



Department of Emergency Services
Division of State Radio
 Computer Aided Dispatch Project

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Title	CAD Gartner Follow-Up & Launch of RFI Execution Phase	Time	14:30 to 15:30
Date	31 March 2008	Place	Fraine Barracks, DES Conference Room
Facilitator	Christy Smith	Call-In #	N/A

Accept/Reject:		Date:	
-----------------------	--	--------------	--

Invitee List:

1. Russ Timmreck
2. State Radio Supervisors
3. Larry Ruebel
4. Carrie Oswald
5. Sarah Keney
6. James Boehm
7. Jim Crow
8. Pam Schafer
9. Gordon Christensen
10. Sam Stoxen
11. Bob Nutsch
12. Justin Data
13. Christy Smith

In Attendance:

1. Russ Timmreck
2. Rosalie Doerr
3. Larry Ruebel
4. Sarah Keney
5. James Boehm
6. Pam Schafer
7. Gordon Christensen
8. Sam Stoxen
9. Bob Nutsch
10. Justin Data
11. Christy Smith

#	Agenda Item	Time Allotted	Presenter or Moderator
1	Gartner Call Follow-Up	30	Sam Stoxen / Gartner

Discussion:

- In our Gartner Call on 3/17, Bill Clark took an action item to look at vendors that are ESRI partners.
 - Our preference is a “peer to peer” system, so that CADs can communicate statewide.
 - Initially, we may not be able to complete “peer to peer” communication, but that is the goal in time.
 - We want the ability to have other CADs cover for Bismarck, to eliminate single point of failure possibility.
 - State would also be able to carry other 9-1-1 dispatch for other PSAPs. Dispatch local fire, ambulance, etc. at the local level for other dispatch centers until they come back up.
 - Need to set up a system for interoperability for voice communications, base map, interoperable AVLs down the road. Purchase a system we can grow into (statewide system – not just a State Radio system).
 - Jeff knows of a Tiburon system that was comparable, implemented for about \$1.2M.
 - Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 vendors break out due to money.
 - Versaterra out of Canada – thinks we would be happy with their product. Work Flow applications provider. Have statewide expertise. Possible issues on the front end. 75-80% data conversion rate with GIS – also might be a concern.
 - Sacramento
 - St. Paul, MN
 - New Zealand (entire country)
 - Tennessee (entire state)
 - Terrain conversion could present issues, depending on the vendor we pick.
 - Intergraph could interact better with 3rd party vendors for GIS, etc.
 - May have a different GIS system in the next 2-3 years due to an upgrade.
 - Jeff: will the formats convert – this could be a big issue to transfer data.
 - GIS data at the city/county level may present a discrepancy in format from the statewide format (ESRI format can differ from other vendors’ formats)

- Jeff has found that the GIS data could have high error rates – not due to file format – but due to attributes, accuracy, TIGER data, etc.
 - Spatial accuracy for CAD should target bi-directional, within 1-2 sq. mile (blocks).
 - Other accuracy refers to route direction (typically inaccurate – one ways, SE 5th, NE 12th)
 - Absolute data in densely populated areas.
 - Gap analysis: need to tell the vendor our expectations, and this may be interpreted as “customizations” – make our expectations our requirements.
 - LAISTC – CAD-specific standards Int’l Assoc Chiefs of Police for standards.
 - Besides roads, we should consider layers for a seamless basemap such as: critical infrastructure, floodplains, elevation / terrain change.
 - Road names are a requirement as a minimum for dispatch purposes – particularly backcountry roads, Section Line roads. Oil field accidents create a challenge to identify the location for ambulance.
- In our Gartner Call on 3/17, Bill Clark took an action item to have Jeff Vining follow up with us to talk more about Records Manager and GIS integration. Jeff is with Gartner, based out of Washington DC.
 - Project management: vendors make more money if they can sell us more modules.
 - On front end, have a very good idea of what we want, and have them show us in a mock-up (not a dumb terminal)
 - Monitoring room, work flow process on mobile terminals, etc. This is a way that vendors cut corners – important to watch for.
 - Intergraph, Motorola, New World, TriTech, Tiburon... cheaper vendors do not offer real-time support. Support can become an issue.
 - Intergraph, Northrop-Grummon, Sunguard, Visionaire, Tiburon –more expensive.
 - Data 911, Versaterm, Priority Dispatch, Hi-Tech are Tier 2 vendors.
 - Nebraska State Police would be a good model to contact: they went with Tiburon (\$1.2M?)
 - Tennessee used Intergraph, but Jeff doesn’t think that would be as good of a model for ND.
 - St. Paul / Sacramento use Versaterm, and they could speak to that vendor.
 - For \$1M, the CAD will have some Records Manager capability, but not comprehensive capability.
 - Need to look for a CAD vendor that puts 10% of their budget into R&D (Hi-Tech in CA is an example) who can scale into the future.
 - Use scalable vocabulary / language in CAD system.
 - Interface with radio system: ask capabilities specific to a radio system.
 - Radio IP has messed up some of the CAD vendors.
 - Macom is pushing radio IP for unified communication centers – Jeff isn’t sure all vendors are prepared for that.
 - Mobile data capabilities in portable and mobile radios – affects CAD system depending on the infrastructure. Sometimes can act differently in the car than in a building. Infrastructure problem rather than a CAD problem.
 - Going to have to go to NDex – WV is testing. ndex@leo.gov.

2	Project Status: Execution	5	Christy Smith
Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The RFI Project Plan was signed-off on 3/27 by Russ. We are now in the Execution & Control phase of the RFI project. ▪ Address questions about time investments needed from the Technical Group and other project resources, based on the schedule. 			
3	Finalize core requirements after stakeholder review / feedback	15	Team
Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review stakeholder comments. ▪ Finalize core requirements and general questions. ▪ Is the RFI ready for Executive Committee review? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Larry and Christy discussed: with the changes to the high level requirements analysis, it is ready to distribute to the Executive Committee and Technical Group for final review and sign-off. 			

4	Follow up from previous action items	5	Technical Group
Discussion:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revise the Project Plan, re-distribute to the team, and review with Russ and Larry (Christy Smith) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Complete ▪ Sign-off of the RFI Project Plan (Russ) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Complete ▪ Set up RFI for issue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Christy has provided the known vendor list to Jackie Bosch, who will serve as the Procurement Officer for the project. ○ Jackie has created a Notice for RFI to distribute to the vendor list when the RFI is ready to post. ○ Jackie will call Pat when we are ready to post the RFI to the State Procurement's website for advertisement, so vendors not on the list can find the announcement. 			

#	Action Item	Assigned To	Due Date
	Distribute final core requirements to stakeholders	Russ Timmreck / Christy Smith	4/1/08
	Jim Boehm and Russ will talk with Ken Dahle to identify point of contact for Nebraska State Police.	Jim Boehm / Russ Timmreck	4/4/08
	Sam to follow up with Bill Clark: get list of ESRI vendors	Sam Stoxen	4/7/08
	Executive Committee / LPO Review of RFI	Executive Committee / LPO	4/9/08
	Sign-off RFI	Russ Timmreck	4/10/08
	Issue RFI for 14 days	Jackie Bosch / Christy Smith	4/11/08