

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>			1. Contract Number	Page of Pages 1 17	
2. Amendment/Modification Number Two (002)		3. Effective Date see block 16		5. Solicitation Caption E911 Data-Base Management Services	
6. Issued By: Office of Contracting and Procurement Office of the Chief Technology Officer 441 4th Street, NW Washington, DC 20001			7. Administered By (If other than line 6)		
8. Name and Address of Contractor (No. Street, city, country, state and ZIP Code)			(X)	9A. Amendment of Solicitation No. DCTO-2007-R-0047	
			x	9B. Dated (See Item 11) 27-Mar-07	
				10A. Modification of Contract/Order No.	
				10B. Dated (See Item 13)	
Code			Facility		
<b>11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS</b>					
<input type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended. <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>2</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or fax which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment number. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or fax, provided each letter or telegram makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.					
12. Accounting and Appropriation Data (If Required)					
<b>13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14</b>					
(X)	A. This change order is issued pursuant to: (Specify Authority) The changes set forth in Item 14 are made in the contract/order no. in item 10A.				
	B. The above numbered contract/order is modified to reflect the administrative changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) set forth in item 14, pursuant to the authority of 27 DCMR, Chapter 36, Section 3601.2.				
	C. This supplemental agreement is entered into pursuant to authority of:				
	D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority)				
<b>E. IMPORTANT:</b> Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return <u>2</u> copies to the issuing office.					
14. Description of amendment/modification (Organized by UCF Section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)					
Page 1 (face page), <b>Delete</b> the Submission and Due Dates of April 17, 2007 and <b>Substitute</b> May 11, 2007, and see Questions and Answers which follows on pages 2 thru 16. END OF AMENDMENT TWO (2) All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.					
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item (9A or 10A) remain unchanged and in full force and effect					
15A. Name and Title of Signer (Type or print)			16A. Name of Contracting Officer William Sharp		
15B. Name of Contractor		15C. Date Signed		16B. District of Columbia	16C. Date Signed 5/2/2007
(Signature of person authorized to sign)			(Signature of Contracting Officer)		

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS  
DCTO-2007-Q-0047**

**The District has provides the following answers to questions received regarding solicitation DCTO-2007-R-0047, and amends the solicitation to the extent that information included in these answers is not included in the solicitation:**

1. The current ALI database systems are physically located in Maryland and New Jersey. Is distance an issue? **No**
2. Is there a limitation as to how far the new databases may be from the District? **No, provided that the vendor meets all the criteria stated in section C.2.3 of the solicitation.**
3. Section C.1.2 mentions the existence of a pANI database for wireless and VoIP steering but there is no functional requirement to support this in the new ALI system. Is it the District's intent to maintain separate systems for wireline and wireless/VoIP? **The District will consider and evaluate all proposed solutions according to the evaluation criteria in the solicitation.**
4. This seems more costly and complex than necessary. Will you accept a proposal for an all-inclusive ALI system that supports wireline, wireless, VoIP and ALI steering to all MPCs and VPCs? **The District will consider and evaluate all proposed solutions according to the evaluation criteria in the solicitation.**
5. Section C.2.1 references NENA Technical Information Document 03-502 but appears to misinterpret the text contained in the document. The quoted text does appear in Section 3 of NENA 03-502, but the paragraph following the quoted text states:

*“In cases where a PBX is programmed to send calling line identification (CLID) on outgoing calls to enable outgoing caller identification, there is a possibility that the CLID would be transmitted as ANI on a 9-1-1 call. Whenever this occurs, the SR tandem may not route the call to the correct PSAP, and the ALI display will read “No Record Found” when the call is answered at the PSAP. These are the end results if ALI records have not been uploaded into the 9-1-1 database management system for every number the PBX might transmit as CLID.”* (Emphasis added)

The last line of this paragraph indicates that it would, indeed, be acceptable to transmit CLID from an ISDN PBX provided that records have been loaded into the 9-1-1 database management system for every number the PBX might transmit as CLID. If the LEC providing service to the ISDN PBX loads all of the numbers using the main address of the PBX, this would not violate NENA recommendations.

6. This requirement appears to be based on a misinterpretation on the NENA document, which was not intended to prohibit the delivery of CLID in the absence

of PS/911 service. Would the District care to reconsider this requirement? **The following line appears in NENA 03-502 TID, in all CAPS, following the paragraph stated above. “THE NEED TO TEST THE ABILITY TO PLACE 9-1-1 CALLS FROM EVERY PBX THAT USES PRI-ISDN TRUNKS CANNOT BE OVER EMPHASIZED.”** In the view of the District, 9-1-1 testing between the legacy DBMSP, wireline phone companies and the MLTS end users has not occurred and thus has contributed to the increase the size of the ALI database. In addition to the recurring cost to maintain these records the possibility also exists to not provide accurate data to the PSAP upon a 9-1-1 call. The District feels and NENA recommends in 03-502 TID, that *“For any PBX that has not implemented a PS/911 enhancement, the billing telephone number (BTN) should be sent as the ANI whenever the serving central office of the PRI trunks routes the call to the 9-1-1 Selective Router via the dedicated 9-1-1 trunks serving that central office.”*

Furthermore, in section 5.1 of NENA 03-502 TID, *“It is recommended that every PBX vendor that installs and maintains PBX systems, as well as local service providers that provide PBX trunks, test the ability to dial 9-1-1 from station lines at the time the systems and/or new PBX trunks are installed or upgraded.”* This testing process is for all PBX systems, whether or not the PS/911 enhancement has been implemented. In the view of the District, this NENA recommendation has not been adhered to; otherwise, every PBX operating within the District that has not implemented PS/911 would be configured to send the BTN as ANI for all 9-1-1 calls. This position is supported by the fact that the District’s ALI database is currently in excess of 1.5 million records.

**The District is seeking all Offerors’ expertise to propose innovative and cost-effective solutions to resolve this ongoing issue.**

7. The first sentence of section C.2.3 states “The District’ s ALI circuits terminate at the two PLANT/CML selective routers”. This conflicts with the diagrams on pages 26 and 27, which show the ALI circuits terminating in ALI Servers. Which is correct? **The wireline and wireless ALI circuits are terminated at the ALI servers which are attached to the Plant/CML routers.**
8. Section C.2.3 requires a “transport facility maintenance schedule”. Can you please elaborate and provide some specifics? **The Offeror shall provide the District with any pre-planned upgrades that may affect the quality of ALI delivery. This includes, but is not limited to, hardware, firmware, and network configuration enhancements that may degrade normal transmissions of ALI data. The Offeror shall also provide notification to the District even if, in the opinion of the Contractor, the maintenance should be transparent to the District.**

9. Section C.2.5: Under what authority can we be expected to collect charges from MLTS providers? **The successful Offeror would not be expected to collect charges from MLTS providers. The cost for obtaining the initial extract of records, if any, will be the responsibility of the District, although any costs associated with obtaining additional extracts of records from the service providers operating within the district shall be borne by the successful Offeror.**
10. Section C.2.5: The system is required to support data exchange in NENA 2.1 or higher format. Who will ensure/enforce all incoming initial loads conform to the same standard? **The successful Offeror will employ the proper safeguards to ensure/enforce that all data conforms to the NENA standard.**
11. Section C.2.5: Who will resolve initial data load conflicts where existing ALI records are not valid against the current MSAG? **ALI discrepancies identified during the initial data load for a carrier shall follow the same procedures stated in section C.2.7.**
12. Section C.2.6, 8<sup>th</sup> bullet states: “Records maintained in the database shall not exclude any valid data elements submitted by service providers.” NENA data exchange formats include more data elements than are capable of being displayed on a typical ALI display screen. Will the District provide a list of which data elements you define as “valid”? **If data elements are provided by the submitting carrier, the data must be stored with the ALI record and must be provided to the District when requested for use during an ALI response.**
13. Section C.2.12 states that ANI failures generate a No Record Found. Generally, NRFs result from the successful delivery of an ANI that is not loaded in the 9-1-1 database. ANI failures generally result in the delivery of an Emergency Services Central Office (ESCO) code in place of ANI. Records are often built in the 9-1-1 database for ESCO codes. Are you classifying the absence of a telephone number record in the 9-1-1 database as an ANI failure? **No. The absence of a telephone number record in the 9-1-1 database is an ALI failure.**
14. Section C.2.19 contains a requirement to resolve system failures in two hours or less. A fully redundant, geographically dispersed database system should never experience a complete system failure, but restoration of a complete failure in two hours is impossible to guarantee. Will you accept a response within 15 minutes and either restoration or a detailed explanation of the failure and estimated time to repair within two hours? **The District will consider and evaluate all proposed solutions according to the evaluation criteria in the solicitation.**
15. Section C.2.22: Requires “a means for the District to access information regarding process activity”. Can you please provide specifics as to which processes would be involved? **The Data Management Interface (DMI) shall provide the District and Service Providers a portal into the DBMSP for the purposes of**

**data quality improvement, including: service order error resolution, TN record address correction, call data discrepancy correction, as well as changes to the Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) and English Language Translation (ELTs). The contract awarded resulting from this solicitation is for purchase of existing software, not software to be developed.**

16. Requires “Simultaneous access for a large number of users.” Can you say how many users and what activities they will be performing? **The users of the system shall include, but not be limited to, District staff and authorized service providers operating within the District. The activities performed on the system shall only be limited by the capabilities of the existing system.**
17. Requires “The ability to export reports (both pre-defined and user defined)...” Does it matter if the report engine is on the ALI system or in an outboard PC (or number of PCs)? **The District will consider and evaluate all proposed solutions according to the evaluation criteria in the solicitation.**
18. Pages 26 and 27 appear to contain the same diagram. Is something missing or is this an oversight? **This has been corrected in the corrected Addendum to this solicitation.**
19. Is all the equipment in the diagram on page 26 still in place? **Yes.**
20. The diagram on page 26 does not show steering links to VPCs. Will steering to VPCs be performed by the new ALI system or the CML ALI Server? (Please see question 2) **Based on the Offeror’s solution, ALI steering to VPCs may or may not utilize the existing circuits in place today.**
21. Can you provide a list of the vendors that requested a solicitation? **The solicitation was posted on OCP’s website, which can be accessed by any interested potential Offeror.**
22. Also, is the solicitation limited to the vendors that requested a solicitation? **The solicitation was posted on OCP’s website, which can be accessed by any interested potential Offeror.**
23. Can you provide the name of the incumbent vendor? **Verizon.**
24. In that regard, if the current prime vendor has a subcontractor? **Not to our knowledge.**
25. Would the work be performed on-site at DC Government, or at the contractor’s facility? **Offerors shall propose location(s) in their proposed solutions. The location(s) of where the work will be performed shall be clearly indicated within the Offeror’s proposed solution.**

26. Is the government going to limit this solicitation to registered LSDBE vendors? **No.**
27. In regards to the proposal response, is there a limit to the technical approach? **The District will consider and evaluate all proposed solutions according to the evaluation criteria in the solicitation.**
28. Is DC Government going to make this a single award? **See section C.1.1. It states that more than one contract may be awarded.**
29. The solicitation does not designate a number of FTEs, or key personnel (i.e. Project Manager, senior technical staff) what is a vendor suppose to use to determine the number of staff to propose? **Offerors shall propose the number of FTEs consistent with their proposed solutions.**
30. Does the current vendor provide the DC government with an on-call list? **Yes. The current Contractor provides the District with a 24x7 on-call list which includes escalation procedures.**
31. The solicitation does not provide instructions in regards to proposal submission. Do vendors submit the proposal via email, or some other means? **See Section C.1.6**

**The District requests vendors respond with 4 hard copies and 1 soft copy of the proposal. All responses should be sent to the following address:**

**Office of Contracting and Procurement  
Bid Room, Attn: William Sharp/Melford Brown  
441 4<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Suite 703 South  
Washington, DC 20001**

**Marked Solicitation No.: DCTO-2007-R-0047  
Solicitation RQ330144  
Due Date: May 11, 2007  
Time: 2:00pm**

32. Will the government consider extended the due date for this solicitation since the questions will be answered until April 10th? **An extension has been provided and identified in an Addendum. Further extensions will only be considered at the District's discretion.**
33. Does the government plan to conduct a site visit? **The District reserves the right to conduct a site visit upon request.**

34. What is the current “uptime” of the current DBMS infrastructure? **The uptime of the current DBMS infrastructure has no bearing on the solicitation response.**
35. Our company is a small disadvantaged 8(a) company with MBE status in Maryland and Virginia. Would this small business distinction apply to DC Government? **The District applies the preferences included in the Small and Local Business Development and Assistance Act of 2005, as amended (Act). The District does not award preferences to federally-certified 8(a)s, only to District-certified businesses under the Act.**
- 35. The solicitation and SOW do not include evaluation criteria. Based on a number of factors, how will the DC Government evaluate the proposals?**

The evaluation criteria are set forth below:

**EVALUATION FOR AWARD**

The contract will be awarded to the responsible offeror whose offer is most advantageous to the District, based upon the evaluation criteria specified below.

The Technical Rating Scale is as follows:

<b><u>Numeric Rating</u></b>	<b><u>Adjective</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>
0	Unacceptable	Fails to meet minimum requirements; e.g., no demonstrated capacity, major deficiencies which are not correctable; offeror did not address the factor.
1	Poor	Marginally meets minimum requirements; major deficiencies which may be correctable.
2	Minimally Acceptable	Marginally meets minimum requirements; minor deficiencies which may be correctable.
3	Acceptable	Meets requirements; no deficiencies.
4	Good	Meets requirements and exceeds some requirements; no deficiencies.
5	Excellent	Exceeds most, if not all requirements; no deficiencies.

For example, if a sub factor has a point evaluation of 0 to 6 points, and (using the Technical Rating Scale) the District evaluates as "good" the part of the proposal

applicable to the sub factor, the score for the sub factor is 4.8 (4/5 of 6). The sub factor scores will be added together to determine the score for the factor level.

Proposals will be evaluated based on the following technical evaluation factors:

**TECHNICAL APPROACH**                      **Maximum of 30 Points**

**PRIOR EXPERIENCE**                      **Maximum of 30 Points**

**SERVICE LEVEL SUPPORT**              **Maximum of 10 Points**

**PRICE**    **Maximum of 30 Points**

The price evaluation will be objective. The offeror with the lowest price will receive the maximum price points. All other proposals will receive a proportionately lower total score. The following formula will be used to determine each Offeror's evaluated price score:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Lowest price proposal} \\ \text{-----} \end{array} \times 30 = \text{Evaluated price score}$$

Price of proposal being evaluated

**LSDBE PREFERENCE, IF APPLICABLE,**  
**as outlined in the Small and Local Business**  
**Development and Assistance Act of 2005,**  
**as amended:**                                      **Maximum of 12 points**

**TOTAL POINTS AVAILABLE**                      112 Points

- 36. Our company is located ten miles from the DC Government building, would DC Government require the selected vendor to have office space within DC? **There is no requirement to have office space within DC.**
- 37. Is June 8th a firm date for implementation? If not, would the District be willing to accept implementation in 3rd quarter of 2007, with a Project Plan that details milestone dates and specifies the implementation date agreed to by successful bidder and the District? **The District intends to implement as close to June 8<sup>th</sup> as possible.**
- 38. C.1.4 in the solicitation, states the expectation of the District's awarded vendor to have systems and resources in place. Assuming the respondent to the solicitation could implement in a timeframe that was agreed to by the District would the District be willing to accept a bid response for a system not fully in place at time

of response to solicitation; thus a system currently in deployment that will meet the requirements of the said solicitation **The District will consider and evaluate all proposed solutions according to the evaluation criteria in the solicitation. Consistent with the evaluation factors, implementing a proven system in a timely manner will play a role in the evaluation.**

39. Can the District provide what they believe to be the "real" number of records to be valid in the database for said solicitation? **The District estimates that only 590,000 of the 1,575,000 ALI records provide specific, unique location information required to assist public safety personnel in locating 9-1-1 callers.**

MLTS customers that do not subscribe to a private switch ALI solution shall only have one ALI record within the ALIDB.

40. Q. Does the District view Centrex customers or other central office-based service customers as MLTS customers? **Yes and Centrex customers may need to be handled differently than PRI-ISDN PBX MLTS customers.**

All MLTS records must contain unique information which identifies the specific location of the caller (e.g. 3rd floor, room 302) or the ALI record will be considered unacceptable and shall be returned back to the owner service provider for resolution.

41. The solicitation states in bullet #2 of this section that MLTS customers who do NOT subscribe to PS-ALI should only have one ALI record in the ALIDB. Yet in this bullet, you state that "all MLTS records must contain unique information which identifies specific location of the caller (e.g., 3rd floor, room 302) or the ALI record will be considered unacceptable." It seems that there is a conflict between Bullet #2 and this one as bullet #2 states one location for the MLTS customer, yet this bullet expects location information for each *caller* (italics added). Please clarify the expectation of what information should be provided for someone calling from behind an MLTS which does NOT have PS-ALI. **In the case where a 9-1-1 call is placed from behind a PBX which does not subscribe to PS-ALI, the PBX should be configured to provide the BTN as the ANI. The District is seeking Offerors' expertise to provide solutions to resolve this ongoing issue.**
42. Who will contact the MLTS customers, to advise them of the District's requirements for their MLTS accounts? This requirement would necessitate changing the end office switches of all carriers to send only one TN per location and possibly the customer's CPE switch to agree. Who would cover those costs? **The District is seeking Offerors' expertise to provide solutions to resolve this ongoing issue.**
43. Verizon's ISDN PRI DID/Centrex customers, do not send individual locations on their ALI records now, unless they have PBX PS ALI. So if the DC govt rejects

their records, the result would be thousands of No Record Finds (NRF). If the Service Owner is sending all the customer's TNs to the Database provider, but only one BTN is in the DB, these NRFs would not ever be resolved. This would require extensive investigations, which would require increased resources. Is this the intent of the RFP? **The District is seeking Offerors' expertise to provide solutions to resolve this ongoing issue.**

- 44.** Today, from PBX's without PS-ALI, a 9-1-1 call is received at the DC 9-1-1 center with the DID number of the caller and the PBX service address. The DC 9-1-1 center can call back the caller if they are disconnected. In addition, responding personnel can identify to the PBX staff on site the DID number of the caller to determine the exact location. DC is requesting in the RFP that a PBX without PS-ALI should not send the DID number. The RFP says no DID numbers will be included in the ALI database. Comparing the situation described above, the DC 9-1-1 center will not have a DID number to callback. The responding personnel will not have a DID number to use with the on-site PBX staff. Verizon feels this is a step backwards and reduces the information provided to your emergency response staff. Could DC please clarify their reasoning in eliminating this emergency information, especially since DC is receiving surcharge revenue from these PBX DID numbers? **The District also believes that ANI is very important on a 9-1-1 call, but that it shouldn't be encumbered with the full costs associated with maintaining the excessive ALI records of which do not supply specific location information for each DID. The revenue obtained from DID numbers is at a much reduced rate yet the maintenance and storage of the associated ALI records are at the charged at the normal per record storage fee. The District is seeking Offerors' expertise to provide solutions to resolve this ongoing issue. The District is looking to the expertise of the proposing vendors to provide innovative and cost effective solutions to resolve this ongoing issue.**

#### C.2.2 ALIDB Hosts

There shall be no limitation to the number of bids that may be received and responded to simultaneously.

- 45.** Does this requirement indicate that bids must be accepted from multiple sources and/or simultaneous bids from different bids or does it indicate that both ALI databases in a mated environment must respond to each bid received? **The proposed solution must accommodate for simultaneous queries from multiple ANI sources such as, but not limited to, wireline, wireless, and VoIP service providers.**

#### C.2.3 Connectivity Between the District and the ALIDB Hosts

Delivery of location data in response to a PSAP query will require that connectivity be installed and maintained between the DBMSP's ALIDB hosts and the District's CML selective routers.

46. Is it the District's intent to perform all Selective Routing through their CML routers and no longer use the ILEC tandems? **This question has no bearing on the District's selection of a DBMSP.**
47. The connecting facility shall be dedicated for the exclusive purpose of communicating PSAP queries and responses to the queries. How many simultaneous queries and/or responses must be supported and from how many District PSAPs? Does this mean the two CML ECS 1000 systems? **The proposed system must be capable, at a minimum, to respond eighty (80) simultaneous ALI queries from two different PSAP's.**

#### C.2.4 Establish Connectivity to Other DBMSPS

Steering between DBMSPs during transition of service from the current provider to the successor DBMSP is expected. This connectivity shall be taken down upon completion of transition.

48. How much time will be allocated for the provisioning of these new steering links between the ALI databases and what is the anticipated period of time where steering will be employed between the two DBMSP systems? **This connectivity shall be taken down upon a District and Contractor's mutually agreed-upon time after the completion of transition.**
49. Please clarify what criteria will be used to deem the transition "complete." **Transition will be deemed complete when all records have been transitioned to the new DBMSP and the District agrees everything is working properly. Vendors should propose acceptance criteria that the District will agree on.**
50. Who will bear the cost of the connectivity between the DBMSPs? **The Contractor shall bear the cost.**

#### C.2.5 Process Initial Loads from all Service Providers

51. Various methods may need to be employed to enable data communication from the different types and sizes of service providers. What are the specific types of data communication that the DBMSP is expected to support? **Any secure, NENA compliant method of data communications must be supported.**
52. Compare initial data loads to the appropriate MSAG using relevant criteria to determine data quality. Would the appropriate MSAG, be the MSAG Verizon has in the Database now? If so, we have the FX accounts which would fall out, with

202 TNs, which are sitting in MD & VA. We convert them to the NENA recommended format, as stated in 02-011 NENA document, to include the physical address in the LOCATION/DRIVING INSTRUCTION field. Would this still be accepted by a new DBMSP? Would the FOREIGN EXCHANGE MSAG remain in the Database? Would these calls be answered by the DC PSAP and forwarded to the appropriate Jurisdiction outside of DC? **Yes to all.**

- 53.** Would TNs having MD or VA NPA-NXXs sitting in DC be accepted if transferred into the DC PSAP by an external MD or VA PSAP? **Yes.**

#### C.2.6 Data Processing and Management

Provide to the District, on a monthly basis, a report that identifies the number and type of translations in use, including the number of inputs submitted during the month, by service provider, which were affected by these translations.

- 54.** Is this referring to the AKA translations table, in which we would be able to identify new entries by mod date, then identify any new TN records with that particular street with the AKA thoroughfare. **Yes.**

#### C.2.10 ALI Extract for EMA Emergency Notification System

Provide a monthly extract of the District's ALI records.

- 55.** Please identify specific type of record and corresponding data fields and record format requested in this monthly extract. **NENA 2.1**
- 56.** Under the "implied consent doctrine" citizens give up the right to privacy when they dial 911. Thus, ALI records retrieved during a 911 call are not subject to the same privacy restrictions as ALI records obtained by the District via the ESL service. Does the District intend to enter into a separate Emergency Subscriber Listings agreement? **The District intends to use the ALI records in compliance with the implied consent doctrine. The Emergency Subscriber Listings agreement has no bearing on this solicitation.**

#### C.2.12 No Record Found (NRF))

A "No Record Found" (NRF) error is identified when an emergency call is received for which there is no corresponding record in the ALIDB. There are many circumstances that may generate an NRF.

- 57.** Verizon ISDN PRI DID/Centrex customers, do not send individual locations now, unless they have PBX PS ALI. So if the DC govt. rejects their records as stated in C2.1 above, the result would be thousands of No Record Finds (NRF). If the Service Owner is sending all the customer's TN's to the Database provider, but only one BTN accepted into the DB, these NRF's would not be allowed to be

resolved. Would the NRF be bashed against the NPAC before sending to the appreciate owner? **No. NRFs will continue to be handled the same way they are currently handled.**

58. Also, what resolution would the District expect in the situation described above? **The District does not wish to supply any recommended solutions at the risk of limiting innovative solutions to the stated issues in the solicitation. The District is seeking Offerors' expertise to provide solutions to resolve this ongoing issue. The District will consider and evaluate all proposed solutions according to the evaluation criteria in the solicitation.**

59. All NRF errors shall be resolved or referred within the next business day. ANI failures do have different causes, which are normally handled by the Verizon's Customer Care Center, for any ANI failure which originates from Verizon's own 9-1-1 network. The PSAP is directed to refer them directly to the Customer Care Center. These ANI failures are usually displayed as such, when the call comes into the PSAP. What are the different types of ANI failure, the District is referencing above? Would the ANI failures be referred back to the appropriate Service Provider company by the District when identified by the Customer Care Center? **ANI Failures will continue to be handled the same way they are currently handled today.**

NENA 02-011 standards shall be followed.

The NENA 02-011 STANDARDS regarding NRF, erroneous ALI DISPLAYS: "7.3.3 As NRFs, misroutes, or erroneous ALI displays are noted at the PSAP, it is required that a 9-1-1 Inquiry Form be completed by the calltaker and returned to the Jurisdiction's 9-1-1 Database Coordinator within one (1) business day. The 9-1-1 Database Coordinator is then responsible for reviewing, researching, and forwarding the inquiry to the DBMSP within one (1) business day. Refer to Exhibit C for complete flow.

NOTE: In some areas, where applicable, 9-1-1 Inquiry forms for erroneous ALI displays are routed directly to the entity providing the dial tone (Service Provider) based on the Access Infrastructure Provider NENA ID displayed at the time of the call.

60. 7.4 The Jurisdiction is responsible for obtaining as much information as possible on the NRF and reporting the information within one business day to the SP. It is desirable that the Jurisdiction locate the SP for a Wireless Call by using the various systems available (NPAC, NeuStar IVR – refer to Section 29). Wireline NRF reports may be forwarded directly to the DBMSP. The ANI on the NRF is absolutely necessary. The date and time of the call are critical and must be provided for any investigation to occur. Any other information obtained from the caller is helpful for investigation of the NRF. Will the District be following this NENA recommendation in the future? We do not receive ANI/ALI inquiries currently, on a regular basis. Is this due to some other method of reconciling these

problem calls without the current DBMSP? **The District does provide ALI updates to the owner service provider when an ALI discrepancy is identified at the PSAP.**

61. We normally handle Misrouted calls as quickly as possible after notification from the PSAP. These calls are treated with the same timetable as ANI/ALI queries. Would the District refer the CLEC Misrouted calls back to the CLECs? **Yes.**

C.2.15 Selective Router Changes (“Re-homes”)

62. Is it the District’s intent to perform all Selective Routing through their CML routers and no longer use the ILEC tandems? **This question has no bearing on the Districts selection of a DBMSP. ALI links are currently connected directly to the ALI server ports.**

C.2.18 Customer Service

The DBMSP must provide information or assistance in a timely manner in response to requests by the District, end users, service providers, and/or selective routing service providers.

63. Please provide more detail regarding the type of information or assistance that may be required; the type of referral determines the departments that may need to be involved in the response. **The successful vendor must support any third party that ultimately may impact the overall health and accuracy of the 9-1-1 ALI or MSAG database.**

All weekdays, with the exception of Federal holidays, are business days. 24 x 7 x 365 toll-free access to technical support shall be provided by the DBMSP for trouble reporting of ALIDB issues.

64. Please clarify what is meant by “technical support”. Does this item refer to Tier 1 Support from a 911 Customer Care or Database Maintenance Center? **The District is requiring a 24x7x365 toll-free access point of contact for escalation of any issue.**

C.2.19 Trouble Handling

Provide a monthly report on any outages, including causes/resolutions and time taken to resolve.

65. Please specify the types of outages that should be listed in this report. Does this include Network, Database and CPE outages? **This monthly report should contain, at a minimum, any issues that may have impeded the delivery of ALI responses. The report should also include any downtime that occurred but may not have been apparent to the PSAP. Specifics, such as length of**

**downtime, why the issue occurred, how it was resolved and by who, etc. should be noted as well.**

C.2.20 Security

The DBMSP must securely interface with the District at the network interconnection points (routers), and with service providers and selective routing providers through various kinds of connections. Ancillary database providers may also interface with the DBMSP.

66. Please specify the kinds of connections that the DBMSP is expected to support. Please specify the types of “Ancillary database providers” that may interface with the DBMSP. **The successful Offeror is expected to securely interface with any third party that adheres to NENA standards, which is deemed necessary by the District.**
67. Section C.2.5 of the SOW refers to enabling “data communication from the different types and sizes of service providers.” How many Telephone Service Providers and Wireless Service Providers will the successful Vendor be expected to work with on MSAG validation. **It is expected that the successful Offeror will interface with any number of NENA compliant service providers operating within the District.**
68. Section C.2.3 mentions the support of “simultaneous queries and/or responses from all District PSAP’ s” Will the successful vendor also be expected to support queries from additional PSAPs through the National Capital Region (NCR)? **Not at this time.**
69. Section C.2.3 refers to a “custom format” for the “diverse and redundant network” and states that the format is available upon the request under non-disclosure. Please send an NDA so that we may review the format while preparing our response. **The ALI format for the District currently is a modified NENA 2 format.**

Section C.2.3 refers to two District-owner CML selective routers. We have three questions concerning selective routers.

70. How many selective routers will require updates from the DBMSP? **The District believes that the selective routers do not need to be updated since all the service providers will be directly connected to the District owned Plant/CML ECS 1000’ s.**
71. What types of selective routers are they? **There are two PLANT/CML ECS-1000’ s operating within the District.**

72. What company owns and operates these selective routers? **The District owns and operates both PLANT/CML ECS 1000 selective routers.**