

**ADDENDUM No. 1**

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
DEP Procurement Section  
3800 Commonwealth Boulevard, MS#93  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000**

**June 19, 2026**

**Addendum To: DEP RFI No. 2026018, entitled  
“Mass Notification Solution”**

The Department hereby answers questions posed by interested entities. This addendum does not need to be returned with the response. The Department hereby answers the following questions:

<b>Question #</b>	<b>Solicitation Section</b>	<b>Solicitation Page #</b>	<b>Question / Answer</b>
<b>1.</b>	-	-	Does DEP accept RFI responses from AI / sub-component vendors that are explicitly NOT pursuing the prime IPAWS Alert Origination role, but could partner with a chosen prime? <i>Answer: No.</i>
<b>2.</b>	-	-	If so, is there a stated pathway (named partner program, sub-component category, etc.), or would Montane simply submit a Position Statement describing complementary capabilities? <i>Answer: See answer to question #1.</i>
<b>3.</b>	-	-	Is DEP planning any pre-bid or vendor information sessions before the 5/26 deadline? <i>Answer: No.</i>
<b>4.</b>	-	-	Please tell us how many Internal Contacts for the FL DEP. <i>Answer: Approximately 4500 internal contacts and 500 external contacts.</i>
<b>5.</b>	-	-	<b><u>Please advise if these requirements are mandatory?</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interactive Survey - phone and web-enabled surveys with multiple questions and responses</li><li>• interactive conference call. ( Decision Tree)</li><li>• Exclude specific contacts from targeted messaging, based on defined attributes, including Location</li><li>• Automatically compare addresses against the United States Postal Service data to suggest a correct address, and then automatically geocode the address into the recipient’s profile</li><li>• Provide the ability for recipients to manually input latitude/longitude or decimal degree.</li></ul>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide the ability for recipients to access a graphical user interface where they can view their location on a map and select points.</li> <li>• Enable message originators to specify whether recipients must acknowledge human receipt of a message. If confirmed receipts are requested, the system must continue trying to reach the recipient until positive confirmation has been received with human acknowledgement. Once acknowledgement has been received, the system will cease all further attempts to reach that Recipient</li> <li>• Allow for voice message throttling, which allows the sender to determine and define desired delivery rate for specific area codes and prefixes so as to not overwhelm a telephone exchange for a given area.</li> <li>• Helpdesk assistance must be available in multiple languages</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: Yes. All requirements above are mandatory. RFI Section 2.00, Technical Requirements, lists the minimum requirements and are mandatory.</i></p>
6.			<p><b><u>Please advise if these requirements are mandatory?</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does FL DEP have a COG Certification as an Alerting Authority for FEMA IPAWS</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: No.</i></p>
7.	-	-	<p><b><u>Please provide clarification on the following requirements</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability to accept and utilize E911 phone data at no additional cost and be able to scrub duplicate information.</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: DEP does not utilize E911 data. See revised Technical Requirements Section 2.02 Minimum System Requirements below.</i></p>
8.			<p><b><u>Please provide clarification on the following requirements</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Pricing purposes, does DEP require access to E911 data for all Florida Residents?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #7.</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
9.	-	-	<p><b>About the Platform Environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there existing contact databases (HR systems, active directory) that would feed into the notification system, and what format is that data currently in?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: Yes. There is a data flow that starts with a flat file from the state's Human Resource Information System (HRIS), another flat file from Active Directory, and concludes with a data import into the mass notification system.</i></p>
10.	-	-	<p><b>About the Platform Environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does DEP have a preference for keeping employee notifications and public opt-in notifications on separate instances or managed within one unified system?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: Separate instances.</i></p>
11.	-	-	<p><b>About the Decision Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beyond the technical requirements listed, what has caused previous notification system deployments at DEP or peer agencies to fall short?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: We do not have any historical data to provide.</i></p>
12.	-	-	<p><b>About Scope and Usage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the estimated number of DEP employees who would be system users vs. recipients, and what is the anticipated public opt-in audience size by geography?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: Five (5) System Administrators, five (5) Jurisdiction Administrators. There are approximately 4,500 internal recipients and an estimated public opt-in audience of 500 within the United States.</i></p>
13.	-	-	<p><b>About Scope and Usage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there specific incident types (hurricanes, chemical spills, facility emergencies) that represent the highest-priority use cases, and should the solution be optimized for those first?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: The system should be optimized to support mass notifications regardless of incident type.</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
14.	-	-	<p><b>Future Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If a competitive solicitation is issued following this RFI, is DEP anticipating a Best Value or Low Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) evaluation methodology?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: Best Value.</i></p>
15.	-	-	<p><b>Future Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will vendors who respond to this RFI be invited to participate in demonstrations, and what would DEP most want to see demonstrated?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: See RFI Section 1.05, Submittal of Response (last paragraph).</i></p>
16.	-	-	<p>Is the Department strictly looking for a digital SaaS software package for employee and public outreach, or is there an interest in a comprehensive system that can integrate with or actuate physical outdoor warning sirens and localized audio arrays at remote facilities?</p> <p><i>Answer: We are seeking strictly a digital SaaS solution.</i></p>
17.	-	-	<p>If the state is open to comprehensive hybrid architectures (combining digital SaaS triggers with physical acoustic hardware endpoints), we would like to tailor our informational response to reflect those integration capabilities.</p> <p><i>Answer: These features are not sought.</i></p>
18.	-	-	<p>Please confirm whether the future competitive solicitation will require bidders themselves (as prime) to hold FEMA IPAWS Alert Origination Software Provider certification, or if certification by a subcontractor/partner will be acceptable.</p> <p><i>Answer: At this time, a formal competitive solicitation has not been developed, and no final determination has been made regarding certification requirements.</i></p> <p><i>For purposes of this Request for Information, solutions that include certification by either the respondent or a subcontractor/partner are acceptable. The proposed solution should be approved by FEMA as compatible alert origination software capable of generating and transmitting messages via the Common Alerting Protocol (CAP).</i></p> <p><i>Any certification requirements applicable to a future competitive solicitation, if issued, will be identified in that solicitation.</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
19.	-	-	<p>What is the estimated total number of DEP employees and public opt-in recipients DEP expects to enroll at launch and at full maturity of the system?</p> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #4.</i></p>
20.	-	-	<p>Does DEP currently utilize any alerting or mass-notification platform statewide or within individual divisions, and if so, which vendor(s) and why is DEP considering replacement or augmentation?</p> <p><i>Answer: Everbridge is the Department's current solution.</i></p>
21.	-	-	<p>Will DEP require full E911 data import and automated daily sync at no additional carrier cost, and can you share the approximate size of the E911 data set?</p> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #7.</i></p>
22.	-	-	<p>Beyond IPAWS, are additional third-party integrations (e.g., GIS layers, Active Directory/IdP, HRIS data feeds) expected to be in scope for the initial implementation?</p> <p><i>Answer: Support for additional third-party integrations with Active Directory and PeopleFirst are our preferred integrations via EntraID, our Identity Management Services provider.</i></p>
23.	-	-	<p><b>Scope, Volume &amp; Sizing (critical for pricing Appendix B)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the approximate <b>employee headcount</b> to be onboarded (full-time, OPS, contractors)?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #4.</i></p>
24.	-	-	<p><b>Scope, Volume &amp; Sizing (critical for pricing Appendix B)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the <b>expected public opt-in subscriber count</b> at go-live and at year 3 (estimate)?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #4.</i></p>
25.	-	-	<p><b>Scope, Volume &amp; Sizing (critical for pricing Appendix B)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the anticipated <b>annual volume</b> of (a) SMS/MMS messages, (b) voice calls/minutes, (c) emails, and (d) desktop alerts?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: Notifications are sent using phone, email, and SMS/MMS as primary delivery methods. In the last calendar year, sixteen (16) notifications were sent, accounting for 25,838 attempts.</i></p>
26.	-	-	<p><b>Scope, Volume &amp; Sizing (critical for pricing Appendix B)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many <b>concurrent/simultaneous events</b> should the system be sized to handle?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: There is no limit.</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
27.			<p><b>Scope, Volume &amp; Sizing (critical for pricing Appendix B)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How many <b>jurisdictions, districts, divisions, or sub-organizations</b> within DEP will need separate administrative segmentation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: Currently we have three (3) distinct administrative segments within Everbridge. The system should support up to five (5) jurisdictions.</i></p>
28.			<p><b>Scope, Volume &amp; Sizing (critical for pricing Appendix B)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How many total <b>administrators, jurisdiction administrators, and message originators</b> are anticipated?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: Five (5) System Administrators, five (5) Jurisdiction Administrators, and thirty (30) Message Originators.</i></p>
29.	-	-	<p><b>Incumbent &amp; Current State</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there an <b>incumbent mass notification provider</b> today? If so, who, and is this a replacement or a net-new deployment?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: Everbridge is the current system. This will be a replacement.</i></p>
30.			<p><b>Incumbent &amp; Current State</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the <b>primary pain points</b> with the current solution (if any) driving this RFI?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: None.</i></p>
31.	-	-	<p><b>Integrations &amp; Identity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2.04 references SSO via OAuth 2.0 / OpenID Connect - please confirm the <b>specific identity provider</b> (Microsoft Entra ID / Azure AD, Okta, PingFederate, other?).</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: Keycloak and Entra ID.</i></p>
32.	-	-	<p><b>Security, Compliance &amp; Hosting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is <b>FedRAMP Moderate (or High)</b> authorization required, preferred, or not required?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: Not required.</i></p>
33.			<p><b>Security, Compliance &amp; Hosting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is <b>StateRAMP</b> authorization required or preferred?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #32.</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
34.	-	-	<p><b>Accessibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is a <b>VPAT (Voluntary Product Accessibility Template)</b> required as part of the response or a future solicitation?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: A VPAT (Voluntary Product Accessibility Template) is not required as part of this Request for Information. Proposed solutions should meet WCAG 2.1 Level A and Level AA accessibility standards. Any requirements for a future competitive solicitation, if issued, will be specified in that solicitation.</i></p>
35.	-	-	<p><b>Languages &amp; Localization</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multilingual TTS is required - which <b>specific languages</b> are priority for Florida (Spanish, Haitian Creole, others)?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: English, Spanish, Haitian Creole, Portuguese, Mandarin, Vietnamese, German.</i></p>
36.	-	-	<p><b>Contract Term, Renewals &amp; Pricing Model</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the <b>anticipated contract term</b> (1-year, 3-year, 5-year base) and renewal structure?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: If the Department decides to advertise this service as a competitive solicitation, the anticipated contract term is unknown at this time.</i></p>
37.	-	-	<p><b>Contract Term, Renewals &amp; Pricing Model</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a <b>budget range or not-to-exceed ceiling</b> for Appendix B pricing guidance?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: No.</i></p>
38.	-	-	<p><b>Contract Term, Renewals &amp; Pricing Model</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferred <b>pricing model</b>: per recipient, per administrator, flat enterprise, tiered, or hybrid?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: While all pricing models are accepted, the Department would prefer a flat enterprise annual rate.</i></p>
39.	-	-	<p><b>Contract Term, Renewals &amp; Pricing Model</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For employee vs. public-opt-in recipients, are both counted toward licensing, or only one tier?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: This would be dependent on the vendor solution. Separate licensing is fine.</i></p>
40.	-	-	<p><b>Contract Term, Renewals &amp; Pricing Model</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should annual maintenance include only SaaS upgrades and vendor support, or also Salesforce release testing, integration monitoring, and enhancement support?</li> </ul>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
			<i>Answer: See RFI Section 2.05, Minimum Support Requirements.</i>
41.	-	-	<p><b>Implementation, Training &amp; Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the <b>target go-live date</b> and any hard milestones (legislative session, hurricane season, fiscal year)?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: The Department is utilizing this RFI only to review options for solutions within the vendor community, at this time.</i></p>
42.	-	-	<p><b>Implementation, Training &amp; Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How many users require <b>role-based training</b>, and is <b>onsite training in Tallahassee</b> expected vs. remote-only?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question # 41.</i></p>
43.	-	-	<p><b>Implementation, Training &amp; Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2.05 mentions a <b>one-month test period</b> — does the subscription clock start at contract execution, system acceptance, or end of test period?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #41.</i></p>
44.	-	-	<p><b>Implementation, Training &amp; Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the <b>uptime SLA, RPO, and RTO expectations</b> for the redundant/failover site?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: The Mass Notification System is a critical component of disaster response. Expected uptime would be 99.9%, RTO should be ≤ 15 minutes, and RPO ≤ 60 minutes.</i></p>
45.	-	-	<p><b>Implementation, Training &amp; Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there <b>response/resolution-time SLAs</b> beyond the 30-minute helpdesk acknowledgment in 2.05?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #44.</i></p>
46.	-	-	<p><b>Implementation, Training &amp; Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who owns the 24-hour help desk and 30-minute response requirement: the platform vendor, Stack Intelligence, DEP, or a shared model?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: See Section 2.05, Minimum Support Requirements.</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
47.	-	-	<p><b>RFI Process &amp; Demo</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If selected for a demonstration, what is the <b>expected format and duration</b>, and who comprises the <b>evaluation audience</b>?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: The Department is unable to provide that information at this time. If Demonstrations are requested, further information will be provided.</i></p>
48.	-	-	<p><b>Respondent Feedback After Evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After the State completes its review of RFI responses, what feedback, if any, can respondents expect regarding solution fit, demonstration selection, or future procurement direction?</li> </ul> <p><i>Answer: The Department will not provide direct feedback. For future solicitations, please monitor the Vendor Information Portal for solicitation advertisements.</i></p>
49.	Section 2.01, 2.02, & 2.03	(Pages 7–10)	<p>What is the current registered volume of active contacts, your projected 3–5 year scale for public opt-in subscribers, and your anticipated annual messaging volume split by channel (Please provide volume for SMS vs. Email)?</p> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #4.</i></p> <p><i>The Department is unable to provide volume for SMS or Email. Notifications are typically sent to all registered channels which include phone, email, and text.</i></p>
50.	Section 2.01, 2.02, & 2.03	(Pages 7–10)	<p>For budget and scoping estimation, how many active "Jurisdiction Administrators" and "Message Originators" require system login access at initial rollout?</p> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #28.</i></p>
51.	Section 2.01, 2.02, & 2.03	(Pages 7–10)	<p>What is the total estimated baseline of unique physical locations or asset data points required for the citizen two-location geocoding mandate?</p> <p><i>Answer: The Department is unable to provide insight into this information.</i></p>
52.	Section 2.01, 2.02, & 2.03	(Pages 7–10)	<p>What are the specific Service Level Agreement requirements for platform uptime and guaranteed message delivery rate, particularly during a declared state of emergency?</p> <p><i>Answer: See response to question #44.</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
53.	Section 2.01, 2.02, & 2.03	(Pages 7–10)	<p>What are the requirements for data retention and archival of historical notification logs and public response data?</p> <p><i>Answer: All documents should be retained until purged by an Administrator.</i></p>
54.	Section 2.02 & 2.04	(Pages 9 & 11)	<p>Which identity provider (e.g., Okta, Azure AD) does DEP use for authentication, and what are the specific source core systems (e.g., HR databases, Active Directory) targeted for recurring automated contact imports?</p> <p><i>Answer: Daily import of user information file from FTP Service, csv, txt. PeopleFirst and Entra ID serve as primary data sources. If API integration is supported, then that is preferred.</i></p>
55.	Section 2.02 & 2.04	(Pages 9 & 11)	<p>For the SMS short code mandate, does the State or DEP currently lease a dedicated short code to migrate, or must the vendor provision and whitelist a new code through major commercial carriers?</p> <p><i>Answer: No.</i></p>
56.	Section 2.02 & 2.04	(Pages 9 & 11)	<p>Does DEP have an active FEMA IPAWS Collaborative Operating Group (COG) and Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) in place, or will the vendor be expected to facilitate that setup?</p> <p><i>Answer: No.</i></p>
57.	Section 2.01, 2.04, & 2.05	(Pages 7–12)	<p>Given the handling of citizen PII, does DEP require or prioritize a platform hosted within a FedRAMP High baseline (or StateRAMP equivalent) government cloud infrastructure?</p> <p><i>Answer: No.</i></p>
58.	Section 2.01, 2.04, & 2.05	(Pages 7–12)	<p>Is DEP interested in utilizing state-compliant Artificial Intelligence (AI)—such as Generative AI for rapid crisis message drafting, or predictive analytics for delivery path optimization?</p> <p><i>Answer: Respondents may, at their discretion, describe any available capabilities such as generative AI for message drafting or predictive analytics for delivery optimization as part of their solution.</i></p>
59.	Section 2.01, 2.04, & 2.05	(Pages 7–12)	<p>To align implementation and training, does DEP favor a multi-phase division/regional rollout model or an immediate agency-wide launch at go-live?</p> <p><i>Answer: The Department would look for an immediate agency-wide launch at go-live.</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
60.	Section 2.01, 2.04, & 2.05	(Pages 7–12)	<p>What (if any) are the specific non-functional requirements regarding mobile accessibility (e.g., WCAG compliance) for the public-facing opt-in portals and messages?</p> <p><i>Answer: WCAG 2.1 at level A and AA standards are required.</i></p>
61.	Section 1.05 & 1.07	(Pages 5–6)	<p>Given requirements for secure data storage, opt-in portals, and automated syncing, is DEP open to expanding and leveraging its existing, agency-provisioned enterprise platforms (such as Salesforce) to maximize state ROI and minimize net-new integration costs?</p> <p><i>Answer: No.</i></p>
62.	Section 1.05 & 1.07	(Pages 5–6)	<p>Following this RFI evaluation, what is the targeted publication date for a formal RFP, and is funding tied to federal/state grants or pre-allocated operational budgets?</p> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #41.</i></p>
63.	Section 2.02 - Minimum System Requirements	9	<p>The RFI states that the system must interface with IPAWS for WEA, EAS, and HazCollect/NOAA Weather Radio, and that the vendor must be a FEMA IPAWS Alert Origination Software Provider. Please clarify whether this requirement must be met directly by the prime vendor, or whether it may be met through an integrated certified software provider, subcontractor, or technology partner.</p> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #18.</i></p>
64.	Section 2.02 - Minimum System Requirements	9	<p>Please clarify the IPAWS capabilities expected at go-live, including whether WEA, EAS, HazCollect/NOAA Weather Radio, and CAP message workflows must all be fully available from day one, or whether DEP would consider a phased implementation.</p> <p><i>Answer: IPAWS capabilities are not expected at go-live. We do not need flows configured at this time; however, the solution must be IPAWS compatible.</i></p>
65.	Section 2.03 - Minimum Notification Requirements	10	<p>The RFI requires SMS messaging through SMPP and an established short code whitelisted with major U.S. commercial cellular carriers. Please clarify whether the short code must be owned by the vendor, or whether an approved SMS gateway provider with carrier-whitelisted short code support is acceptable.</p> <p><i>Answer: SMS gateway is acceptable.</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
66.	Section 2.03 - Minimum Notification Requirements	10	<p>Please clarify which notification channels must be available at initial implementation, including phone, SMS, MMS, email, RSS, desktop alerts, mobile app alerts, and phone-based message launch.</p> <p><i>Answer: All notification channels must be available at Go-Live.</i></p>
67.	Section 2.03 - Minimum Notification Requirements	10	<p>The RFI states that system usage shall not be governed by minutes, messages, increments, or credits. Please clarify whether DEP expects a fixed annual subscription for unlimited usage, or whether vendors may provide alternate pricing models for informational purposes.</p> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #38.</i></p>
68.	Section 2.02 - Minimum System Requirements	8	<p>The RFI requires statewide coverage to an unlimited number of recipients and support for multiple simultaneous events. Please provide the estimated number of recipients, expected peak message volume, and expected number of concurrent incidents or events.</p> <p><i>Answer: See answers to questions #4 and #25.</i></p>
69.	Section 2.01 - Overview / Geographic Tools	8	<p>Please clarify the expected GIS-based targeting capabilities, including whether the solution must include built-in map-based targeting, integration with DEP or State GIS systems, or both.</p> <p><i>Answer: The solution must include built-in map-based targeting.</i></p>
70.	Section 2.01 - Overview / Geographic Tools	8	<p>For location-based alerts, please clarify the expected data sources, including whether locations will come from DEP systems, public opt-in users, E911 data, GIS layers, or a combination of these sources.</p> <p><i>Answer: A combination of these sources.</i></p>
71.	Section 2.01 - Overview	7	<p>The RFI mentions discovery capability for all text messaging for Public Records Requests. Please clarify the expected retention period, search capability, export format, and audit requirements for SMS/text message records.</p> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #53.</i></p>
72.	Section 2.04 - Minimum Security Requirements	11	<p>The RFI requires SSO integration using OAuth 2.0 or OpenID Connect. Please identify DEP's identity provider and clarify whether SAML support is required, preferred, or optional.</p> <p><i>Answer: OAuth 2.0 or OpenID connect is required. Keycloak will serve as the Identity Provider.</i></p>

Question #	Solicitation Section	Solicitation Page #	Question / Answer
73.	Section 2.04 - Minimum Security Requirements	11	<p>The RFI requires user management through role or group assignment within DEP's identity provider. Please clarify whether user roles should be managed fully in DEP's identity provider, fully in the notification system, or through a role-mapping approach between both systems.</p> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #72.</i></p> <p><i>Keycloak roles should be managed in Keycloak and the system should support role-mapping.</i></p>
74.	Section 2.01 and Section 2.03 - Accessibility Requirements	8, 10	<p>The RFI references Section 508, ADA compliance, and TDD/TTY capability. Please clarify whether DEP also expects WCAG 2.1 AA or WCAG 2.2 AA compliance for the public and private portals.</p> <p><i>Answer: Yes, WCAG 2.1 Level A and AA.</i></p>
75.	Section 2.05 - Minimum Support Requirements	11	<p>The RFI requires 24-hour helpdesk assistance, multilingual support, TTY support, and response within 30 minutes. Please clarify the required support languages and whether this support applies to DEP administrators only or also to public recipients.</p> <p><i>Answer: Applies to DEP administrators and support should be available in English.</i></p>
76.	Section 2.05 - Minimum Support Requirements	11	<p>The RFI requires backup site redundancy with automatic failover. Please clarify the expected uptime SLA, Recovery Time Objective, and Recovery Point Objective for the solution.</p> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #44.</i></p>
77.	Section 2.01 and Section 2.02 - Data Import / Contact Data Management	7, 10	<p>The RFI requires regular data synchronization, secure automated imports, and import/export of recipient group data. Please clarify the expected source systems, preferred data formats, sync frequency, and whether real-time API integration is preferred over scheduled file transfer.</p> <p><i>Answer: See answer to question #54.</i></p>

In accordance with Section 1.04 – Addenda to the RFI, the Department hereby formally amends the RFI. The amendments are indicated in blue with ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and underlines for additions.

### SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

The following schedule will be strictly adhered to in all actions relative to this posting. The Department reserves the right to make adjustments to this schedule and will notify Interested Entities in the request by posting an addendum on the VIP. It is the responsibility of the Interested Entity to check VIP on a regular basis for such updates.

DATES	EVENTS	METHOD
05.12.26	<b>RFI Advertised</b>	Vendor Information Portal <a href="https://vendor.myfloridamarketplace.com/">https://vendor.myfloridamarketplace.com/</a>
05.26.26 by 5:00 PM ET	<b>Questions Submitted in Writing</b>	Submit via email: Attn: Wanda Norton, Procurement Officer E-mail: <a href="mailto:Wanda.Norton@FloridaDEP.gov">Wanda.Norton@FloridaDEP.gov</a>  <b>RFI NUMBER MUST BE IN SUBJECT LINE OF EMAIL</b>
On or about, 06.09.26	<b>Answers to Questions Posted</b>	Vendor Information Portal <a href="https://vendor.myfloridamarketplace.com/">https://vendor.myfloridamarketplace.com/</a>
<del>06.23.26</del> <u>07.13.26</u> by 3:00 PM ET	<b>Response Due</b>	Submit via email: Attn: Wanda Norton, Procurement Officer E-mail: <a href="mailto:Wanda.Norton@FloridaDEP.gov">Wanda.Norton@FloridaDEP.gov</a>  <b>RFI NUMBER MUST BE IN SUBJECT LINE OF EMAIL</b>

### SECTION 2.00 – TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

**2.02 Minimum System Requirements.** The System shall include the following, minimum requirements:

- Provide statewide coverage to an unlimited number of recipients.
- Be capable of sending mass notifications for multiple unique simultaneous events.
- The following levels of access: Administrator, Jurisdiction Administrator, Message Originator and Recipient. The system must allow each administrator and message originator to have a unique username and credentials to access the site and launch calls, at no additional cost.
- Tiered administration to include multiple levels. Administrators shall be able to view system activity of all administrators below their level. There shall be no limit on the number of administrators.
- Allow administrators and jurisdiction administrators to create and edit an unlimited number of notification groups and sub-groups. Administrators and jurisdiction administrators shall be able to manage their own user groups. Jurisdiction administrators shall be able to create an unlimited number of message categories that recipients may subscribe to.
- Be web-based and hosted on the vendor’s infrastructure, accessible from any internet connection. The vendor will not require additional client- or server-based hardware to be housed on-site by administrators. The web-based system must be compatible with supported versions of industry standard browsers, at a minimum, Microsoft Edge, Google Chrome, Apple Safari and Mozilla Firefox.

- Fully interface with the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System (IPAWS) for alerting via Wireless Emergency Alerts (WEA), Emergency Alert System (EAS), and HazCollect National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Weather Radio All Hazards. The vendor must be a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) IPAWS Alert Origination Software Provider.
- ~~The ability to accept and utilize E911 phone data at no additional cost and be able to scrub duplicate information.~~
- Provide a training/exercise mode which provides full functionality but separate from contact data in the “real-world” instances of the system.
- Contains a reporting tool, with the ability for jurisdictions to define reports without vendor assistance and any jurisdiction-defined report format to be generated again in the future. The number of report formats shall be unlimited. The system shall allow for the export of any data in standard delimited format and pdf.
- Allow for the creation and storage of pre-scripted scenarios and messages. The system shall be able to store broadcast templates/scenarios with content and recipients for later deployment. The system shall allow jurisdiction administrators and message originators to edit pre-scripted messages and scenarios as needed.
- Capable of text-to-speech. Voice recordings and text-to-speech must be reviewable as part of message origination workflow before message transmission.
- Allow web-based access for recipients to a jurisdiction-specific subscription portal where they can “opt in” to the system and manage contact information.
- Allow the public to opt-in to the system by registering phone numbers, SMS/Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS) numbers and email addresses. The system will only require the public to enter one selection for the record to be effective. This information shall be updated in real time. Lost password and username recovery shall be accomplished automatically and without administrator action.
- Allow jurisdiction administrators to customize, without vendor intervention, the opt-in page content and banner for custom branding.
- Ability for recipients to identify a preferred language.
- Allow citizens to register a minimum of two (2) location points in their recipient profile (example: work, home, etc.). The system shall provide all of the following methods for recipients to register with it:
  - Automatically compare addresses against the United States Postal Service data to suggest a correct address, and then automatically geocode the address into the recipient’s profile.
  - Provide the ability for recipients to manually input latitude/longitude or decimal degree.
  - Provide the ability for recipients to access a graphical user interface where they can view their location on a map and select point.
- Able to support a minimum of two (2) telephone numbers, two (2) SMS numbers, and two (2) email addresses per recipient.
- Adhere to the Common Alerting Protocol (CAP) standard specified by FEMA via the Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards (OASIS). As new CAP versions and sources are implemented, the system must be updated to include CAP format changes as part of ongoing system updates.
- Support automatically adding and removing recipients at the jurisdiction-level from static and dynamic groups without vendor assistance.
- The inherent capability to immediately import and export recipient group and subgroup data. Capable of accepting recurring, automated imports and updates, via a secured service. Information could include items such as employee phone numbers, email addresses, physical addresses and other relevant contact information at no additional cost.