application, storage area network [SAN], and network attached storage [NAS]) through open architecture.				
MIN-11	The proposed solution shall be designed to allow for the addition of capacity to accommodate increases in MSS throughput and workload over a 5-year period.				
MIN-12	The system shall be designed to provide fault tolerant processing.				
MIN-13	The storage medium used for backup/recovery data shall be reusable. The disaster recovery process shall utilize the reusable storage medium.				
MIN-14	The warranty clock shall not start until final acceptance of the MSS solution.				
MIN-15	The proposed solution shall be compatible with Internet Protocol (IP) networking standards.				
MIN-16	The proposed solution shall be capable of and compliant with NIEM and XML.				
MIN-17	The proposed solution shall provide Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) and the Web-based tool set for centralized control of the system using an enterprise management platform.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MIN-18	The proposed solution shall be compatible with current wired networking standards for ALEA.				
MIN-19	The proposed solution shall provide TCP/IP addressability for all components throughout the network.				
MIN-20	The proposed solution shall recognize addressable agency ORIs.				
MIN-21	The proposed solution shall support the main MSS operations at the primary location and a disaster recovery hot site located at an alternate location.				
MIN-22	The proposed solution shall include a disaster recovery hot site that provides load-balancing.				
MIN-23	The primary site and the disaster recovery hot site shall each be capable of providing 100% operating capability, in the event that one site goes down and is inoperable.				
MIN-24	The proposed solution shall provide automated failover, in the event that one site goes down and is inoperable.				

Applications Requirements

The table below describes components required of the software systems that ensure operability in the target environment and includes software platform, storage, and data model specifications.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
Applications					
MAP-1	The proposed solution shall provide multilevel security to restrict access and control functionality, in accordance with CJIS Security Policy.				
MAP-2	The solution shall provide an administrative or dashboard monitor view of the application and its status.				
MAP-3	The proposed solution shall afford system administrators the ability to easily update security parameters while the system is online.				
MAP-4	The proposed solution shall process data in real time. This means that any parameter change, or data change shall be done while the system is online. The change shall take effect immediately.				
MAP-5	The proposed solution shall utilize secure Hypertext Transport Protocol (HTTPS), especially for the user application component.				
MAP-6	The proposed solution shall provide the export or import of system code tables for ALEA use with other systems.				
MAP-7	The proposed solution shall utilize application server technology that allows tasks to be off-loaded onto other computers or processors to prevent a loss in performance as system usage grows.				
MAP-8	The MSS application software shall have a minimum 12 months of warranty against defects.				
MAP-9	The MSS application shall their programming language.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MAP-10	The MSS application <i>shall</i> identify their debugging and trace aids.				
MAP-11	The MSS application software <i>shall</i> provide fault tolerant processing.				
MAP-12	The development environment <i>shall</i> include version control and provide source code change tracking. It will also track changes to message switch configurations and program modifications.				
MAP-13	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> provide NCIC file transfer capability.				
MAP-14	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> interface with and utilize ALEA's identity management solution.				
MAP-15	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> allow ALEA to define how long a password will remain valid within the following secure password attributes established by the current FBI CJIS Security Policy.				
MAP-16	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> provide automatic user account deactivation, based on certification date or cancellation by an authorized manager-level command.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MAP-17	<p>The proposed solution shall utilize user-driven (e.g., user ID, ORI, or combination) security profiles to determine system access to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Read” authority • “Add” authority • “Modify” authority • “Delete” access • Each function key for which authority is granted. • Each command for which authority is granted. • User classification or role. • Production (live) or training mode. 				
MAP-18	<p>The proposed solution shall require users to log on to the system before receiving access to any function. The solution shall generally provide one user sign-on, system-wide with agency associations. The product must allow for different ORIs to be associated with a given action (e.g. dispatch for multiple agencies). This sign-on shall include, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency ORI. • A unique user ID and password. 				
MAP-19	<p>The proposed solution shall allow for the ability to change password at setup, at sign-on, and during a logged-in session.</p>				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MAP-20	<p>The proposed solution shall provide a means for users to recall or reset their password using techniques including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forgot My Password techniques used extensively on Internet sites. Challenge questions and answers established during user setup. A temporary complex password if the user successfully answers the challenge question and a required new user password upon successful session sign-on. Ability for the terminal agency coordinator to reset a password if necessary. 				
User Interface					
MAP-21	The proposed solution shall allow for the establishment of user accounts and passwords, and shall be fully compliant with, the guidelines and specifications established in the FBI CJIS Security Policy.				
MAP-22	The proposed solution shall provide the identification and credentialing of individual users on the local agency interface to MSS for agencies accessing via a secure HTTP session.				
MAP-23	The proposed solution shall allow the system administrator to authorize users to log in to the system, set allowable functions for each user, and reset user passwords.				
MAP-24	The proposed solution shall allow users to reset their own passwords.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MAP-25	The proposed solution shall allow ALEA to define how long a password will remain valid within the following secure password attributes established by the current FBI CJIS Security Policy.				
MAP-26	The proposed solution shall provide automatic user account deactivation, based on certification date or cancellation by an authorized manager-level command.				
MAP-27	The proposed solution shall utilize user-driven (e.g., user ID, ORI, or combination) security profiles to determine system access to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Read” authority • “Add” authority • “Modify” authority • “Delete” access • Each function key for which authority is granted. • Each command for which authority is granted. • User classification or role. • Production (live) or training mode. 				
MAP-28	The proposed solution shall require users to log on to the system before receiving access to any function. The solution shall generally provide one user sign-on, system-wide with agency associations. The product must allow for different ORIs to be associated with a given action (e.g. dispatch for multiple agencies). This sign-on shall include, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency ORI. • A unique user ID and password. 				
MAP-29	The proposed solution shall allow for the ability to change password at setup, at sign-on, and during the course of a logged-in session.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MAP-30	<p>The proposed solution shall provide a means for users to recall or reset their password using techniques including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forgot My Password techniques used extensively on Internet sites. Challenge questions and answers established during user setup. A temporary complex password if the user successfully answers the challenge question and a required new user password upon successful session sign-on. Ability for the terminal agency coordinator to reset a password if necessary. 				
MAP-31	<p>The proposed solution shall be able to be configured such that users are notified of impending password expiration. If a user’s password has expired, the system shall prompt the user to change the password at sign-on.</p>				
MAP-33	<p>The proposed solution shall produce an audit trail of all user logon transactions, including password resets, for the direct-connect, secure HTTP clients.</p>				
MAP-34	<p>The proposed solution shall allow for the use of pointing devices, hot keys, keycombinations, buttons, and hyperlinks.</p>				
MAP-35	<p>The proposed solution’s client application, if browser-based, shall utilize modern form design and usability elements.</p>				
MAP-36	<p>The proposed solution shall provide an application capable of operating in a mobile environment.</p>				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MAP-37	The proposed solution’s client application screens shall be printable to configurable local or networked printers, using print commands provided by the browser. The proposed solution’s client application screens shall be able to be captured using commands provided by the browser.				
MAP-38	The proposed solution shall allow printing of messages, to include automated printing.				
MAP-39	The proposed solution shall provide value-added features normally associated with a mail system, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saving draft messages for finalizing and sending at a later time. These shall be available to other supervisors/users as authorized in the user profile. • Recovering and resending messages at all levels of the system. 				
MAP-40	The proposed solution shall provide users with a consistent UI throughout the application, in order to minimize user training and system administration.				
MAP-41	The proposed solution shall provide a command line, as well as screen entry. Users shall be able to enter messages on the command line without affecting operations in the forms or other work area.				
MAP-42	The proposed solution shall allow tasks to be entered by keystroke and/or mouse action. However, the system shall allow all commands to be initiated by keystroke if desired.				
MAP-43	The proposed solution shall provide standard UI items, such as drop-down menus, to make selection easier for frequently used fields, such as message keys, all code tables, and agency IDs.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MAP-44	The proposed solution shall provide “auto complete” functionality for code table lookups as the user begins to enter data in the code table lookup field.				
MAP-45	The proposed solution shall allow for automated updates to the UI application.				
MAP-46	The proposed solution shall utilize prefill fields in appropriate preformatted screens, eliminating redundant data entry without impacting the usability.				
MAP-47	The proposed solution shall provide quick entry methods such as hot keys to minimize the keystrokes required to perform inquiries. Such hot keys would enable the entry of single data inquiries on the command line, and the inquiry would then be executed according to the hot key used. The single data inquiries include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operator’s license number (OLN). • License plate number. • Name. • Vehicle identification number. 				
MAP-48	The proposed solution shall provide menus to facilitate access to less frequently used functions and to aid users with applications used infrequently.				
MAP-49	The proposed solution shall allow users to move forward and backward to complete data fields.				
MAP-50	The proposed solution shall notify users to correct spelling errors without having to retype the entire field.				
MAP-51	The proposed solution shall provide users with standard form navigation and allow easy movement from one work area to another via mouse or keyboard.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MAP-52	The proposed solution shall provide hot keys for frequently used functions (e.g., opening a form template) and associate them with the user profile. Hot keys could be standard key assignments(e.g., F1 through F4), and user keys would be optional key assignments (e.g., F5 through F9).				
MAP-53	The proposed solution shall enable users to recall (configurable by ALEA) and resend recently sent messages. The solution shall also provide cut-and-paste functionality.				
MAP-54	The solution shall provide default, configurable values for fields based on previous input, referential lookup, or other mechanisms. It shall incorporate currently used defaults.				
MAP-55	The proposed solution shall provide authorized users the ability to load a document or other file onto the system that is then available to designated users.				
MAP-56	The solution shall provide lookup tables for valid values for fields.				
MAP-57	The vendor shall highlight other functionality or capabilities available in the solution beyond those noted above.				
MAP-58	The solution shall provide stackable transactions functionality, such as semi-batch processing.				
Database and Backups					
MAP-59	The proposed solution shall provide an ORI table. The elements within the table shall be configurable by ALEA and give the option to update Nlets.				
MAP-60	The proposed solution shall utilize relational database solutions.				

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MAP-61	The solution <i>shall</i> provide for access to and manipulation of the data (e.g., ORI data) in the database through a standard management system.				
MAP-62	The solution <i>shall</i> provide tools for monitoring and enhancing database organization and performance.				
MAP-63	The solution <i>shall</i> provide tools for database design and development, including documentation, diagramming, normalization, database generation, screen design and generation, report design and generation, and procedure maintenance tools.				
MAP-64	The solution <i>shall</i> provide for the development and maintenance of relational database structures for the support of MSS.				
MAP-65	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> have the capability to execute scheduled, unattended online system backups without affecting system performance.				
MAP-66	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> have the ability to restore from system backups.				
MAP-67	The solution shall provide robust system backup/archiving tools and strategies.				

Publication Requirements

The table below lists components required to ensure user access to information captured by the desired system and includes such elements as global search engine indexing, report-writing services, data transformation services, and subscription and notification systems.

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
Publication					
MPU-1	The proposed solution shall have a report batch monitor that controls the number of reports that may be run at a given time for each server.				
MPU-2	The proposed solution shall have a report scheduler that can schedule reports to be automatically run at user-defined times.				
MPU-3	The proposed solution shall provide reports, both of real-time and snapshot data, which are publishable.				
MPU-4	The proposed solution shall provide the ability for authorized end users to retrieve transaction log activity to report on actions and responses for a period of time. The parameters shall be configurable by ALEA.				
MPU-5	The proposed solution shall provide a user-friendly type of reporting (preferably something other than SSRS).				
MPU-6	The proposed solution shall provide a full range of reporting include basic, ad-hoc, and customizable reports (i.e., new data sources, non-standard reports, specific filters, etc.)				
MPU-7	The proposed solution shall be demonstrably dynamic in terms of making change things in the reports.				

Integration Requirements

The table below describes components involved in the exchange of information between the future MSS system and related public safety systems. Specifications here pertain to the interfaces that move information between systems at a predetermined time (i.e., batch and/or real-time interfaces).

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
Interfaces					
MIT-1	The proposed solution shall minimally provide the interface and protocol capabilities of the current MSS environment.				
MIT-2	The proposed solution shall interface with NCIC and provide file transfer functionality.				
MIT-3	The proposed solution shall interface with Nlets – the International Justice & Public Safety Information Sharing Network.				
MIT-4	The proposed solution shall interface with the ALEA Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system				
MIT-5	The proposed solution shall interface with the proposed hot files solution, in the event that the proposed hot files solution is not already integrated with the proposed message switch solution.				
MIT-6	The proposed solution shall seamlessly enable all current regional system interfaces to send properly formatted NCIC messages and transactions. This capability shall be in place on the first day of implementation.				
MIT-7	The proposed solution shall interface with the Alabama DMV Vehicle Title and Registration and Driver License (including photos) systems.				
MIT-8	The proposed solution shall interface with the ALACOP systems.				
MIT-9	The proposed solution shall be compliant with, recognize, and allow for data transactions according to the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) data model.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MIT-10	The proposed solution shall provide transaction-based electronic data access to third-party systems (e.g., DMV, CAD) for query/exchange (for example, Web services, XML, dot limited, OFML, or other transaction-based exchanges).				
MIT-11	The proposing vendor shall explain their approach to Web services.				
MIT-12	The solution shall provide authentication of an electronic report/interface data source.				
MIT-13	The proposed solution shall have the ability to search multiple (e.g., spawn inquiries) external systems and/or databases via a single query.				
MIT-14	The proposed solution shall have the ability to receive and respond to queries from authorized external systems and/or databases.				
MIT-15	The proposed solution shall save or print images regardless and independent of the response.				
MIT-16	The proposed solution shall interface with the new ALEA Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system which will be/is a cloud enabled solution with both a primary system and secondary system that are both “hot” and constantly operational.				
MIT-17	The proposing vendor shall be responsible for providing the complete interface (both directions) with ALEA’s CCH, as well as all of the costs involved in completing this interface to CCH.				
MIT-18	The proposed solution shall ensure information related to the dissemination of CJI and CHRI such as date, time, requester, purpose code, reason, etc. is saved and logged in applicable audit logs and ensure a record of dissemination of criminal history records is maintained.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MIT-19	The proposed solution shall provide for interfaces to NICS, III, NCIC (all capable NIEM XML compliant payloads out of box).				
MIT-20	The proposed solution shall allow for a UI that can dynamically render and display XML (NIEM XML / N3G).				
MIT-21	The proposed solution shall be capable of initiating configurable message workflows.				
MIT-22	The proposed solution shall support the interface to ABIS, Vehicle Registration System (currently called ALVIN), FPPD, and NSOR systems.				
MIT-23	The proposed solution shall provide an interface with the legacy CCH, if necessary, and all other legacy interfaces.				
MIT-24	The proposing vendor shall be responsible for providing and assuming responsibility for MSS to CCH interface.				
MIT-25	The proposed solution shall be/become XML compatible prior to system acceptance.				
Images					
MIT-26	The proposed solution shall process images as defined by NCIC.				
MIT-27	The proposed solution shall provide batch file processing from NCIC (e.g., \$.B).				
MIT-28	The proposed solution shall access other documents or images stored in a specified repository.				
MIT-29	The proposed solution shall retrieve, and route images stored in various sources.				
MIT-30	The proposed solution shall retrieve, and route other documents or images stored in a specified repository.				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
MIT-31	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> interface with the Alabama Sex Offender Registry (SOR) database.				
MIT-32	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> interface with the Mobile Architecture for Communications Handling (MACH) Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) system.				

Management and Administration Requirements

The table below lists components associated with the management and administration of the proposed system, including the components necessary to ensure successful operation in the desired technical environment, as well as applicable standards and vendor support.

Req. ID	Requirement	Current Capability or Configurable Item	Future Release	Custom Development	Not Available
Vendor Support					
MMA-1	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> continually perform interface connectivity monitoring, hardware self-diagnosis, and self-checking, and report errors to the operator console for remedial action.				
MMA-2	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> provide for software upgrades/maintenance that do not affect the production system (no downtime) in a load-balanced environment.				
MMA-3	The proposed solution <i>shall</i> provide a logging feature that logs entries, changes, and/or deletions to any configuration data				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

	(data transaction recovery log).				
MMA-4	The proposed solution shall be designed to allow for remote maintenance and troubleshooting.				
MMA-5	The proposed solution shall be able to set date, time, and time zone using a government-approved time server.				
MMA-6	The proposing vendor shall provide ongoing services and support, including, but not limited to, the following: toll-free 24/7 customer service, annual training classes, an online customer service Web site, and online software maintenance.				
MMA-7	To maintain configuration integrity, the proposed solution shall provide control for all configurable elements, including auditing, rollback, roll-forward, and configuration change transactions, with the ability to both import and export configurations.				
MMA-8	The proposed solution shall accommodate changes to production applications without impact to operations, and the vendor shall explain how this is accomplished.				
MMA-9	The proposed solution shall provide the ability to designate control terminals.				
MMA-10	The proposing vendor shall provide continuous management of all IT components, emphasizing regular, iterative updates and upgrades, ensuring that software and hardware are always up to date. This is the concept known as “evergreen IT”.				
MMA-11	The proposed solution shall allow capturing NCIC lists (e.g., vehicle codes) at the switch, for other systems to download and use.				
Standards					
MMA-12	The proposed solution shall be compliant at production with all national standards and policies specifically to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FBI NCIC 2000. • FBI CJIS Security Policy. • NIEM. 				
MMA-13	The proposed solution shall meet response time, delivery, and transmittal requirements for NCIC 2000 and Nlets.				
MMA-14	The proposed solution shall use standard NCIC and Nlets codes and descriptors, as well as the ability to add unique state codes.				

Training, Documentation and Testing					
MMA-15	The proposed solution shall provide access to online system help files (both user and application versions) that describe fields, forms, and data requirements, as well as procedures from system documentation.				
MMA- 16	The proposed solution shall provide access to online NCIC manual files that describe fields, forms, and data requirements, as well as procedures and automatic updates.				
MMA- 17	The proposed solution shall provide access to online Nlets manual files that describe fields, forms, and data requirements, as well as procedures and automatic updates.				
MMA- 18	The proposed solution shall provide access to online MSS manual files that describe fields, forms, and data requirements, as well as procedures and automatic updates of the manual by ALEA administrators.				
MMA- 19	The proposed solution shall provide the ability to query the MSS manual and to allow automated updates by ALEA administration.				
MMA- 20	The proposed solution shall provide a detailed user-training program and include a syllabus of each class and sample training manual.				
MMA- 21	The proposed solution shall provide sufficient training for the number and type of users described in the training plan outlined in the Management Response section of the proposal. This includes providing training during evening shifts.				
MMA- 22	The MSS application vendor shall supply all documentation in English.				
MMA- 23	The MSS test system shall include scripting tools.				
MMA- 24	The MSS solution shall contain load-testing software for measuring system performance.				
MMA- 25	The proposed solution shall provide a training environment, especially for hot file entry and maintenance, available to both ALEA and agency end-users. This environment shall simulate complete hot file entry and maintenance functionality, validation, and response, without sending to NCIC. Further, this training environment shall implement a color scheme, screen banners, or other means (including notifications/warnings) to minimize confusion between the training and production				

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

	environments.				
--	---------------	--	--	--	--

Attachment D – MSS Current Environment Overview

Current MSS Provider:

The current MSS is provided by Computer Products of Illinois, Inc. (CPI).

Current MSS Throughput:

During 2023, the current message switch system processed:

- 109,444,307 total incoming messages
- 109,642,219 total outgoing messages

Current MSS Licensing:

The CPI workstation software is called Messenger. Currently, there are:

- Approximately 1,500 licenses (and additional separate tokens) are issued to agencies.
- Approximately 30,000 third-party connections to the message switch system.

Current MSS User Agencies:

Currently, there are:

- Approximately 450 agencies that connect to the switch.
- Of the 450 agencies, approximately 350 agencies are entry agencies.

Attachment E – Vendor References Form

For each reference checklist item listed in the table below, offerors are instructed to respond to each item in the table space to the right of the item providing the requested information.

Reference Checklist		
1.	Name of Agency	
	Location of Agency, City/State	
	MSS Agency or Other (what is agency function)	
	System/Solution Installed	
	Year Contracted/Duration	
	Total Contract Value	
	System/Solution Accepted?	
	Agency Contact Name/Title	
	Contact Telephone Number	
	Contact E-Mail Address	
2.	Name of Agency	
	Location of Agency, City/State	
	MSS Agency or Other (what is agency function)	
	System/Solution Installed	
	Year Contracted/Duration	
	Total Contract Value	
	System/Solution Accepted?	
	Agency Contact Name and Title	
	Contact Telephone Number	

State of Alabama – Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
RFP – MSS Modernization Project

Reference Checklist		
	Contact E-Mail Address	
3.	Name of Agency	
	Location of Agency, City/State	
	MSS Agency or Other (what is agency function)	
	System/Solution Installed	
	Year Contracted/Duration	
	Total Contract Value	
	System/Solution Accepted?	
	Agency Contact Name/Title	
	Contact Telephone Number	
	Contact E-Mail Address	

Attachment F – Cost Response Form

Vendors **shall** complete **all** four (4) sections below of this cost response form for their proposed system solution for a complete MSS Solution Service Hosted at Vendor selected site, including responsibility for network connectivity between the primary and DR/COOP sites to a central network point of presence in Alabama (ALEA-Montgomery).

NOTE: ALEA will consider cost proposals that include reasonable and clearly defined (deliverable-based) milestone payments during implementation phase leading to final system acceptance. If offerors wish to propose such reasonable and clearly defined (deliverable-based) milestone payments during the implementation phase leading up to final system acceptance, offeror must list/outline the proposed milestones with each milestone named along with a detailed description of what the milestone deliverable would be and including the proposed milestone cost.

*The four (4) milestone line items included in Section 1 are a guide, not the required number of milestones. Offerors may propose fewer or more milestones. However, Offerors should only propose a minimum and reasonable number of major milestone payments. For example, they should not propose milestone payments for each deliverable outlined in their Implementation Statement of Work response.

Cost proposal scoring is based on the cost total for only Sections 1-3 of this form.

Section 1 - Milestone Payments (during implementation phase only)

Provide prices for each proposed separately described (in detail) and priced milestone deliverable. Each proposed milestone deliverable during implementation must be measurable or quantifiable in order to be accepted.

- Milestone 1 – Detailed description of milestone 1 and price. \$ _____
- Milestone 2 – Detailed description of milestone 2 and price. \$ _____
- Milestone 3 – Detailed description of milestone 3 and price. \$ _____
- Milestone 4 – Detailed description of milestone 4 and price. \$ _____

Total of all proposed Milestone Payments during Implementation Phase. \$ _____

Section 2 - Base Contract Price for Hosted Service

2-year Base Contract Pricing

Provide the **annual** price for the base 2-year hosted service contract upon final system acceptance, including full Active/Active DR/COOP system solution:

\$ _____

Total of the Annual Base Contract Price for Hosted Service (2 x Annual Price above):

\$ _____

Section 3 - Contract Extension Price Options for Hosted Service

Optional 1-year Contract Extensions Pricing

Provide **prices for each** and all three of the following separately priced contract extensions, *including* full Active/Active DR/COOP system solution.

- Option extension 1 – Price per year for the *first* 1-year option period. \$ _____
- Option extension 2 – Price per year for the *second* 1-year option period. \$ _____
- Option extension 3 – Price per year for the *third* 1-year option period. \$ _____

Total of the 3 Optional Annual Contract extensions for Hosted Service: \$ _____

Section 4 - Fixed Hourly Rate

Provide a blended (labor & expenses) Fixed Hourly Rate for Professional Services to be used for calculating the Maximum Fixed Price for Professional Services that may be requested by State under the resultant Agreement; for services requested that may be outside of the scope of the initial contract and SOWs:

\$ _____