**GNSS Systems RFP Amendment 1:**

*Questions and Answers from Prospective Vendors*

**PLEASE NOTE** that if your receivers do not meet all of our listed requirements at present time, you are still encouraged to respond to the RFP and simply state that fact, or provide a disclaimer agreeing to make necessary modifications to your firmware to add that feature in a reasonable amount of time. The failure to meet all requirements would not preclude a Prospective Vendor from receiving an offer based upon its Proposal. However, the evaluation deduction, if any, could differ depending upon the importance of the missing requirement.

1. What is the format of the **March 24th Vendor Conference** and who will be selected to participate?

   Answer from UNAVCO: The Vendor Conference will allow each Vendor visit with the UNAVCO Evaluation Committee for at least an hour, and perhaps longer depending on the number of responses. You will be given the opportunity to give a formal presentation (which can last 15 or 20 minutes), then you will ask UNAVCO any questions you may have, and finally the Evaluation Committee will ask a series of varying questions based upon the equipment you have proposed. The schedule will be released by UNAVCO as soon as possible following the **March 20th** deadline for Responses. Every Vendor that submits what the evaluation committee determines to be a “good-faith” Proposal will be invited to attend the Conference.

2. In the Technical Specifications section 2.1.1 Required, you state that multifrequency GNSS receiver be **able** to track all signals from GPS, GLONASS, Galileo, Beidou, and SBAS. Are you specifying here that each of these constellations be **enabled** in this offering?

   Answer from UNAVCO: We do require that you submit prices for your products with all signals enabled. We then state in 1-a that we would prefer the option of being able to disable specific constellations in order to achieve price reductions, so you could then provide a menu of cost savings that would be realized by turning off any of the constellations, or other features if applicable.

3. In the Selection Process section 4.2 you list 8 separate evaluation criteria. Can you provide weighting values for each criterion?

   Answer from UNAVCO: We are unable to provide the weighting values for each evaluation criterion at this time.
4. Section 4 of the RFP specifies the following regarding the Proposal Preparation. It is stated that the proposal should contain the following information (and lettering/numbering format). I do not see where to input the technical specifications using this formatting type (A, B, C, i, ii, iii) as Section 2: Technical Specifications is formatted differently (2.1, 2.1.1, 1, a). Is it ok to format the technical response the same way that the RFP is formatted or is UNAVCO looking for something different?

Answer from UNAVCO: You may format the Tech Specs the same way it is formatted in the RFP. Section 4 is a procedural standard for the overall layout of the Response and asks that you assemble your Response with the Sections in that order.

5. Regarding Section 2/2.1/2.1.1/19/e: Is the requirement for each logged session to be the independent session data, which can be managed in user-defined folders on the receiver memory?

Answer from UNAVCO: Yes. We would like each logged session to be stored in separate folders if the user wishes to configure it that way, and that each independent session can be allotted a user-defined amount of storage space.

6. Regarding Section 2/2.1/2.1.2/6/a: Is the requirement that the session programming stay intact and continue as planned once power resumed or is the requirement for an open file to be appended until the end of a session and a second file not open to complete the remainder of the session?

Answer from UNAVCO: We do require that the session programming stay intact and continue as planned once power is reapplied, and also would like at least the option for an open file to be appended until the end of a session and a second file not open to complete the remainder of the session.

7. Regarding section 2.2 (Requirements for “Archival-Quality Streaming): Is UNAVCO requiring that the stream conform to an existing protocol or specification?

Answer from UNAVCO: No, we are open to the development of any streaming protocol, which may already have been defined or is new, that will allow us to rely solely upon TCP/IP-based streaming to achieve epoch complete data files. We currently must download fully logged data files in addition to streaming for real-time applications, resulting in the use of twice the bandwidth.
8. Regarding Question #14: How does UNAVCO expect a receiver to support RTCM SSR messages?

Answer from UNAVCO: Simply describe in as much detail as possible how your hardware and firmware does now or will in the future support SSR, whether in transmission (Base Station) mode or client (rover) mode.

9. Regarding section 28: Please give an example of the type of on-line attacks that concerns UNAVCO and how a firewall implementation might prevent them.

Answer from UNAVCO: In early 2014, the NTP servers that many GNSS receivers host were the subject of a DDoS attack that used the receivers to rebroadcast and amplify NTP requests; this caused many local subnets to slow down or crash, and caused receivers to be unreachable. The implementation of a firewall strategy such as that used in a UNIX/linux “hosts.allow” file or similar IP-selective firewall would limit incoming traffic to the receiver to a user-defined list of IP addresses or ranges. Any unauthorized traffic would be blocked.