January 23, 2012

RE: Bid Title: Request for Proposals for NG 9-1-1 System
       Bid No: BC-01-11-12-25
       Opening Date: Thursday, February 9. 2012 at 2:00PM

ADDENDUM #4

Dear Vendor:

This letter serves as Addendum #4 for the above referenced project. The following questions were received and the answers follow.

1.   Attached is a sets of answers prepared by RCC to vendor submitted questions;

Acknowledgment of this addendum is required as part of your bid submittal. Failure to acknowledge this addendum may result in rejection of your bid (may be done on page 17, the Proposal Response Cover Sheet).

Should you have any questions, feel free to call me at (850) 606-1600.

Sincerely,

Keith M. Roberts
Purchasing Director

The following are responses to questions received by Leon County for the NG9-1-1 System Request for Proposal (#BC-01-11-12-25). This and all other documents issued are a part of the contract documentation. When returning your response to the RFP, please acknowledge receipt of this document (may be done on page 17, the Proposal Response Cover sheet).

---

1.   Question: This vendor respectfully requests and extension of the deadline for response for two additional weeks beyond the January 11, 2012 deadline, to January 25, 2012, in order to prepare a detailed response to this RFP, and in consideration of the responses to our additional questions to the County. It is our belief that other potential vendors, and the overall process for the County, will benefit from the answers to these questions.

Response:	The County has extended the response deadline to 2:00 PM, February 9, 2012.

2.   Question: Will the County take responsibility for the system performance, warranty, and maintenance of the system if any part, hardware or software, of the complete system is purchased from a third party by the County? Is the County willing to purchase, from the vendor, services necessary to configure and evaluate the performance of hardware and/or software the County may purchase from a third party? Is the County willing to delay turn-on for the period needed to configure and evaluate the system with third party hardware and/or software. Will the County agree to hold a vendor harmless regarding liquidated damages for any project delays and down-time caused by the use of third party hardware and/or software for the life of the system? Is the County willing to be the main point of contact for any problems related to third-party equipment and software and accept overall responsibility for system performance, including any expectation of system up-time? Does the county desire to purchase a complete, functional, and reliable system under warranty from the vendor?

Response:	The County intends to purchase a complete turnkey system (hardware, software, services). However, the County will purchase hardware from a third party if that is in its best interests. In this case, the NG9-1-1 vendor will only be responsible for its provided hardware, software, and services. The implementation schedule will be extended as necessary to accommodate purchase/configuration of third-party hardware.

3.   Question: Does the County understand that one manufacturer's system data will likely not be compatible with another manufacturer's system and hardware. Is the County willing to make and store hard copies of any and all previous data that is necessary and accept responsibility for that data?

Response:	The Contractor will be responsible for migrating any existing system data to the new system database(s). If data storage is required, the proposer should include that in the RFP response.

4.   Question: What make and model of radio console is located at the dispatcher positions? Are headsets used, and does the position hardware contain the NENA-compliant headset interface?

Response:	This RFP does not contain any radio equipment.

5.   Question: Are these Central Office Connections "End Office Trunks" (Direct Trunks) as described in the NENA Recommended Generic Standards for E911 PSAP Equipment?

Response:	These trunks do not yet exist in the new PSAP. These trunks will be ordered by the Contractor.

6.   Question: Are these Cellular Telephone Provider Connections Tandem Trunk Connections or End Office Trunks?

Response:	These trunks do not yet exist in the new PSAP. These trunks will be ordered by the Contractor.

7. Question: This RFP states, in a later section, the County is using an Avaya PBX. Does the PBX support SIP-IP access for phoneset integration? If so, does the County desire to integrate administrative lines through SIP-IP?

Response:	The system has the capacity to do both SIP and IP phone sets.

8. Question: Do the secondary PSAP locations require headset interface to another manufacturer's radio console system? If so, what are the brands and model of the radio console systems located at the secondary PSAP location? Does the County maintain IP network access to each of the secondary PSAP locations? If so, is this network privately maintained? Is this network the same as the NFRN mentioned later in the RFP?

Response:	Radio is not included in this RFP

9. Question: What is the purpose of connection to this Network? What Data packets are needed for send/receive on this network? Will the County be able to provide the IP addressing plan, including the necessary ports and services, needed for these connections? Who is responsible for maintenance, configuration, and security standards on this network? What are the requirements for connection to this network by a vendor regarding the security of hardware and software in order to maintain the overall network security standards on this network?

Response:	The NG9-1-1 system must be capable of providing intercom calls to/from the PSAPs via the NFRN system and provide 9-1-1 call transferring to/from these PSAPs via the NFRN system.

10. Question: Will the County consider ANI/ALI Controller Systems that are not server-based?

Response:	The base system should include a server-based ANI/ALI Controller System. Other solutions providing the required functionality/performance may be proposed as optional.

11. Question: Does the County intend to access the PSAP through the Public Switched Internet Network through the use of VPN, or does this requirement describe access through a privately maintained network connection through a VLAN gateway?

Response:	VPN access via the Internet. The County encourages the proposers to discuss this configuration and propose recommended optional solutions.

12. Question: Does TSPS type central office trunk describe the Traffic Service Position System used for operator-assisted toll calling as described in Bell System documentation? If so, why is this needed and what function, if any is required of the PSAP equipment? If not, please define TSPS and what this requirement represents for the PSAP?

Response:	The proposed system must support CAMA trunk supervision. "Or TSPS" can be deleted from RFP Section 2.4.4B.

13. Question: What is the purpose of this requirement? Are these proprietary telephone sets presently owned by the County, and are they presently connected to the County's PBX system? Is this a requirement that the PSAP equipment should support proprietary telephone sets from the same manufacturer as the PSAP? If so, why would proprietary telephone sets be preferred over other types such as non-proprietary?

Response:	This will allow call takers to answer 9-1-1 calls via PBX phonesets.

14.   Question: Are point-to-point data modems used for this interface? If so, what is the modem manufacturer, model number, and baud rate used for this interface? If needed, is the modem supplied by the LEC, or does the vendor supply the modem?

Response:	The proposed system shall propose ALI system access.

15.   Question: Is the above-mentioned "AT&T Enhanced 911 standard communications protocol" the same protocol specified by the NENA Recommended Generic Standards for PSAP Equipment regarding CAD interface? If not, please provide a copy of these interface standards. Is the County's CAD system capable of interface to the PSAP based on the NENA standards if this AT&T standard is not available.

Response:	Yes, output is NENA conformant ASCII.

16.   Question: By "continuous format", does the RFP specify a tractor-feed, dot-matrix printer using the "fan-folded" paper traditionally used for this type of printer? If so, why is this desired over the newer laser-jet printers and the more readily-available single sheet paper?

Response:	This is not necessary if the data is able to be retrieved and printed.

17.   Question: Is the alternative stored data option equally desirable by the County if provided free of additional charges?

Response:	Yes.

18.   Question: Is touch-screen functionality desired?

Response:	No it is not

19   Question: What is the source of the 99.999% up-time as an industry standard? This vendor has been unable to find a source for this up-time percentage standard in any of the industry standards documents pertaining to PSAP equipment of the type described in this RFP. One manufacturer claims in some of their advertising, "In fact, field data of systems in operation for more than a decade indicates an unprecedented 99.999 percent availability." The context of this advertising statement makes no other reference regarding industry standards, and does not provide data from any other source other than that of the manufacturer themselves. As a vendor, we have no information regarding how they would obtain this type of information from us, or other competitors, to support the claim as "unprecedented". The accuracy of such a statement is highly doubtful; however the claim is that this up-time factor is "unprecedented", rather than referring to an industry standard of any kind. The claim also indicates the up-time percentage was obtained over an extended period and analyzed multiple systems. If valid, this statement represents an average performance and not a design specification or industry standard for a system. Is this requirement based on this subjective promotional advertising information?

Response:	The system requirement is for 99.999% availability. If alternative availability is proposed, that should be clearly identified.

20.   Question: Please describe how this call transfer feature will be used in the context of ACD. Is this feature desired to simply transfer calls within the PBX environment as described in the later section?

Response:	Call transfer is integral to an ACD.

21.   Question: DOD is a specific type of trunk service provided by the phone company. Is the PSAP equipment required to directly connect to and signal DOD circuits in the same manner as a PBX? Other sections of the RFP suggest the PSAP will interface through the County PBX. What is the correct configuration?

Response:	DOD dialing should be accomplished via the PBX interface.

22. Question: Is this requirement needed in order to access PBX features, such as call transfer and call parking, through analog ports installed to connect the PBX analog station lines to the PSAP hardware?

Response:	Used to access the ACD externally.

23. Question: Will the County consider a superior, and more reliable, non-server based PSAP system that does not require redundant servers for critical call processing functions?

Response:	Yes.

24. Question: Please describe this function and how the County proposes to use this feature from the PSAP equipment. Is this feature controlled by the Tandem Office? If so, will the telephone company provide the dry contact control pairs? If not, please describe in detail.

Response:	The proposal should include the best solution for providing this function.

25. Question: Is this feature available to the County through the PBX system for the lines entering the PSAP? If so, why is this a requirement of the PSAP equipment.

Response:	Toll Restriction should be accomplished via the PBX interface.

26. Question: Do these lines include all 20 of the lines described earlier in the specifications? If not, how many of the administrative phone lines are PBX lines, and how many originate at the CO?

Response:	Yes it does

27. Question: This type of interface is not listed as one of the line types required for connection to the PSAP. For what purpose is this type of line required, where do these tie lines originate, and how many tie lines will be used.

Response:	This one is yet to be determined

28. Question: How many ring-down circuits are needed? Are these lines included in the 20 administrative line appearances?

Response:	These are dedicated ring down circuit from various agencies, and may or may not be incorporated onto the 9-1-1 console. But needs to have the capability.

29. Question: Is this a requirement to display caller ID at the operator position display, or is this a requirement for telephone sets other than telephone sets that may be connected to the County PBX system?

Response:	The NG9-1-1 should capture and display callerID information for seven-digit calls transferred in from the PBX.

30. Question: Does the County anticipate connecting to CAMA lines through T1 without hardware support and translation to CAMA Analog (NENA) by the LEC?

Response:	Delivery of CAMA is tariffed.

31. Question: Does the County anticipate connecting to SS7 without hardware support and translation to CAMA Analog (NENA) by the LEC?

Response:	Delivery of SS7 is tariffed.

32. Is the County's PBX system capable of SIP interface.

Response:	Yes

33.   Question: How strongly does the County desire to purchase a server-based TCP/IP client/server network designed PSAP solution? Will other configurations be given equal consideration?

Response:	The base proposal should include a server-based TCP/IP network. Other optional solutions may also be proposed.

34.   Question: Is the County's Avaya PBX capable of SIP-IP interface?

Response:	yes

35.   Question: Is the local telephone company fully NENA compliant in their technical requirements? Please list all Local Exchange Carriers providing E9-1-1 connectivity to the PSAP and whether or not these connections are through the Tandem office or connected directly to the local office.

Response:	Century Link- Tandum

37.   Question: How strongly does the County desire to purchase a system entirely based on one technology and offering limited, and problematic, failsafes? Will the County consider more reliable designs than those offered by open-source PBX hardware gateways and server systems?

Response:	The County will consider alternative technologies that provide comparable functionality/performance. The proposal should carefully describe alternative solutions.

38.   Question: Would the County consider a system capable of 100% reliability in case of a network switch failure if that system was not based on IP in the core of the back room equipment, and if that system uses a superior digital interface for local operator positions?

Response:	The County will consider alternative technologies that provide comparable functionality/performance. The proposal should carefully describe alternative solutions.

39.   What purpose does the County have for NENA XML if the ALI database is maintained by the telephone company?

Response:	The system should also support advanced NENA Extensible Markup Language (XML) tags for standardized data exchange.

40.   Question: What objective of the "NENA Standard for NG9-1-1 Additional Data" does the County desire? The above-mentioned document is not a design specification intended for use by a manufacturer to build equipment. Can the County provide design specifications for features they desire under the list of objectives outlined in this document?

Response:	Proposals should include a migratable platform conforming to standards.

41.   Question: Does the County intend to use the NENA-compliant CAD interface or use an IP interface during the initial installation?

Response:	The base system should provide a NENA-compliant CAD interface. If an IP interface is available, it should be proposed as an option.

42.   Question: Because an alternative non-industry standard is not specified for the purpose of a design and implementation quote by our company, is the industry-standard CAD interface sufficient to satisfy this requirement for the County?

Response:	The Motorola Premier CAD interface is a basic requirement. The proposal should address the proposed system's capabilities in interfacing other CAD/Map systems.

43.   Question: Is the Local Telephone Company's network infrastructure, as it is currently available, and will be at the time of a proposed system installation, compliant with NENA Recommended Standards for E9-1-1 PSAP Equipment?

Response:	The proposer should confirm this with the Local Telephone Company. The Contractor will be responsible for the system's interface with the Local Telephone Company.

44.   Question: Is this requirement provided by the telephone company? If so, what is required of the PSAP in order to interface?

Response:	The proposer should confirm this with the Local Telephone Company. The Contractor will be responsible for the system's interface with the Local Telephone Company.

45.   Question: Is this requirement describing a transfer from the main PSAP to the secondary PSAP positions? If not, please provide details on the proper signaling if hook-flash is not used to accomplish the transfer.

Response:	The proposal shall describe how a call is transferred to another PSAP via the ESInet and via leased trunks. This should include transfers to secondary PSAPs within the County and to PSAPs elsewhere in the State/Country.

46.   Question: Are these transfers to emergency service providers accomplished by the PBX, through the Tandem Office, or both?

Response:	Both.

47.   Question: Will the County consider a superior, and more reliable configuration that is not server-dependent?

Response:	The base proposal should include a server-based network. Other optional solutions may also be proposed.

48.   Question: What is meant by "demonstrated ability" in reference to features (items D through G below) that do not yet exist in the body of available standards? What is desired by this section in terms of a response to this RFP?

Response:	The proposal should state the proposed system's ability to perform the functions.

49.   Question: What types of traditional digital call capabilities are desired by this requirement? Does this refer to calls placed into the PSAP from VoIP phones?

Response:	The proposal shall verify that analog and digital calls are supported by the proposed system.

50.   Question: Has the NENA i3 been completed for Florida's ESINet? If so, please provide those standards.

Response:	No. However the proposal shall confirm the system's compliance with NENA I3 Standards.

51.   Question: Are any standards available, for items D through G above, for Florida at this time other than the NENA i3 and other NENA objectives for NG911?

Response:	No.

52.   Question: Is a printer desired if a system retains a permanent log of all diagnostic system events?

Response:	The County will consider alternative technologies that provide comparable functionality/performance. The proposal should carefully describe alternative solutions.

53.   Question: What is meant by QoS in the context of this requirement. Assuming a Quality of Service rating is desired, please describe the criteria used. Please provide documentation, or an Internet link for download, regarding the 9-1-1 State Plan Technical and Operational Standards referenced in this section.

Response:	All data for the 9-1-1 calls must be accessible for q& A purposes and for adherence to state plan specifications.

54.   Question: Why does the County desire for a vendor to adhere to a standard required by the European Union to purchase equipment for use in Florida? Is there a specific component of the CE compliance testing the County would like to see demonstrated that is not covered by the industry-standard ratings used in the United States? Does the County desire to purchase PSAP hardware designed and built for the U.S.A. market?

Response:	Please indicate if the proposed product has a CE mark.

55.   Question: Is touch control desired by the County?

Response:	If by touch control you referring to the screens it is not.

56.   Question: Does the County desire to purchase a complete system where workstation PCs are certified and optimized by the manufacturer as part of the complete system, and burn-in tested prior to delivery as a complete system and warranted by the vendor? If so, what option is desired?

Response:	Yes. Minimum specifications should be provided. Optimum PCs should be proposed.

57.   Question: Can the County provide the standards desired for this interface if not provided under NENA recommendations? What manufacturer's radio console is used at each location? Do these radio consoles support the standard NENA interface for phone integration in the radio console headset. Is headset integration required at the secondary PSAP locations?

Response:	Radio is not to be in this proposal.

58.   Question: Can you describe, in more detail, what is meant by "independent of any associated telephone instrument"?

Response:	The system should support generic handsets/headsets.

59.   Question: Question: How many user/role combinations are desired?

Response:	The proposal should specify what is provided by the proposed system.

60.   Question: Is the Motorola TLC/GIS Premier CAD GIS compliant with the NENA standards for CAD interface? If not, please describe how the interface to this CAD GIS is different and provide specifications for the interface.

Response:	The Proposer should contact the CAD vendor to confirm its GIS requirements.

61.   Question: How will NENA XML be used at the PSAP workstation? How is this different than the standard NENA display format for ALI information?

Response:	Preparation for an imminent standard is desired to preclude premature obsolescence.

62.   Question: Are maps files and the viewer desired, or just the viewer with the capability to display maps provided by the county?

Response:	As an option, the proposal should include the viewer and producing maps from current County map data.

63.   Question: Assuming a go-live date of August 1, 2012, when does the County plan to give the successful vendor an order for the system?

Response:	To be determined

64.   Question: Please define "appropriate availability rates" and provide documentation regarding the source of this requirement if the source is a standards body issuing standards for the design and manufacturing of PSAP equipment such as NENA.

Response:	System Availability as agreed in the project contract.

65.   Question: Will the County provide storage for spare parts on-site and accessible to the vendor's on-site maintenance personnel?

Response:	Yes, there will be some storage available as well as an office for on-site personnel.

66.   Question: Does the County desire to purchase spare parts and assemblies based on vendor recommendations?

Response:	This is very likely.

67.   Question: Does the County plan to provide suitable office space, with suitable furniture for desk and storage of spare modules, for on-site maintenance personnel. Will the County provide connectivity, including a telephone extension from the County PBX, and Public Internet Access for the maintenance personnel? Will the County accept terms whereby the on-site maintenance personnel are employees of the vendor and may be assigned lower priority tasks by the vendor unrelated to the County system during normal working hours and while located at the County facility? Will the County accept terms whereby technical time provided by the vendor's maintenance personnel to the county, for any purpose other than specified in A through E above, shall be billable to the County by the vendor at a prevailing rate for technical services consistent with the area?

Response:	The County will provide adequate office facilities. The County will consider the other terms included in the vendor question.