



ADDENDUM NO. 1

RFP #25/26-101 – Police Training Simulator – Various Sites

Date Issued: March 20, 2026

This Addendum forms a part of the Request for Proposal (RFP) documents and shall be acknowledged as part of the Vendor's proposal submission. The following questions were received from prospective vendors. Responses are provided below for clarification.

Question 1

Question: Can CRY-ROP utilize a cooperative purchasing contract instead of submitting a proposal through this RFP?

Response: This project has been formally released as RFP #25/26-101. Vendors must submit a proposal in accordance with the requirements and instructions outlined in the RFP in order to be considered during the evaluation process.

Question 2

Question: What level of use-of-force options should be included with the training simulator?

Response: CRY-ROP is primarily seeking a training simulator that emphasizes scenario-based learning focused on decision-making, mental health awareness, and verbal de-escalation techniques. Pepper spray represents the highest anticipated level of use-of-force for student training. Vendors should ensure any higher-level use-of-force scenarios are limited or restricted and appropriate for a High School level educational environment. Vendors may include additional capabilities as optional components, and systems that offer curated scenario or playlist options are encouraged.

Question 3

Question: Is it required that the training be conducted onsite?

Response: Per the RFP, the successful proposer must provide comprehensive training, including system operation, scenario creation, and maintenance. Initial train-the-trainer instruction is preferable to be conducted onsite unless otherwise approved, however, we are open to a virtual alternative.

Vendors proposing a virtual alternative must provide justification and demonstrate equivalent effectiveness.

Question 4

Question: Is there a preferred number of students who can participate simultaneously in a VR or simulation scenario?

Response: CRY-ROP seeks a simulator solution that supports 2 to 4 concurrent participants in a simulation scenario. The system should also support real-time observation by up to 35 students in a classroom setting (e.g., via display or projection).

Vendors should specify:

- Maximum number of concurrent users and recommended configurations
- How the system supports real-time observation
- Any relevant system requirements or performance considerations (e.g., hardware, space, tracking).

Question 5

Question: How important is scenario customization for instructors?

Response: Vendors should provide systems that allow for flexibility in training scenarios to support instructional objectives. Scenarios should align with an High School level educational environment, including restricted or limited deadly force scenarios (see Question 2 for additional context). Please describe available customization features in your proposal.

Question 6

Question: Is student performance tracking and reporting required?

Response: Vendors are encouraged to include student performance tracking, reporting, and evaluation tools as part of their system if available. It is not a requirement. The system should also support instruction in a classroom setting and be observable by up to 35 students simultaneously. Please describe available features in your proposal.

Question 7

Question: Will the system be used for individual or group instruction?

Response: The system should be suitable for classroom-based instruction, which may include both individual and group participation. Vendors should describe how their system supports these use cases.

Question 8

Question: Is CRY-ROP seeking VR-based systems, projection-based systems, or both?

Response: CRY-ROP is open to various simulator technologies, including VR-based and projection-based systems. Proposed solutions must support instructional use in a High School level educational environment and be observable by up to 35 students at one time. Vendors should clearly describe their system configuration.

Question 9

Question: How important are after-action review tools (e.g., playback, annotations, performance tracking)?

Response: After-action review capabilities are considered valuable components of a training system. Vendors should include and describe any available review, playback, and performance analysis features in their proposal if applicable.

End of Addendum No. 1