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| FORM N: PROPONENT PROPOSALRESOURCE ALLOCATION TOOL REQUIREMENTS |
|  |
| Instructions for filling out Form N: Proponent Proposal - Requirements1. Complete Form N: Proponent Proposal
2. Follow the proposal instructions in the Proposal Instructions section below
 |
| **PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS**1. **For each Mandatory requirement, provide a Y (Yes) or N (No), indicating whether your solution can meet the requirement**. Y indicates that the solution you are proposing will meet the requirements listed in the requirement statement. N indicates that the solution you are proposing will not meet the requirements.
2. **For each Non-Mandatory requirement (except where indicated N/A via grey shading), indicate which Proponent response code that best describes your solution:**

**Y – Available Out of the Box:** the solution for the requirement is currently available in the existing product “out of the box”. Configuration may be required to enable the feature (requirement will be met through changes to settings of tables, switches, and rules without modification to the source code). Requirement is installed and operational at other sites and can be demonstrated to the City of Winnipeg.**C – Available via Customization:** the solution for the requirement is not currently available in the existing product “out of the box”, but may be incorporated via customization of the solution components. Requirement will be met through changes to the source code which would require analysis and re-application during updates, upgrades, or when applying software patches.**F – Future Availability:** the solution for the requirement is not currently available, but will be available in an upcoming planned product release. If this option is indicated, include the date/timeframe when the requirement will be available for implementation, which should be either:1. A planned release up to 3 calendar months after the RFQ 205-2016 competition close date, where an additional Proponent response code of **3** should be provided;
2. A planned release up to 6 calendar months after the RFQ 205-2016 competition close date, where an additional Proponent response code of **6** should be provided, or
3. A planned release up to 12 calendar months or longer after the RFQ 205-2016 competition close date, where an additional Proponent response code of **12** should be provided.

**3 – Third Party Supplied:** the solution for the requirement is expected to be met by using a third party vendor’s existing integrated product. **N – Not Possible:** the solution for the requirement will not be provided by the Proponent.**Notes:**1. An omitted response will be assumed to be the same as a response code of “N”.
2. Any deviation from the response code will be re-coded at the discretion of the City of Winnipeg.
3. This Form N document lists the requirements ordered by requirement category (Mandatory, Non-Mandatory or Desired). The accompanying document titled “WFPS Resource Allocation Requirements by Function” is provided to allow the Proponents to view the requirements ordered by function (and original numbering).
 |

| 1. **Mandatory Requirements**
 | **Proponent Response (Y, N)** |
| --- | --- |
| **Requirement Description** | **Requirement****Info** | **Requirement Category** | **RFQ** **Requirement Ref#** |  |
| The system must be capable of analyzing the current state of coverage and, based on pre-defined business rules, recommend the 'move up' or reallocation of apparatus and resources in order to improve coverage. |  | Mandatory | T1.1 |  |
| Predefined business rules must be modifiable as they will change over time. | Ideally these would be modifiable by the system administrator. | Mandatory | T1.2.1 |  |
| The system must take historical data into consideration along with the pre-defined business rules when making reallocation recommendations. | This will allow the system to review what the 'likelihood' of a scenario occurring before making a recommendation. | Mandatory | T1.5.1 |  |
| The system must display the coverage in both graphical (map) and text-based methods. | Graphical display should have different representation for different levels of coverage. This could include different colours (green, yellow, red, etc.) | Mandatory | T1.7.1 |  |
| Resource management must be done by unit or apparatus 'type'. For example, a Primary Care Paramedic versus an Advanced-Care Paramedic, a fire pumper versus a rescue unit etc. | The system must be configurable so that the appropriate combination of resources can be defined for coverage. | Mandatory | T1.12.1 |  |
| The system must be capable of interfacing with COTS CAD solutions |  | Mandatory | T2.1 |  |
| The interface must operate over standard IP-network |  | Mandatory | T2.3 |  |
| The system must operate on a standard industry-recognized operating system |  | Mandatory  | T3.2 |  |
| Must be capable of operating in a Windows Server 2008 r2 or higher environment. |  | Mandatory | T3.5 |  |
| The database must be on a standard industry-based database |  | Mandatory | T3.6 |  |
| The vendor must allow for annual upgrades of OS and DB |  | Mandatory | T3.7 |  |
| System backups must not negatively impact system performance |  | Mandatory | T3.8 |  |
| Vendor solution must be currently installed in departments of similar size and number of users | Vendor may be able to provide references | Mandatory  | T4.1 |  |
| Vendor must provide support/work with standard vendors for various interfaces including CAD systems |  | Mandatory | T4.2 |  |
|  |

| **B. Non-Mandatory Requirements** | **Proponent Response (Y, C, F, 3, N)** |
| --- | --- |
| **Requirement Description** | **Requirement****Info** | **Requirement Category** | **RFQ** **Requirement Ref#** |  |
| Predefined business rules should include rules based on specific areas, apparatus or event type expectations | Areas may include station area or community area and may be different based on unit type or class of unit type (EMS vs Fire) | Required | T1.3.1 |  |
| Coverage should be based on a variety of criteria including unit type and skills of personnel associated to that unit | For example, an EMS unit could have personnel associated to it which make it Primary Care Paramedic (PCP) versus an Advanced-Care Paramedic (ACP) | Required | T1.4.1 |  |
| It should be possible to recognize a unit as different unit types | For example a Quint could be considered a Ladder or an Engine | Required | T1.6.1 |  |
| The system must display the coverage in both graphical (map) and text-based methods. | Text based methods would present the information in different forms based on different coverage levels. | Required | T1.7.2 |  |
| The system should be capable of warning the appropriate personnel before coverage in any area is critical. | The graphical (map) should change colour or have a specific representation for a warning  | Required | T1.8.1 |  |
| The system should be capable of warning the appropriate personnel before coverage in any area is critical. | A textual warning should be presented to the user indicating the warning.  | Required | T1.8.2 |  |
| The system administrator should be able to define areas of priority. | Areas of priority mean that anytime there are multiple coverage gaps in the city, the areas of priority are covered first. | Required | T1.11.1 |  |
| The system administrator should be able to define areas of priority. | The system should allow for different areas of priority based on the class of the units (i.e. fire versus ambulance). | Required | T1.11.2 |  |
| The system administrator should be able to define areas of priority. | The system should allow for different areas of priority based on the time of the day, day of week and month of year. | Required | T1.11.3 |  |
| Resource management must be done by unit or apparatus 'type'. For example, a Primary Care Paramedic versus an Advanced-Care Paramedic, a fire pumper versus a rescue unit etc. | The system should be configurable so that the appropriate coverage can be defined by hour of the day, day of the week, month of the year etc. | Required | T1.12.2 |  |
| When a coverage gap is detected by the system, the system should recommend the most appropriate unit reallocation based on pre-defined business requirements. |  | Required | T1.13 |  |
| The dispatcher should be able to select a recommendation option and 'test' the results prior to selecting a recommendation to be performed | Selecting the recommendation option may change the graphical display of the coverage for the user | Required | T1.16.1 |  |
| The dispatcher should be able to override the recommended unit reallocation and manually move units as required. |  | Required | T1.17 |  |
| The system should record when a recommendation was overridden and another move was made. |  | Required | T1.18 |  |
| If a two way interface with CAD is configured, when the dispatcher selects the recommendation option, the system should be able to send the appropriate move up (relocation) information to the CAD system and the unit will be moved in the CAD system. |  | Required | T1.21 |  |
| A mechanism should be available to prevent specific units from being moved. |  | Required | T1.22 |  |
| The system should be capable of moving a unit to a station (hall) or a 'post' |  | Required | T1.24 |  |
| The system administrator should be able to define what information is viewable at each workstation | Fire dispatch positions may not by default see the ambulance coverage etc. | Required | T1.26.1 |  |
| The system administrator should be able to define what information is viewable at each workstation | The dispatcher should be able to toggle between what coverage they see (for break coverage) | Required | T1.26.2 |  |
| The system administrator should be able to define what information is viewable at each workstation | The system administrator should be able to prevent a dispatcher from viewing coverage that is not appropriate. | Required | T1.26.3 |  |
| The interface may be able to be configured as one-way only (CAD to Resource Reallocation Tool) or two-way | This will allow the system administrator to determine if actions taken in the resource reallocation tool are sent back to the CAD automatically | Required | T2.2.1 |  |
| The system administrator should be able to configure the network ports that the interface will operate over |  | Required | T2.4 |  |
| The font size, colour and type should be configurable by the system administrator. |  | Required | T3.1 |  |
| The user interface should scale appropriately based on the size, orientation and screen resolution of the user device. |  | Required | T3.3 |  |
| Any Web App or Web Interface should operate in modern browsers including Safari, Firefox, Internet Explorer, Microsoft Edge, Google Chrome |  | Required | T3.4 |  |
| The vendor should provide the database schema, with annual updates |  | Required | T3.9 |  |
| The vendor should provide detailed system administration documentation |  | Required | T3.11 |  |
| The vendor should provide system administration training |  | Required | T3.12 |  |
| The vendor should provide functional documentation |  | Required | T3.13 |  |
| The vendor should provide functional test plans and test scripts |  | Required | T3.14 |  |
| The vendor should all for multiple environment test environments | There may be at least the following database environments required - Production (LIVE), training and development | Required | T3.17.1 |  |
| Database backup | The system should provide the ability for on line/hot backups of the database without impairing system operation | Required | T3.18.1 |  |
| Failover capability | The system should have the ability to fail over to another server/system | Required | T3.19.1 |  |
| The system should support current industry standard infrastructure formats | The system should be capable of operating in a Virtual Machine environment | Required | T3.20.1 |  |
| Vendor should offer annual maintenance packages |  | Required | T4.3 |  |
| Vendor should provide a warranty for the product/solution |  | Required | T4.4 |  |
| The vendor should provide a system database schema |  | Required | T4.10 |  |
| The vendor should provide product release notes for the version of the software being recommended for use at the time of system implementation |  | Required | T4.12 |  |
| System documentation should include both user guides and system administrator guides |  | Required | T4.13 |  |
| The vendor should provide technical assistance with the configuration of the system |  | Required | T4.15 |  |
| The vendor should provide technical assistance with the implementation of the system |  | Required | T4.16 |  |
| A predefined process and associated expected timelines for trouble resolution should be provided |  | Required | T4.17 |  |
| The vendor should be able to provide a process for system upgrades |  | Required | T4.18 |  |
| The vendor should provide software configuration training to identified super users |  | Required | T4.20 |  |
| Vendor should provide 7/24/365 support | The vendor should provide an agreed service level agreement | Required | T4.23.1 |  |
| Vendor should provide 7/24/365 support | The vendor will provide a response within a certain time frame to calls for assistance | Required | T4.23.2 |  |
| Vendor should provide 7/24/365 support | The response time should be based on the priority of the request | Required | T4.23.3 |  |
| Vendor should track and monitor customer submitted bugs | May track, monitor bugs and provides feedback to the customer | Required | T4.25.1 |  |
| Vendor should provide a single point of contact | The vendor should provide a single point of contact for customer supportThis should include a single project manager | Required | T4.26.1 |  |
|  |

| **C. Desired** | **Proponent Response (Y, C, F, 3, N)** |
| --- | --- |
| **Requirement Description** | **Requirement****Info** | **Requirement Category** | **RFQ** **Requirement Ref#** |  |
| It should be possible to recognize a unit as different unit types | Unit types can be changed on the fly based on the skills of the personnel or equipment on the apparatus | Desired | T1.6.2 |  |
| The system should be capable of warning the appropriate personnel before coverage in any area is critical. | Warnings may be logged so they can be referenced at a later time for training and quality improvement opportunities | Desired | T1.8.3 |  |
| When a unit is 'busy', the system may display the estimated time until the unit is available for dispatch. | It may be clear what method or formula is utilized to calculate estimated times. | Desired | T1.9.1 |  |
| When a unit is 'busy', the system may display the estimated time until the unit is available for dispatch. | The system may recognize the availability of a unit vs the status alone. For example, a unit could be assigned to an event or busy code but still be recommendable. | Desired | T1.9.2 |  |
| When a unit is 'busy', the system may display the estimated time until the unit is available for dispatch. | It may be beneficial if the system used status code and event type to calculate estimated time to availability | Desired | T1.9.3 |  |
| The system may allow the dispatcher to override the estimated availability time in order to make it longer or shorter based on external information. |  | Desired | T1.10 |  |
| Recommendations may be presented only to the affected dispatchers | Affected dispatchers would be dispatchers who are responsible for units or areas associated to the recommendation | Desired | T1.14.1 |  |
| The system may present multiple options for the recommendation when a coverage gap is detected | Each option may include the impact on the overall coverage  | Desired | T1.15.1 |  |
| The system may allow the dispatcher to enter comments when they override the recommended unit reallocation. |  | Desired | T1.19 |  |
| The system may provide a mechanism for the dispatcher to 'test' specific resource allocation changes in order to see what the impact is. | This test may not be committed automatically unless the dispatcher 'commits' the change. | Desired | T1.20.1 |  |
| The system may provide a mechanism for the dispatcher to 'test' specific resource allocation changes in order to see what the impact is. | The dispatcher may be able to test and compare up to 3 scenarios at a time to see what the best overall coverage would be. | Desired | T1.20.2 |  |
| A mechanism may be available to prevent any unit from moving beyond a specific distance from their normal coverage area. | This may be configurable by the system administrator | Desired | T1.23.1 |  |
| A mechanism may be available to prevent any unit from moving beyond a specific distance from their normal coverage area. | May be beneficial to have this be based on time of day (i.e. so a unit isn't too far from base of operations prior to the end of shift). | Desired | T1.23.2 |  |
| The system administrator may be able to define the level of detail displayed on the map | Major streets | Desired | T1.25.1 |  |
| The system administrator may be able to define the level of detail displayed on the map | Minor streets | Desired | T1.25.2 |  |
| The system administrator may be able to define the level of detail displayed on the map | Coverage boundaries (by response type - Fire or EMS) | Desired | T1.25.3 |  |
| The system administrator may be able to define the level of detail displayed on the map | Water features | Desired | T1.25.4 |  |
| The system administrator may be able to define the level of detail displayed on the map | Railroad tracks | Desired | T1.25.5 |  |
| The vendor may provide the database dictionary |  | Desired | T3.10 |  |
| The vendor may provide load test scripts |  | Desired | T3.15 |  |
| The vendor should provide a system architecture diagram |  | Desired | T3.16 |  |
| Vendor may offer an extended warranty |  | Desired | T4.5 |  |
| Vendor may support/provide a user conference | Vendor may support/provide a user conference | Desired | T4.6.1 |  |
| Vendor may support/provide a Canadian user conference | Vendor may support/provide a Canadian user conference | Desired | T4.7.1 |  |
| Vendor may support a regional user conference | Vendor may support supports a regional user conference | Desired | T4.8.1 |  |
| Vendor may support annual data reviews to ensure the system is configured and calculating appropriately. |  | Desired | T4.9 |  |
| The vendor may be able to describe the different services and levels of support that are available |  | Desired | T4.11 |  |
| The vendor may provide system test plans | User Acceptance Test Plan | Desired | T4.14.1 |  |
| The vendor may provide system test plans | Regression Test Plan | Desired | T4.14.2 |  |
| System solution may be subject to an internal (vendor) QA process |  | Desired | T4.19 |  |
| The vendor may provide user-level training in a train-the-trainer format |  | Desired | T4.21 |  |
| The vendor should provide implementation and project support |  | Desired | T4.22 |  |
| Vendor should provide 7/24/365 support | The vendor may provide first, second and third level support | Desired | T4.23.4 |  |
| Vendor should provide 7/24/365 support | The vendor may provide a web-based knowledge bank; | Desired | T4.23.5 |  |
| Vendor should provide 7/24/365 support | Users should be able to post information/issues to the web-based bank | Desired | T4.23.6 |  |
| The vendor may provide a file transfer site |  | Desired | T4.24 |  |
|  |