JEFFERSON PARISH

CYNTHIA LEE SHENG
PARISH PRESIDENT

RENNY SIMNO

April 22, 2025

ADDENDUM # 1

RFP Number: 0501 RFP Receipt Date: April 25, 2025 at 3:30 pm cst.

RFP Receipt Date Postponed to: May 9, 2025 at 3:30 pm cst.

Software and Implementation Services for an Enterprise Asset Management (EAM) Software Systems Environment

CLARIFICATION:

1. Will the Parish consider waiving Milestone Payments for the SaaS software modules? Attachment C2 reads:

The Parish requests that the following Payment and Retainage Terms be utilized for the Parish's Project:

- a. **Software Licensing:** Use of an acceptance-based payment schedule for software licensing.
 - i.Potential milestones including system deployment, Phase Kickoff, Initial Module/System Configuration, Approval of Phase Go-Live, and Acceptance of System. The Parish expects that licensing for any software modules will not be payable until the associated project phase for that module begins. For example, if Module X were a part of a potential Phase II to the project, the Parish would expect to have payment milestones for Module X begin with the phase kickoff for Phase II.
 - ii.Proposer shall fully describe their proposed milestone-based payment schedule for software licensing as part of their Price Proposal.

Parish Response: Proposers may take exception to the RFP terms and conditions, refer to Attachment A, Tab 13. The Parish reserves the right to disallow exceptions it finds are not in the best interests of the Parish. Any and all exceptions must be identified and fully explained in the submitted Proposal. It is the Parish's intention to be made aware of any exceptions to terms or conditions prior to contract negotiations. *Note: Deviations to the payment and retainage schedule to be provided in the Price Proposal.*



RENNY SIMNO

2. Will the Parish consider a three-week extension for the RFP response submittal?

Parish Response: This RFP will be postponed until May 9, 2025.

3. Is there a page limit to the response?

Parish Response: No.

4. Do the required notarized documents have to be submitted with the proposal or can they be submitted after the proposal is submitted?

Parish Response: Refer to Section 1.13 of the RFP Specifications document.

5. Why is Jefferson Parish replacing its current EAM system – Lucity? What are the issues with the current system? Will the parish be considering an upgrade to Lucity as opposed to completely new EAM systems?

Parish Response: Refer to Section 1.3 of the RFP Specifications document. The Parish is open to reviewing what is available in the marketplace.

6. The RFP mentions both Oracle work orders and Lucity as the current EAM solutions. Will both be replaced? Please explain the differences in how each system is currently used by the Parish.

Parish Response: The Parish is open to reviewing what is available in the marketplace.

7. Is source code escrow a requirement?

Parish Response: No.

8. Were consultants engaged in writing the RFP? Will consultants be engaged in the evaluation of the proposals and selection of vendors?

Parish Response: The Parish has retained BerryDunn as a consulting partner for this project. The role of BerryDunn is to provide information and analytical services to support this project. BerryDunn will be facilitating activities as part of the procurement but will not be participating in the evaluation scoring. Evaluations and resulting decisions will be made solely by the Parish Evaluation Committee.



RENNY SIMNO

9. Is there a pre-determined number of vendors that will be shortlisted? If so, how many?

Parish Response: Refer to Section 1.21 of the RFP Specifications document.

10. Does the proposal have any WMBE requirements?

Parish Response: No.

11. Is the Parish open to negotiations concerning milestone payments for software?

Parish Response: Proposers may take exception to the RFP terms and conditions, refer to Attachment A, Tab 13. The Parish reserves the right to disallow exceptions it finds are not in the best interests of the Parish. Any and all exceptions must be identified and fully explained in the submitted Proposal. It is the Parish's intention to be made aware of any exceptions to terms or conditions prior to contract negotiations. *Note: Deviations to the payment and retainage schedule to be provided in the Price Proposal.*

12. The RFP states that the Parish does not have an established budget in place for this project, but intends to use the proposals received through this process to inform the budget development process. Are there funds that have been designated for this project?

Parish Response: Yes.

13. What is Berry Dunn's involvement in vendor selection and post-award? Will Berry Dunn be involved in the evaluation and implementation?

Parish Response: The Parish has retained BerryDunn as a consulting partner for this project. The role of BerryDunn is to provide information and analytical services to support this project. BerryDunn will be facilitating activities as part of the procurement but will not be participating in the evaluation scoring. Evaluations and resulting decisions will be made solely by the Parish Evaluation Committee.



RENNY SIMNO

14. If a vendor cannot meet one or more critical requirements, will the vendor be disqualified?

Parish Response: The Parish reserves the right to disallow exceptions it finds are not in the best interests of the Parish. Any and all exceptions must be identified and fully explained in the submitted Proposal. It is the Parish's intention to be made aware of any exceptions to terms or conditions prior to contract negotiations. *Note: Deviations to the payment and retainage schedule to be provided in the Price Proposal. Deviations to functionality to be provided in Tab 14 (Attachment B).* The proposal will not be disqualified; however, points may be deducted for not meeting the needs requested. Any Proposer who does not meet a minimum of 80% of the total possible score, will not be considered for award.

15. Has the Parish seen any product demonstrations in the last 18th months? If so, which products did you see?

Parish Response: The Parish has not procured an EAM system in the last 18 months.

16. Does the Parish have a budget threshold you are looking to stay within for this project?

Parish Response: Refer to Section 2.1.11 of the RFP Specifications document.

17. Could you please share how the technical specifications were evaluated and decided upon for inclusion in the RFP?

Parish Response: The Parish subject matter experts in collaboration with BerryDunn, the Parish's consulting partner, identified each functional and technical requirement as well as its criticality.

- 18. To support accurate planning and resource allocation, we need clarification on the user count in Table 2-03: Number of Users.
 - a. Are the 350 Work Order and Customer Service users included within the individual area breakdowns in Table 2-03? If not, can you specify how these users are distributed across the functional areas?
 - b. Regarding Mobile and Field Users:
 - i. Are the 10 mobile/field users dedicated to handling Service Requests and Work Orders, or are these roles rotated among staff members?





RENNY SIMNO

ii. Do you anticipate any changes in the number of field users, particularly with the introduction of new functionalities?

Parish Response: The user counts are an estimate as each vendor's solution will have a unique license model and user roles.

19. Would the Parish consider replacing CFA for fleet management with the proposed EAM solution?

Parish Response: The Parish is open to reviewing what is available in the marketplace.

20. Do you require that the awarded vendor be headquartered in the United States?

Parish Response: Preferred. Additionally, please refer to the Tech Affidavit attached to this addendum.

21. What is the anticipated project start date and desired go-live date for the solution?

Parish Response: Dependent on several factors, anticipated start date would be Q4 2025 with go-live Q1 2027.

22. Is Jefferson Parish open to a phased implementation?

Parish Response: The Parish is open to reviewing implementation best practices from proposing vendors.

23. What are the departments that will be using the solution?

Parish Response: Sewerage, Water, Drainage, Streets, Parkways, Traffic Engineering, PWIRS, Environmental, Warehouse, General Services, Recreation, Animal Shelter, Fleet, at minimum

24. Will the Parish require bi-directional synchronization with Oracle or Lucity, or is one-way data migration sufficient for legacy data?

Parish Response: Solution dependent on if and what data we transfer.



RENNY SIMNO

25. What specific Oracle Work Order version and schema is currently in use, and can schema documentation be provided to support mapping?

Parish Response: Oracle Forms and Reports

26. Does Lucity currently expose APIs or web services, or will data need to be extracted via database-level access or flat files?

Parish Response: Yes, APIs

27. Are there standard integration protocols or middleware platforms (e.g., MuleSoft, Boomi, SSIS) mandated or preferred by Parish IT for interfacing with internal systems?

Parish Response: Currently there are no standard integration protocols

28. Is there a need for real-time data exchange (e.g., REST API polling, webhook subscriptions) between the proposed EAM and systems like ESRI ArcGIS, or will nightly batch processing be acceptable?

Parish Response: Real-time

29. Is Single Sign-On (SSO) integration expected to follow SAML 2.0, OAuth 2.0, or another protocol? And what is the current Identity Provider (IdP) platform (e.g., Azure AD, Okta, ADFS)?

Parish Response: Yes, Azure AD, SAML 2.0, DUO

30. How many years of historical data (e.g., work orders, service requests, asset maintenance logs) are to be retained and accessible in the new system?

Parish Response: Approx. 3 years, but solution and cost dependent.

31. Will legacy data require transformation (e.g., normalization, de-duplication, restructuring), or should it be preserved in its native structure for audit/compliance purposes?

Parish Response: Data conversion will be part of this project; the Parish will work with the awarded vendor to determine most appropriate approach to data conversion.



Cynthia Lee Sheng PARISH PRESIDENT

RENNY SIMNO DIRECTOR

32. Is there a requirement for live cross-querying between legacy and new systems (e.g., federated queries), or will legacy data be ingested and centralized into the EAM platform?

> Parish Response: Varies, depending on the solution, transformation needs, and data conversion.

33. Are there any mandated reporting formats (e.g., federal compliance, FEMA, state-specific asset reports) that require templates or system configuration?

Parish Response: Refer to Attachment B, all tabs for required reporting.

34. Should the reporting module support direct integration with existing Parish BI tools (e.g., Power BI via OData feeds or REST APIs)?

Parish Response: Rest APIs/solution, Power BI

35. Is ad-hoc report generation expected to support advanced logic (e.g., conditional filters, cross-module joins, user-based data visibility)?

> Parish Response: The Parish has an expectation of modern reporting platform, and will be open to reviewing what is available in the marketplace.

36. Will the Parish require mobile device management (MDM) compatibility for field use (e.g., iOS/Android device support, offline mode, GPS logging)?

Parish Response: Yes, but Parish might supply its own MDM solution.

37. Should the mobile application support barcode/RFID scanning for asset tagging or inventory tracking?

Parish Response: Yes

38. Are there specific logging and audit trail requirements (e.g., immutable logs, exportable audit history, tamper detection)?

Parish Response: Yes

39. Is FIPS 140-2 compliance required for encryption modules, or are general industry standards (e.g., AES-256) acceptable?

Parish Response: Yes, AES-256 at minimum



RENNY SIMNO

40. Should GIS integration support real-time map-based asset updates, or is static data sync sufficient (e.g., weekly sync with ArcGIS feature layers)?

Parish Response: Yes, real time

41. Does the Parish require field-level GIS data editing from within the EAM system (e.g., editing geometry, attributes), or only viewing capabilities?

Parish Response: Needs to be available

42. What level of in-house configurability is expected from the system (e.g., UI layouts, form logic, automated workflows), and what will require vendor development?

Parish Response: System dependent. Would like in-house configurability available.

43. Are there existing workflow definitions or process diagrams that must be reproduced exactly in the new system (vs. process redesign allowed)?

Parish Response: Some workflow diagrams exist, and Parish is open to workflow changes.

***The RFP due date has been postponed until May 9, 2025 at 3:30 pm cst. ***

Sincerely,

Misty A. Camardelle Assistant Director

Proposer shall acknowledge all addenda on the RFP Signature page. Proposer acknowledges receipt of this addendum on the signature page by indicating the addendum number listed above. Failure to list each addenda number on the RFP signature page could result in being considered non-responsive.

This addendum is a part of the contract documents and modifies the original RFP documents and specifications. The contents of this addendum shall be included in the contract documents. Changes made by this addendum shall take precedence over the documents of earlier date.

STATE OF	
PARISH OF	

TECHNOLOGY AFFIDAVIT

BEFO	RE M	IE, th	e undersigi	ned autl	nority, pers	onally	came	and a	appeared	•
				, who	as				_ is a	
					as	(Title)			_	
legal represent	tative	of		(C	`				, after	
being duly swo				(Compai	1y)					
The eq	uipme	ent an	d services	to be pi	ovided by					_,
							(Com	pany)		
under the acco	ompar	ying (bid/invoice) fully c	omply with	Louis	iana R	evised (Statutes	
38:2237.1 and	39:17	53.1.								
None	of	the	equipmen	it or	services	to	be	provid	led b	y
				are "pro	hibited tele	comm	unicati	ions or v	video	
(Company)				•						
surveillance e	quipn	nent o	r services"	' as def	ined therei	in, and	d do 1	not inc	lude an	y
equipment or	comp	onents	from all of	the foll	owing:					

- Telecommunications equipment produced by Huawei Technologies Company or ZTE Corporation, or any subsidiary or affiliate of such entities, as described in Section 889(f)(3)(A) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.
- Video surveillance equipment or telecommunications equipment produced by Hytera Communications Corporation, Hangzhou Hikvision Digital Technology Company, Dahua Technology Company, or any subsidiary or affiliate of such entities, as described in Section 889(f)(3)(B) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.
- Telecommunications or video surveillance equipment or services produced or provided by an entity found to be owned, controlled, or otherwise connected to the government of the People's Republic of China, as described in Section 889(f)(3)(D) of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.
- Any product or equipment, regardless of manufacturer, containing as a component any equipment identified above. This may include but is not limited to the following:
 - Computers or other equipment containing a component which enables any form of network connectivity or telecommunications regardless of whether the equipment is regularly connected to a network.
 - o Building automation, environmental controls, access controls, or facility management and monitoring systems.

	In ac	ldition,	none	of	th	ie	services	to	be	prov	ided	d by
	(Compan	w)	ut	tilize	any	equ	ipment o	r coi	mpone	nts as	desc	ribed
bove.		у)										
DUVC	•											
							Name: Title:					
							As rep	resent	ative o	f:		
							1					
							(Comp	any)				
	SWOR	N to ar	nd subs	cribe	d be	fore	me, No	tary,	this _		_ day	of
			, in my o	ffice	in			, L	ouisian	ıa.	_	
			, ,									
		Not	tary Pub	olic								
		Not	tary Nar	ne: _								