



144-2023 ADDENDUM 3

CENTRALIZED SOLUTION FOR EMERGENCY VEHICLE PREEMPTION PILOT AT TRAFFIC SIGNALS

URGENT

**PLEASE FORWARD THIS DOCUMENT TO
WHOEVER IS IN POSSESSION OF THE
BID/PROPOSAL**

ISSUED: June 20, 2023
BY: Morgan Glasgow
TELEPHONE NO. 204 986-2671

**THIS ADDENDUM SHALL BE INCORPORATED
INTO THE BID/PROPOSAL AND SHALL FORM
A PART OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS**

Template Version: A20190115

Please note the following and attached changes, corrections, additions, deletions, information and/or instructions in connection with the Bid/Proposal, and be governed accordingly. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in Paragraph 10 of Form A: Bid/Proposal may render your Bid/Proposal non-responsive.

PART B – BIDDING PROCEDURES

Revise: B2.1 to read: The Submission Deadline is 12:00 noon Winnipeg time, July 14, 2023.

Replace: 144-2023_ Form N-Requirements with 144-2023_Addendum 3 - Form N (R1) - Requirements. The following is a summary of changes incorporated in the replacement Bid/Proposal Submission:

- Form N (R1): Requirement RM.F.01.006 has been deleted.
Requirement RM.F.01.001 has been deleted.
Requirement RM.F.01.008 has been deleted.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q1: Regarding IS.F.01.006 of Form N, what are the Cities approved encryption mechanisms to store and transmit credentials?
- A1: The City would accept any current NIST-approved encryption standard to store and transmit credentials, such as AES-256. Storage is only required if you're not using the City's standard directory services (AD) to authenticate against (i.e., the credentials are stored within, and authentication is performed within the application itself).
- Q2: Regarding IS.F.01.008 of Form N, how does the city propose to ensure this requirement is satisfied? Will the city provide the successful vendor a list of know critical and security vulnerabilities on a quarterly basis?
- A2: Most vendors subscribe to vulnerability notifications (from a variety of government and private entities) and will release critical patches for those vulnerabilities. Less critical vulnerabilities would be addressed through normal patch cycles. The vendor should indicate the cadence of their normal patch cycles and indicate whether critical patches for critical vulnerabilities would be released on an ad-hoc basis. They would indicate this in their documentation and proposed service levels. This is a key control highlighted within the NIST Cybersecurity Framework so, we prefer our vendors align with that framework.
- Q3: Is the existing CAD/AVL system capable of providing 1 Hz vehicle position and Code 3 status updates?
- A3: 1 Hz vehicle position and Code 3 status updates are expected to be achievable by existing CAD/AVL. Currently, settings are configured to check every 7 min, but 1 s should be feasible. The Solution can

collect code 3 status from either the CAD or modem. GPIOs are not currently used in modems. A GPIO could be used for lights and sirens status (Code 3).

Q4: Is it acceptable to receive AVL and Code 3 vehicle status information directly from the vehicles or must it be first aggregated and delivered by the CAD/AVL system?

A4: Refer to A3 above.

Q5: Can the Solution send NTCIP pre-emption commands directly to the controllers or must the controllers receive pre-emption commands through the ATMS system?

A5: Refer to D2.3(e) and A1 in Addendum 2.

Q6: What minimum level of integration between the Solution and the ATMS system is required?

A6: Refer to A1 in Addendum 2.

Q7: Is the ATMS and controller vendor expected to participate in the integration with the Solution? Is this an additional cost borne by the Solution provider?

A7: Refer to D2.3(e) in Addendum 2 for expected controller integration. There is no requirement for the City's ATMS provider to participate in integration to the Solution.

Q8: Is it acceptable to receive AVL and Code 3 vehicle status information directly from the vehicles or must it be first aggregated and delivered by the CAD/AVL system?

A8: Refer to A3 above.

Q9: Does the Hexagon CAD/AVL software have an API and will it be made available to the successful vendor at no charge?

A9: Hexagon has an API for a preemption system. The integration between the EVP Solution and the API would need to be discussed between the Proponent and Hexagon due to proprietary information. The cost will be based on the scope and requirements of the EVP Solution. If applicable, this cost shall be included in the Implementation Price.

Q10: Does the city have a preference if the vendor integrates to the Hexagon software or the Sierra modem?

A10: The City prefers integration to the CAD (Hexagon).

Q11: Will the CAD/AVL system vendor participate in the integration with the Solution? Is this an additional cost borne by the Solution provider?

A11: Refer to A9 above.

Q12: Will the City provide the successful proponent with an API for integration into the solution proposed? (i.e., for integration to the existing CAD/AVL system).

A12: Refer to A9 above.