

Wyoming PSMC RFI Questions/Answers and Clarifications:

- Q1. Is your Request for Information ("RFI") seeking proposals regarding spectrum, whether coupled with equipment solutions or not?
- A1. *Specific spectrum licenses are not an issue at this point. In part the vendors' responses will help decide which frequency bands will be preferred. Licensing issues will be addressed at a later date. Vendors should respond with their selections of frequency bands in their proposed solutions. Note that comparison between multiple frequency bands (at least two) has been requested.*
- Q2. How can a vendor submit proposals for equipment to satisfy the design goals of the project if they do not know what spectrum is available on which the equipment will operate?
- A2. *Spectrum bands will be determined after the RFI responses are received and before October 2003 when the planning phase of this project has been completed. Assume spectrum/frequency channels are available. The State is seeking vendor inputs as to which frequency bands are "best" to minimize cost and maximize coverage.*
- Q3. Can you estimate the probability and time for obtaining funding for the project?
- A3. *At this point, the State is assuming the funding issues will be addressed once the technical plan and its cost have been approved. A major part of the RFI responses is to solicit vendor input to system costs. Obviously without funding, the project may take a different track. System cost is a major component in deciding which technical solutions will be considered. In any case, the planning phase is scheduled for completion in October 2003 for legislative approval and funding authority in 2004.*

Clarifications:

- C1. Section 2.4, page 10. The RFI is not asking for detailed designs, but rather the vendors should be presenting conceptual designs with their estimated costs for evaluation by the State. It is **very important** that the June 24 delivery date of initial RFI responses be met. Project evaluation efforts cannot be delayed. However, there will be some opportunity for amplification of initial RFI responses during the Q&A period ending July 16th.
- C2. Section 2.8, page 12. It is not necessary that vendors address all technical specifications addressed in this RFI. If a responding vendor only designs/supplies a partial solution, this is acceptable.
- C3. Section 3.9, page 27. The interoperability discussed is between public safety agencies only.
- C4. Section 3.12.2, page 31, FB-2 Add low-speed (less than 19.2 kbps) mobile data capability. Although it is preferred that a single radio support both voice and low-

speed data communications (to avoid multiple radios and/or multiple antennas), the State encourages the vendors to propose the “best” overall solution for the stated goals. The State has not ruled out separate voice and data systems.

- C5. Section 3.16, page 34, first paragraph, This should be an integrated solution . . . It is highly desirable that the hardware/software interfaces for communications between modules (*e.g.*, radios, MDCs) of an equipment set have open system specifications (*i.e.*, non-proprietary, not a vendor specific type). For example, it is in the State’s interest to allow stakeholders to independently specify and/or purchase new or future upgrades of MDC/laptop equipment to suit each agency’s needs without being tied into non-industry standard interfaces or methods. Reference - PSMC STEERING COMMITTEE PARTNERSHIP OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES #7: Planning will explicitly address technology innovations and how they may be adopted. Implementation will require best systems engineering disciplines for efficient and cost-effective updating of the system over a long lifespan.

Issued/posted: June 19, 2003