

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) 149-26

**MAXIMO APPLICATION SUITE
(MAS) UPGRADE**

CITY OF HENDERSON

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	General	2
1.2	Purpose of this SoW	2
1.3	Reference Documents	2
2	HENDERSON BACKGROUND	3
2.1	General	3
2.2	MAS Upgrade	3
2.3	Known Risks and Constraints Identified in Prior Phases.....	4
3	VENDOR SUBMISSIONS	6
3.1	General Response Expectations	6
3.2	Vendor Qualifications Requirements	6
3.3	Request for Proposals (Scored Evaluation).....	8
4	VENDOR EVALUATION.....	10
4.1	Vendor Evaluation Overview.....	10
5	PROJECT TIMELINE & CONTACT	11
5.1	Submission Deadline	11
5.2	NGEM (Nevada Government eMarketplace).....	11
5.3	Submission Instructions.....	11
5.4	Vendor Selection Timeline.....	11

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 General

The City of Henderson (the City) currently operates IBM Maximo 7.6.1.3 to support asset management across facilities and other asset classes. The City intends to transition this environment to IBM Maximo Application Suite (MAS) to better support evolving operational needs, system integrations, security requirements, and long-term asset management maturity.

1.2 Purpose of this SoW

The purpose of this Statement of Work (SoW) is to:

- Request proposals to support City's MAS upgrade and related services
- Provide consistent information to all vendors responding to this Request for Proposals (RFP)
- Clearly communicate how vendor submissions will be evaluated, including minimum qualification requirements and scored evaluation criteria
- Enable the City to compare vendor approaches, assumptions, qualifications, and costs on a consistent basis

1.3 Reference Documents

In addition to this SoW, vendors should reference the following documents when developing their submissions:

- Appendix A – Functional and Technical Requirements: Vendor proposals must align with the requirements and constraints defined in Appendix A; proposals that conflict with these requirements may be disqualified.
 - i. Cloud / SaaS Managed Services
 - ii. On-Premises + Managed Services
- Appendix B – City of Henderson Indicative Technology Contracting Conditions: Provided for informational purposes to ensure vendors understand applicable contractual terms. This is not the complete or final contract and is provided as a sample only. Final terms and conditions will be determined once a vendor has been shortlisted. Shortlisted vendors must comply with the City's Terms and Conditions.
- Appendix C – Sample Financial Stability and Non-Disclosure Letter: Provided for informational purposes to ensure vendors understand financial stability compliance when providing a submission. The City reserves the right to request additional financial

documentation as needed. The Financial Stability and Non-Disclosure Letter which must be submitted by the Vendor on letterhead including the financial reference.

- Appendix D – City of Henderson Intelligence (AI) Questionnaire: Questionnaire must be completed by all vendors providing a submission.

2 HENDERSON BACKGROUND

2.1 General

The City of Henderson (“City”), incorporated in 1953, is the second largest city in Nevada, home to more than 369,000 residents. The City currently spans nearly 121.65+/- square miles and is nestled among three of the most renowned man-made attractions in the world: the Las Vegas Strip, the Hoover Dam, and the Lake Mead Recreational Area. The City’s mission is to provide services and resources that enhance the quality of life for those who live, learn, work, and play in our community.

This project aims to upgrade the City’s existing Maximo platform to the Maximo Application Suite (MAS). By modernizing our enterprise asset management (EAM) infrastructure, we will remove legacy technical barriers and strengthen integrations with existing City applications. This upgrade directly supports the proactive maintenance and reliability of the City’s vital public infrastructure through enhanced data driven insights. The two departments that use Maximo are the Department of Utility Services (DUS) and the Public Works Department (PW).

DUS is responsible for all facets of water, wastewater, and reclaimed water services for the City. Our operations include the distribution of drinking water, the collection and treatment of wastewater, laboratory testing, utility infrastructure planning and management, and customer care and billing services. To support these core operations, DUS uses Maximo to manage approximately 550,000 assets and complete nearly 90,000 work orders each year.

PW maintains essential City infrastructure- such as streets, drainage systems, public facilities, and related operational assets- and relies on IBM Maximo to manage this portfolio effectively. PW currently manages 205,291 assets in Maximo, and the system supports the department by centralizing asset data, work management, and maintenance activities, enabling the department to plan, track, and sustain critical infrastructure with greater accuracy, consistency, and long term lifecycle stewardship.

2.2 MAS Upgrade

The City has used IBM Maximo for approximately 15 years to support asset management functions including work management, inventory and materials management, and asset lifecycle management. The City is now undertaking a structured, multi-phase effort to transition its existing

IBM Maximo 7.6.1.3 environment to MAS. This initiative is intended to modernize the City's asset management platform, improve system scalability and maintainability, and ensure long-term alignment with evolving operational, technical, and security requirements.

The City completed an initiative dedicated to defining technical and functional requirements for the MAS environment (provided in Appendix A). This effort included workshops and analysis to:

- Identify and document functional and technical requirements
- Assess impacts to existing Maximo integrations
- Evaluate customizations requiring replacement or re-implementation in MAS
- Develop a requirements matrix to support vendor comparison and evaluation

Special attention was given to understanding how the selected deployment option would affect existing integrations, including potential redesign or validation requirements, as well as the handling of custom Maximo functionality. At this time, the City is exploring whether to proceed with Cloud/SaaS or On-Premises and are therefore welcoming approaches for both options.

The project is currently in the solicitation phase, during which the City is requesting vendor submissions in response to the RFP. Vendors responding to this request are not expected to revisit or redefine prior strategic decisions but are instead asked to propose an approach that aligns with the defined requirements, constraints, and deployment direction established during earlier phases.

Following submission, the City will validate vendor qualifications, evaluate responses, and select a vendor to support the MAS upgrade. The selected vendor will then work collaboratively with the City to finalize the implementation approach, confirm assumptions, and proceed with contract negotiation and execution.

The City's target objective is to complete implementation by the end of the second quarter of 2027. This timeline is subject to change. Additional schedule context is provided in Section 6.

2.3 Known Risks and Constraints Identified in Prior Phases

During earlier phases of the MAS upgrade effort, the City identified the following risks and considerations. These items are provided to ensure vendors are aware of known constraints and areas requiring careful planning and risk mitigation. These risks are not exhaustive. Vendors are expected to demonstrate awareness of these risks and describe how their proposed approach addresses or mitigates them, where applicable.

A. Platform Lifecycle and Schedule

- IBM support for Maximo 7.6 is scheduled to end in April 2027, after which no new fixes or patches will be provided by IBM. This creates a schedule constraint for completing the MAS upgrade and stabilizing the target environment.
- Upgrading to the latest versions of Maximo Manage or Maximo Spatial may introduce new defects, behavioral changes, or regressions that must be identified and resolved through structured testing and stabilization activities.

B. Deployment Model

- A Cloud/SaaS deployment requires significant redesign and modification of several existing external system integrations that currently rely on direct database access or batch-based data exchange.
- A Cloud/SaaS deployment may introduce performance considerations for Maximo Spatial, particularly for GIS-intensive workflows, map rendering, and bi-directional spatial data synchronization.
- An on-premises deployment requires the addition of compute, memory, and storage resources within the City's data center to support the MAS 9.x platform operating on Red Hat OpenShift. Infrastructure sizing assumptions must be validated during implementation planning.

C. Integration, Report, and Data

- For a Cloud/SaaS deployment, a production database replica or alternative architecture may be required to support reporting and ArcadisGen forecasting if REST-based data access methods prove insufficient for performance or data completeness needs.
- Existing SharePoint URL references used for DocLinks must be confirmed to function correctly in the MAS 9.x environment and under the selected deployment model.
- Compatibility issues may arise if third-party systems, including EAM360, do not support the selected MAS version or deployment architecture.

D. Security, Identify, and Licensing

- Existing security group assignments may require reevaluation as part of the transition to MAS to ensure appropriate role-based access and to align with MAS AppPoint licensing. If not managed carefully, there is a risk of over-allocating AppPoints and incurring unnecessary licensing costs.
- The transition from Maximo-native LDAP synchronization to the MAS identity model (e.g., Microsoft Entra ID) may require security group and role remapping. This effort is

dependent on City IT availability and coordination and may affect the overall project schedule if not planned appropriately.

3 VENDOR SUBMISSIONS

3.1 General Response Expectations

The City is issuing an RFP to identify a vendor best suited to support the MAS upgrade. Vendor submissions must include all required qualification materials and a scope-based response addressing how the work would be completed and at what cost. Vendor proposals should clearly state all assumptions. Assumptions not explicitly stated may not be accepted during contract negotiation.

3.2 Vendor Qualifications Requirements

Vendor Qualifications are evaluated on a pass/fail basis and must be submitted as outlined in Table 1 - Vendor Qualifications. All qualification submissions must clearly reference the applicable ID number from Table 1. Unless otherwise specified, all Vendor Qualification requirements apply equally to the prime vendor and all proposed subcontractors. Failure to submit required qualification materials may result in disqualification.

Table 1 - Vendor Qualifications

Vendor Qualifications			
#	Heading Category	Qualification	Requirement
I.1	Administrative	Cover Letter & Point of Contact	Submission of a signed cover letter identifying an authorized representative and a single point of contact for the proposal. <i>2-page limit.</i>
I.2		Vendor Entity Description	Provide a description of the responding entity, including the parent company and all proposed subcontractors. All qualification requirements detailed in the SoW or additional documents supplied by the City apply equally to subcontractors, unless otherwise specified. <i>No page limit, but respondents are encouraged to be brief. Pre-printed brochures, presentations, and other marketing materials are not desired and will not be considered.</i>
I.3		Required Forms & Certifications	Submit proof of IBM partnership and any required procurement or compliance forms. <i>No page limit.</i>
II.1	Experience & Capability <i>15-page limit</i>	Firm Experience	Continuous operation for a minimum of five (5) years. <i>No page limit.</i>
II.2		MAS Upgrade Experience	Completion of at least three (3) Maximo 7.X to MAS upgrade projects.
II.3		MAS Upgrade Experience - On-Prem / Cloud	Experience supporting On Prem and/or Cloud/SaaS MAS environments, including relevant cloud and hybrid integrations, based on the deployment approach being proposed. <i>5 pages maximum.</i>
II.4		Public-Sector / Utility Experience	Completion of at least three (3) MAS or Maximo upgrades for public-sector or utility clients of comparable size to the City, including facilities assets (not limited to water or wastewater). Comparable size criteria shall align with the Statement of Work. <i>5 pages maximum.</i>
II.5		Client References	Must provide at least three (3) verifiable client references for Maximo or MAS upgrades and managed services engagements.
II.6		Dedicated Delivery Team	Identify a dedicated project delivery team with defined roles. Team members must be available to work in the same time zone as the City (PST). Vendors with unescorted access to our data or servers must be based in the US and pass the Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) background check. <i>3-page limit for description of project delivery team. No page limit for team member resumes.</i>
III.1	Hosting & Operations	MAS Hosting Capability	Demonstrate the ability to provide MAS hosting and/or managed services, and other related services to transition the City to MAS either directly or through a qualified subcontractor. <i>No page limit.</i>
III.2		Managed Services & Support Model	Provide a defined post-go-live support and managed services model, including Service Level Agreements (SLAs), uptime targets, response time, and escalation procedures. <i>No page limit.</i>
IV.1	Legal & Financial	Financial Stability	Must demonstrate sufficient financial stability to support project delivery and ongoing operations. Documentation may include a formal letter confirming financial viability from a certified financial institution. See Appendix C for sample letter. Vendors must report employee turnover for the past three years and provide their current employee headcount.
IV.2		Security Requirements	Must complete All the City Questionnaire, found in Appendix D.
IV.3		Regulatory / Legal Compliance	Must provide written confirmation of no unresolved conflicts of interest or disqualifying legal actions that would impact contract execution. If any potential conflicts exist, the vendor must disclose all relevant information and provide sufficient detail to allow the City to fully evaluate the circumstances and determine whether to proceed. <i>1-page limit.</i>
IV.4		Licensing & Certifications	Must possess and provide proof of all licenses and certifications required to operate and contract in the project jurisdiction, including but not limited to, registration as a business in the State of Nevada, prior to contract execution. <i>No page limit.</i>

3.3 Request for Proposals (Scored Evaluation)

Vendors shall submit an RFP response describing their proposed upgrade strategy. The required sections of the RFP submission are outlined in the Evaluation Table (next page), along with their associated weighting.

The RFP submission will be scored using a percentage system. Vendors should strive to respond to all categories of the RFP described below in a concise fashion and remain within page limits where specified.

The City's overall evaluation approach is described in the following section to help vendors understand how submissions will be assessed.

The City may require a presentation by short listed Vendors, and presentations shall be conducted via MS Teams.

EVALUATION DETAILS				
	Item	Evaluation Title	Evaluation Description	Weight
Part 1	1	MAS Upgrade Approach and Strategy	Vendor's upgrade philosophy. Describes a clear, single MAS upgrade strategy (e.g., lift and shift, transform) grounded in prior utility experience. Clearly explains why the approach is appropriate for the City’s environment.	10
	2	Project Team	Provides a dedicated project team, including defined roles and relevant experience.	10
	3	Migration Phasing & Sequencing	Provides a phased upgrade plan that includes preparation, configuration, testing, validation, cutover, and stabilization. Sequencing reflects operational continuity and risk mitigation.	35
	4	Integration Technical Approach	Identifies key system integrations and demonstrates awareness of integration complexity during upgrades or hosting transitions. Describes common risks associated with re-implementing or validating integrations during MAS upgrades and outlines mitigation strategies (e.g., rollback options).	45
			Total	100
Part 2	1	Project understanding*	Demonstrates understanding of the project and aligns the submission with the Statement of Work and technical and functional requirements.	20
	2	Risk Management	Identifies potential risks, including technical, schedule, integration, operational, and change management risks, using prior experience. Proposes practical mitigation strategies directly tied to identified risks (e.g., regression testing, phased cutovers, stabilization periods).	20
	3	Support Model	Clearly describes the hosting and managed services model, including roles and responsibilities, SLAs, escalation paths, and support availability. Demonstrates experience supporting mission critical systems. Clearly defines roles and responsibilities for each proposed deployment strategy. Demonstrates the ability to align maintenance windows, notifications, and support processes with the City’s operational needs.	15
	4	Proposed Project Timeline	Provides a project timeline that is defensible, realistic, and includes all tasks to be completed. Identifies operational constraints and accounts for potential PTO, holidays, and dependencies.	15
	5	Data Validation	Explains the approach to data cleansing, extraction, migration (if applicable), including how data accuracy will be confirmed post-cutover, and validation based on prior Maximo/MAS upgrade experience.	10
	6	Fee Schedule	Includes a fee schedule or detailed budget with task level or milestone based breakdowns and explanations where costs exceed expectations. Includes forecasted operational budgets (e.g., Year 1 and beyond) and uses prior experience to justify assumptions.	10
	7	Confidence & Realism*	Proposal is consistent, realistic, and supported by prior experience. Assumptions appear achievable and well reasoned.	5
	8	Scalability Strategy	Demonstrates how the solution scales users, data, integrations, and mobile usage over time. Describes governance structures and controls to support scalability and long term system health.	5
			Total	100

*Both Project Understanding and Confidence & Realism do not require dedicated headings within vendor submissions. These criteria will be evaluated based on the submission as a whole.

4 VENDOR EVALUATION

4.1 Vendor Evaluation Overview

The City's will evaluate submissions first for the Vendor Qualifications. If vendors are to fail any of the specified sections, the City may choose to disqualify the vendor from further evaluation. The City is not required to notify vendors if they have been disqualified, however they may reach out for clarification as desired.

Once the City has deemed the vendor has passed the qualifications requirements, they will evaluate the RFP submission. The City will evaluate the RFP submission using a two-part evaluation approach:

- Part 1: Vendor Upgrade & General Philosophy
- Part 2: Vendor Alignment with the City's Objectives

This two-part approach allows the City to assess both:

1. A vendor's ability to successfully deliver the MAS upgrade, and
2. The vendor's overall alignment with the City's operational needs, goals, and constraints.

Each part of the evaluation will be weighted equally in the City's overall assessment.

5 PROJECT TIMELINE & CONTACT

5.1 Submission Deadline

The City is requesting vendors to have their submissions in by Tuesday July 14, 2026.

5.2 NGEM (Nevada Government eMarketplace)

Vendors must register as a supplier in NGEM in order to review the contents of the RFP. The website is: www.ngemnv.com. Questions regarding this RFP shall be submitted through NGEM, and RFP submissions must be submitted through NGEM.

5.3 Submission Instructions

Vendors shall submit their complete RFP submission electronically through NGEM. Submissions should be provided as a single compressed (.zip) file unless otherwise instructed.

1. All Requirements as outlined in Vendor Requirements – Table 1 in this RFP
2. Any Exceptions to the City of Henderson’s Information Technology Contracting Conditions – Appendix B
3. Financial Stability and Non-Disclosure Statement signed by an Officer of the Company and includes a financial reference – Appendix C
4. Completed Artificial Intelligence Questionnaire - Appendix D

5.4 Vendor Selection Timeline

The City is providing the following high-level timeline related to vendor selection:

Item	Description
Vendor Question Period	Vendors may submit questions and requests for clarification during the designated question period.
Responses to Questions	All questions and corresponding responses will be compiled and posted to https://www.ngemnv.com/ to ensure consistent information to all.
Submission Validation Period	Following submission, the City and its representatives may contact individual vendors to clarify specific elements of their submissions, as needed. Any requests for clarification will be directed only to the applicable vendor.

The City reserves the right to modify the timeline at its discretion and will notify vendors of any changes.

[The Remainder of this Page Intentionally Left Blank]