



CLARIFICATION DOCUMENT

Please note clarifications may be provided in response to queries submitted and/or at the Contracting Authority's own volition and discretion. Submitted queries may have to be modified for publication purposes.

Contracting Authority:	Irish Prison Service
Title of competition:	Multi operator framework for the provision of a Body Worn Camera system with associated accessories, software and Services, for Irish Prison Services.
Procedure	Competitive Procedure with Negotiation
eTenders Ref:	8369846
Closing date and time for Queries:	03/07/2026 @12 noon (Irish time)
Closing date and time for Submissions:	13/07/2026 @12 noon (Irish time)
<i>This Clarification relates specifically to Questions 1 to 21. For completeness, it contains answers to all the questions to date.</i>	
Clarification Number:	1
Issue Date:	Monday, 29 June 2026

Question #1:

Regarding MR1 "current closed video management system" can the contracting Authority confirm:

1. The name, manufacturer and version of the current video management system, where this can be disclosed
2. If the system name cannot be disclosed at this stage for security reasons, the required integration method, file formats, metadata requirements, API/interface requirements, and any applicable evidential audit/logging requirements
3. Whether "compatible" means direct technical integration with the existing VMS, export/import of video and metadata into the VMS, playback/search capability within the VMS, or interoperability with a separate on-premises BWC evidence management system
4. Whether suppliers may propose an on-premises BWC evidence management system that interfaces with the existing IPS local system, subject to meeting all data security, audit, retention and evidential integrity requirements.

Answer #1:

1. Johnson Controls/American Dynamics; Victor (version 4.00.3188.188)
2. System Above



3. The Footage from the cameras when docked, get uploaded into a Video Edge CCTV recorder, in the victor environment, and can be viewed there along with normal cameras, for a period of 28 days. If the evidence is to be retained for future use, it is exported and kept in IPS Storage which is integrated and managed from the victor environment.
4. Victor is AD integrated and the BWC cameras are tracked to officers, all officers' activity are logged and audited, via Victor ... Any proposed on-premises BWC evidence management system must clearly show how it meets current integration with Victor.

Question #2:

Regarding MR3 "on-premises video/data storage requirement" can the contracting Authority confirm:

1. Whether the Irish Prison Service already has an on-premises storage platform/local system in place for receipt of BWC footage, or whether the supplier is expected to provide this as part of the proposed solution
2. Whether storage is required locally at each prison location, centrally within the IPS estate, or via another IPS-hosted architecture
3. The expected integration method between the BWC docking/upload system and the IPS local system, including any file format, metadata, audit trail, encryption, retention, access control or evidential integrity requirements
4. Whether the supplier will be responsible for storage sizing, resilience, backup, disaster recovery, monitoring and ongoing maintenance of the on-premises storage environment
5. The expected retention periods, estimated daily/monthly footage volumes, and number of users/cameras to be supported for the initial Mountjoy Male Prison deployment and any subsequent estate-wide rollout

Answer #2:

1. IPS already has long term storage for the Evidence, or footage to be retained as long term evidence, however current operational footage, retained for 28 days, are currently stored on a Video Edge CCTV recorder, in the current CCTV VMS.
2. Currently stored locally first on CCTV recorder – then when saved as evidence it goes to a local evidence gateway and back to centrally.
3. Fully integrated to upload footage to Victor VMS and put it on Video Edge Recorder – to include officer name that camera was assigned to that day, timestamps and audio.
4. Initial day to day storage on recorders is the vendors responsibility, video retained for long term is the responsibility of the IPS.
5. 28 Days on Site recorder – (same Nationwide)



Question #3:

In relation to section B1 Quality Assurance Measures there is a large section explaining the minimum requirement to remain eligible in the competition we can't see where a response to this is to be inserted only the tick boxes and certificate information etc please can you advise if there is a requirement for us to add a response to this in detail

Answer #3:

All additional information can be submitted as an appendix to the response.

Question #4:

Does MR1 require the body-worn camera solution to integrate or interoperate with a specific existing video management system already in place across the prison estate? Or would a self-contained, closed (offline/on-premise) video management system, supplied as part of the body-worn camera solution and operating independently within the prison network, satisfy this requirement?

Answer #4:

See answer 1, must integrate with this solution (Johnson Controls/American Dynamics; Victor (version 4.00.3188.188)

Question #5:

If integration with a named existing platform is required, we would be grateful if the Contracting Authority could identify the system concerned and the nature of the integration expected.

Answer #5:

Johnson Controls/American Dynamics; Victor (version 4.00.3188.188)

The Footage from the cameras when docked, get uploaded into a Video Edge CCTV recorder, in the victor environment, and can be viewed there along with normal cameras, for a period of 28 days. If the evidence is to be retained for future use, it is exported and kept in IPS Storage which is integrated and managed from the victor environment.

Question #6:

The Qualification Questionnaire appears to contain two different reference periods for previous experience.

In the summary table under B3 Previous Experience, Candidates are requested to refer to instances within the previous five years. However, in the Questionnaire Response Document, under Previous Experience, Candidates are requested to refer to instances within the last ten (10) years.

Could the Contracting Authority please confirm which reference period applies for the purposes of assessing Previous Experience?



In particular, please confirm whether Candidates may submit reference contracts delivered within the last ten (10) years, provided that such contracts are comparable in nature and scale and were substantially delivered by the Candidate party.

Answer #6:

Apologies for the confusion, please refer to contract delivered in the past **Ten (10) years**.

Question #7:

If the five-year period is intended to apply, would the Contracting Authority nevertheless accept and evaluate reference contracts completed or substantially delivered more than five years ago but within the last ten (10) years, where such references demonstrate highly relevant experience in secure environments, including prisons, critical national infrastructure, border security, high-security government buildings or comparable environments?

Answer #7:

Please refer to Question 6 above.

Question #8:

Can the Contracting Authority confirm whether ongoing contracts may be submitted as reference contracts, provided that a substantial part of the relevant services, supplies or implementation activities have already been delivered?

If so, should the Candidate describe only the delivered scope, or may the Candidate also describe planned but not yet delivered elements of the ongoing contract?

Answer #8:

Ongoing contracts may be submitted. However, candidates must understand that If elements of the requirements have not yet been delivered, assessment will be limited to the elements that have been delivered. The IPS cannot make any assumptions on “not yet delivered elements”.

Question #9:

Framework agreements and call-off contracts as references

Where a Candidate has delivered relevant services under a framework agreement, should the reference be presented as:

- a) the overall framework agreement,
- b) individual call-off contracts delivered under that framework, or
- c) both, where this provides the clearest evidence of comparable scale, complexity and successful delivery?

Answer #9:

Option (c) is the mostly appropriate approach, noting that Frameworks are a method of awarding contracts.



Question #10:

- a) Where a Candidate relies on another entity, subcontractor, consortium member or technology partner for part of the previous experience requirement, can the Contracting Authority confirm whether at least one of the three reference contracts must include that third party, as indicated in the Response Document?
- b) Please also confirm whether the Candidate may submit references where the Candidate acted as prime contractor/integrator and the third party supplied specialist equipment or software.

Answer #10:

- a) This is acceptable, once you clearly identify the candidate and the relevant contract.
- b) This is acceptable.

Question #11:

Meaning of “current closed video management system”

Mandatory Requirement MR1 states that the proposed solution must be compatible with the current closed video management system in the Prison estate.

Could the Contracting Authority please identify the current video management system, including, where possible:

- a) manufacturer,
- b) product name,
- c) product version,
- d) deployment model,
- e) whether it is used centrally or separately per prison location,
- f) available integration interfaces or APIs.

Answer #11:

- a) Johnson Controls/American Dynamics; ()
- b) Victor
- c) version 4.00.3188.188
- d) Victor Application Site Server
- e) One Per Site - Separate per prisons, also a central Site server that gives HQ a view of all recorders across the estate.
- f) Johnson Controls / American Dynamics API - use to be determined by vendor / solution provider.



Question #12:

Required level of compatibility with the existing video management system

Could the Contracting Authority please clarify what level of compatibility is required at the Qualification stage?

In particular, please confirm whether Candidates are required to demonstrate:

- a) native certified integration with the existing video management system,
- b) integration through a documented API,
- c) integration through ONVIF or another standard interface,
- d) import/export of video files and metadata,
- e) operational compatibility without direct technical integration at this stage.

Answer #12:

- a) Yes
- b) Yes
- c) Yes
- d) Yes
- e) No – proposed solution must demonstrate integration with existing infrastructure

Question #13:

Scope of the required integration

Please confirm which of the following must be supported by the proposed Body Worn Camera solution in relation to the existing video management system:

- a) live video streaming from body worn cameras,
- b) upload of recorded video,
- c) import/export of metadata,
- d) user identity and officer assignment,
- e) incident/case identifiers,
- f) timestamps and location metadata, where applicable,
- g) audit trail,
- h) chain of custody,
- i) retention and deletion policies,
- j) evidential export.

Answer #13:

- a) Yes
- b) Yes



- c) Yes
- d) Yes
- e) Yes
- f) Yes
- g) Yes
- h) Yes
- i) Yes

Question #14:

On-premises storage and docking workflow

Mandatory Requirement MR3 states that video storage must be on-premises and that data and footage from the Body Worn Cameras will be automatically uploaded to the Irish Prison Service local system once the BWC is inserted in the camera docking station, after which no data will remain on the BWC.

Could the Contracting Authority please clarify whether the “Irish Prison Service local system” refers to:

- a) the current closed video management system,
- b) a separate on-premises digital evidence management system,
- c) local storage at each prison site,
- d) a central IPS-hosted on-premises repository,
- e) another system to be specified at tender stage?

Answer #14:

- a) Yes - VMS recorder first
- b) No
- c) No
- d) No
- e) No

Question #15:

Evidence required at Qualification stage for MR1

At the Qualification stage, is it sufficient for Candidates to confirm that their proposed solution can be made compatible with the current closed video management system, or must Candidates already provide technical evidence, such as integration documentation, vendor confirmation, API compatibility statements or previous integration examples?

Answer #15:



No, Candidates must provide technical evidence, such as integration documentation, vendor confirmation, API compatibility statements or previous integration examples.

Question #16:

Vendor certification or approval

Will the Contracting Authority require the proposed solution or integration to be certified, approved or supported by the manufacturer of the existing video management system?

If yes, please confirm whether such certification or approval is required at the Qualification stage or only at the Tender stage.

Answer #16:

Yes – certification at the Tender stage.

Question #17:

Equal treatment and interoperability

To ensure equal treatment of Candidates, can the Contracting Authority confirm whether compatibility with the current closed video management system may be demonstrated through open, documented and non-proprietary interfaces where available, rather than through a vendor-specific or incumbent-only integration?

Answer #17:

Must be vendor-specific or incumbent-only integration.

Question #18:

Future tender-stage information

The Qualification Questionnaire indicates that detailed requirements will be made available at tender stage. Could the Contracting Authority please confirm whether full technical details of the existing video management system and required integration approach will be made available to all shortlisted Candidates at the Tender stage?

Answer #18:

Yes

Question #19:

Security and data handling

Please confirm whether the Body Worn Camera solution must operate entirely without cloud services, or whether limited cloud-based components are permitted provided that video footage and evidential data remain stored on-premises within the Irish Prison Service environment.

Answer #19:

To confirm the solution must operate entirely without cloud services.



Question #20:

Data deletion from BWC after upload

Mandatory Requirement MR3 states that once docked and uploaded, no data will remain on the BWC. Could the Contracting Authority please clarify whether this requires:

- a) automatic deletion immediately after successful upload,
- b) secure deletion/wiping after verification,
- c) retention on the device until integrity verification has completed,
- d) configurable deletion policy controlled by IPS.

Answer #20:

- a) automatic deletion immediately after successful upload.
- b) automatic deletion immediately after successful upload.
- c) No.
- d) Yes

Question #21:

- (a) Regarding Section A1, Question 4, could the Contracting Authority please confirm that if a Lead Candidate relies on the capacities of an affiliated entity belonging to the exact same corporate group, this affiliated entity will not be required to co-sign the formal contract?
- (b) Consequently, if they are not required to co-sign the contract, could you please confirm that the correct answer to Section A1, Question 4 for this specific intra-group scenario would be 'No'?

Answer #21:

- (a) Ideally, The framework agreement and Initial Contract will sign with the lead Candidate. However, if a candidate is relying on a fundamental requirement from another party, this may be required. In this situation specifically, where the other “party” is part of the same corporate group and the risk is greatly reduced, then the Lead candidate would be acceptable to sign the framework agreement and contract.
- (b) Specifically in the case presented above the answer would be no. However, as a general comment, irrespective of the nature of the relationship, same corporate group/ sub-contractor/ consortium etc. IPS might request clarity at the next stage of the competition, on how the relationship might work.