



STATE OF TENNESSEE
TENNESSEE BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION # 34800-030821
AMENDMENT # 1**

**SOLUTION FOR STATEWIDE REPLICATION OF ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT
RECORD MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS INTO THOR**

DATE: April 20th, 2021

RFI # 34800-030821 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. This RFI Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled RFP dates.

1. RFI SCHEDULE OF EVENTS:

	EVENT	TIME (Central Time Zone)	DATE (all dates are State business days)
1.	RFI Issued		March 8, 2021
2.	Question and Answers		March 22, 2021
3.	Responses to Question and Answers		April 20, 2021
4.	RFI Response Deadline		April 30, 2021
5.	Demonstrations to be Performed Virtually		May 10-21, 2021

2. RFI Amendment Effective Date. The revisions set forth herein shall be effective upon release. All other terms and conditions of this RFP not expressly amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.

\RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		1. Do you happen to know the estimated funding source, or budget for this project? If so, has funding for an RFP been secured?	This is to be determined. No budget or funding source has been identified at this time.
		2. Is this a new requirement? Or is there an incumbent vendor providing these services? If there is an incumbent, would you be able to provide the contract number, vendor name, and term of the contract?	This is not a new requirement. There is not one vendor that provides replication for all agencies statewide. We have a few vendors that provide replication services for the agencies they support, but a statewide contract does not exist.
		3. Is there a timeline for an RFP to be released? If not, what steps are expected to make a decision on releasing an RFP?	This is to be determined. No RFP timeline has been determined at this time.
		4. Is there a data standard (standard data element names, standard business rules, and standard format of data collection, e.g., NIEM XML) each RMS must follow in order to replicate data to THOR?	<p>Currently there is a data standard that each RMS must follow, however, a statewide replicating service would have the discretion of determining the most efficient data standard to get agency data replicated to THOR.</p> <p>Currently, we utilize GJXDM standard that replicators must comply with in order for data to be replicated to THOR. The current replication process entails records being converted to XML at the agency level and then sent to an identified webservice at the State.</p>
		5. Can you provide a high-level overview of the existing THOR technical architecture?	<p>Current THOR Replication architecture can be broken down into three parts. The solution for this RFI will be primarily focused on Part (A). Refer to attached THOR Architecture Diagram for more information.</p> <p>A) Agency Side Replication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detect RMS Records being added, changed, or deleted

\RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reads RMS Record Detail - RMS Record Detail information is translated to XML message (Incident, Arrest, Custody, Warrant, Incarceration) - XML Transmitted to THOR queuing Service - Receives a response code (Success or Fail) - On Transmission Failure, replicator goes to recursive monitor for heartbeat and resumes replication process B) Host Side Replication Queueing Service functions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Receives XML Messages - Validates XML Message - If Valid, Stores XML in queueing Database and sends success response - If invalid, sends failure response C) Host Side De-Queue Service: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reads Replication Queue looking for work - Reads Replication Queue XML Message - Translates XML - Performs Database Commands - Upon Success - Removes record from Queue - If error, notification email is sent to support
		6. Can you provide the technical architecture for the current generic THOR Replication web service?	The THOR Generic Replicator is an open source software application which takes RMS (Records Management System) data and sends it to the THOR

\RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>webservice in a specified XML message format. The Generic THOR Replicator software has components that make the proper formatting conversions according to the IEPD (Information Exchange Package Documentation). It then stores into specified data objects that then gets sent via an XML message to THOR's webservice.</p>
		<p>7. Who is currently responsible for ensuring that RMS replicators are performing correctly?</p>	<p>THOR replication is not mandated by state law. It is currently the discretion of the local agency and their RMS vendor to maintain their replication connection. The state has a contract with a vendor that supports replication for a handful of agencies that utilize specific RMS vendors.</p> <p>The solution would also entail the development of a dashboard that allows THOR administrators the ability to monitor the status of replication at each agency.</p>
		<p>8. How scalable should the new solution be?</p>	<p>The solution should be able to accommodate replication of every law enforcement record management system in the state.</p>
		<p>9. How is the administration of the generic replicator currently handled?</p>	<p>Our current THOR maintenance and Support vendor is responsible for the generic replicator administration. When agencies become interested in setting up replication, we provide our generic replicator documentation to the agency RMS vendor, who is then responsible for mapping the agency RMS fields to the generic replicator.</p> <p>The solution scope should incorporate the administration of replicating agencies' data up to the point it is received by the THOR webservice.</p>
		<p>10. Can you elaborate on why only a limited number of vendor supplied RMS systems use the generic</p>	<p>Since developing replication and mapping agency RMS fields using the generic replicator</p>

\RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		replicator. What are the specific issues that currently inhibit a vendor supplied RMS from transferring data using the generic replicator?	documentation is time intensive, some RMS vendors may not have the resources to allocate to development and the local agency may not have the funds at the time to pay their vendor for the interface development.
		11. How many different RMS systems are currently being used in the State?	According to our records, we show approximately 20 commercial RMS vendors operating within the state.
		12. Is there a predominant RMS system that is used in the State?	We are unable to provide the name of the predominantly used RMS system in the state.
		13. What types of Local Law Enforcement Agencies transactions are currently being replicated into the THOR System?	Incidents, Arrests, Warrants, Incarcerations, Custody are the record types currently accepted by the THOR webservice.
		14. The RFI stated that the generic replicator currently supports a limited number of vendor supplied RMS systems. What percentage of vendor supplied RMS Systems used by Law Enforcement Agencies in the State are currently replicating data to THOR?	Approximately 25% of RMS vendors within the state have active interfaces with their platforms.
		15. When does the State expect to have the Replicator Solution in place?	No timeline has been established yet
		16. Can the State release a list of vendors who have responded to this RFI?	Yes, after the response deadline of 4/30/2021.
		17. Does THOR store large media file types such as audio or video?	No audio or video files are stored within THOR.
		18. How many Tennessee Law Enforcement Agencies currently replicate records data to THOR?	Approximately 415 law enforcement agencies replicate records to THOR, 352 of which utilize the State provided reporting system.
		19. Can you please provide a list of the current RMS vendors used by Tenn Law Enforcement Agencies that send records to THOR?	No
		20. What is the monthly volume of data replicated into THOR?	During a six month period from July through December 2020, we averaged approximately 2.9

\RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			million records submitted per month from local law enforcement agencies.
		21. Is any of the data Law Enforcement Sensitive? Or is the data all public record?	Replicated data should be handled as confidential as described under TCA 10-7-504
		22. For accessing Record Management Systems, how many users will need full rights (upload, edit documents) and how many will need read-only rights (only view the documents or participate in workflow process)?	This RFI is solely related to replication, and not the development or access to an RMS
		23. Is State of Tennessee's preference more towards Cloud based Record Management System or On-Premise Record Management System?	This RFI is solely related to replication, and not the development or access to an RMS. THOR database infrastructure is already established.
		24. Do you have budget already available for this project? If yes, what is the maximum budget you are planning to spend on this project?	This is to be determined. No budget or funding source has been identified at this time.
		<p>25. Do we need to provide Scanning services as a part of this project? If yes, please provide answers to following scanning related questions:</p> <p>1. 8.5"x11" up to 11"x17":</p> <p>2. 11"x17" up to 18"x24":</p> <p>3. 18"x24" up to 24"x36":</p> <p>4. 24"x36" up to 36"x48":</p> <p>b. What is the required preparation level before scanning the files? (how many staples or fasteners are there on each file approximately)?</p> <p>c. What DPI are you looking to scan the files at?</p>	No scanning services are required. THOR is a web based platform that receives information from agencies via XML submissions to a webservice.

\RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		d. Do you want to make the files text searchable (OCR)?e. What are the indexing requirements? Per Page, Per document, etc.?	
		26. Have State of Tennessee seen demonstrations of any Record Management System? If yes, what is the name of the solution and vendor which provided the demonstration?	This RFI is solely related to replication, and not the development or access of an RMS
		27. Will the RMS vendors modify their systems, one time, to fit into the framework of the new Replicator?	It is assumed that the vendor responding to this RFI will have the responsibility of fixing/developing replication to THOR for all agencies not currently replicating as well as maintenance and support for replicators that are currently submitting.
		28. What is the relationship between the replicator solution sought through this RFI to the replicator services specified in the State of Tennessee's September 2020 contract award to Forensic Logic?	Replication in the State of Tennessee's September 2020 contract award to Forensic Logic concerns replication from THOR to Coplink and forty additional agencies which replicate directly to Coplink and not to THOR. Replication in this RFI concerns replication from law enforcement agencies to THOR.
		29. What is the scope of the replication solution sought through this RFI - how many data/RMS connections and how many unique vendors/service providers?	Please refer to RFI # 34800-030821 section 2.3 for scope of solution. According to our records, there are approximately 175 agencies using 20 RMS commercial vendors.
		30. Will data from LEA systems replicated to THOR be shared with other third party systems/tools upstream (i.e., NIBRS, N-DEx, analysis tools, state systems, etc.)? If so, which systems, and would the Respondent be expected to make changes to replicators to ensure ongoing compliance with submission of data to those systems upstream?	Third party data connections are outside the scope of this RFI. The solution will not need to incorporate submissions to third party platforms.
		31. Are RMS records expected to be replicated in real time or in batch?	RMS records are expected to be replicated as close to real time as possible.