Q1. The RFI does not mention a redundancy / “no single point of failure” requirement. The current Selective Router that serves these PSAPs (I believe the AT&T Selective Router in Chico, CA) does not operate in a redundant mode. Shall I assume a service level comparable to that of today is the aim?

A: We would like to see a higher level of redundancy than what we have now in the legacy network. We’ll let you decide what you think would be best.

Q2. Is the state requesting a network based CPE solution to enable “virtual PSAP” functionality as stated in the RFI?

A: Yes.

Q3. And if network based CPE is an option, will the option require the host sites to be in CA?

A: Not necessarily. That is, we would entertain any solution if it provides the feature/functionality we require.

Q4. Does the State prefer to use the existing Cal-Net IP network to all the PSAP locations specified in the RFI?

A: Again, not necessarily. We are open to discussing any contractual vehicle at this point in time.

Q5. To provide continuous location data to the call taker without “re-bid” may require upgrades to the CPE. Is the state requesting a solution approach that would remove this dependency from the CPE? Or will the state accept a solution that would require an upgrade to the CPE, assuming the upgrade to the CPE is a more cost-effective approach?
Q6. Assuming the number of trunks per PSAP is indicated on the RFI, can you please break out the number of wireline and wireless trunks per PSAP?

A: The PSAPs do not have separate wireless/wireline trunks today.

Q7. Will this be connected to the State Network or, are they looking for a provider to supply the network?

A: This will be a stand alone network that will interconnect to the existing legacy network.

Q8. Do they plan to replace all the PSAPs?

A: Not necessarily.

Q9. How many admin lines are at each PSAP?

A: Do not know. For the purposes of responding to this RFI, please use the data provided in the RFI.

Q10. Do they have a state wide PBX

A: No.

Q11. Does each PSAP have CAD / MAP - If yes, is it hosted? And which vendor?

A: Don’t know.

Q12. The RFI requests a complete solution but the requirement seems to mainly address the call routing issue. Is this simply a matter that the main deficiency of the current system is routing?

A: Yes

Q13. Are you requesting a complete PSAP solution with a complete system including the agent(s) (dispatcher or call taker) or is it only the network routing mechanism that should be handled?

A: A complete solution

Q14. If a complete solution is requested, what are the operational requirements for the Call takers and Dispatchers at the PSAPs?

A: The same as they are today for California call-takers.
Q15. A list of PSAP and number of operator positions is provided but these are not divided between Call takers and Dispatchers. We support these two roles separately. Can we get some idea of how the number of positions are allocated?

A: These are relatively small PSAPs. Please make the assumption that the call taker and dispatcher are one in the same.

Q16. Will there be an RFP after the RFI or are decisions going to be made off of the RFI?

A: The real purpose behind the RFI is to get some budgetary costs together so that we can respond to the Enhance 911 Grant available to States. We hope to issue a RFP from this after we get the grant funds.

Q17. If we did not respond to the RFI could we respond to the RFP?

A: We will not award off of this RFI and we will not eliminate anyone if they do not respond to the RFI.