

eRFQ Questions and Answers

RFI Number: PE-48401-RFI-2026-000000577	RFQ Title: Next Generation Public Safety Solutions and Services
Requesting State Entity: Ga Dept of Transportation	Date: 6/22/2026
Issuing Officer: Haley Ford	RFQ Initially Posted to Internet: 5/14/2026
eMail Address: HFord@dot.ga.gov	Telephone: (470) 549-6535

The purpose of this document is to provide answers to supplier questions. Please see Questions and Answers included herein.

Note: This document is intended for informational purposes only. Any changes to the above solicitation must occur through a published addendum (or through publication of a new version in Team Georgia Marketplace™). If multiple Q & A documents are posted, the most recent Q & A shall govern in the event of a conflict.

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
1.	Please provide physical street address of each site that considered in scope.	General	- District 1- 1475 Jesse Jewell Pkwy, Gainesville, GA - District 2- 643 SR 15, Tennille, GA - District 3- 115 Transportation Blvd, Thomaston, GA - District 4- 702 W 2nd St, Tifton, GA - District 5- 204 US-301 N, Jesup, GA - District 6- 30 Great Valley Pkwy, White, GA - District 7 – 935 United Ave SE, Atlanta, GA. 30316
2.	For Phase 1, should respondents assume responsibility for providing ESInet and NGCS infrastructure/services, or should respondents assume integration with an existing or future statewide ESInet/NG9-1-1 environment?	Background	Respondents should assume full integration with the existing future statewide ESInet and NGCS environment, rather than providing their own ESInet or NGCS infrastructure or services. TBD
3.	Can GDOT provide a detailed Phase 1 scope definition identifying the operational workflows, integrations, capabilities, and participating organizations expected at go-live?	Background	GDOT is seeking a turnkey Phase 1 solution, and therefore does not plan to provide a detailed scope definition at this time. Respondents should propose a comprehensive, fully integrated approach that includes the operational workflows,

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
			system capabilities, integrations, and participating organizations required to achieve a successful go-live.
4.	Please identify the external agencies anticipated to participate in Phase 1, including: • County PSAPs • Georgia State Patrol • Emergency Operations Centers (EOCs) • Local law enforcement agencies • Other public safety organizations	Background	GDOT is not prepared to identify specific external agencies for Phase 1 at this time. This is one of the reasons we are requesting a turnkey solution, in which respondents define the recommended participating organizations, integration points, and operational workflows necessary to support a successful Phase 1 deployment.
5.	Please identify the external agency systems anticipated to participate in Phase 1 integrations, including CAD, RMS, call handling, dispatch, and public safety platforms, along with vendor names and versions where available.	Background	GDOT is not prepared to identify specific external agencies for Phase 1 at this time. This is one of the reasons we are requesting a turnkey solution, in which respondents define the recommended participating organizations, integration points, and operational workflows necessary to support a successful Phase 1 deployment.
6.	Can GDOT provide a high-level system interaction diagram or description showing how iNET, GA511, Cisco WebEx, ESRI, L3Harris, and external public safety systems currently exchange information?	Background	iNET and GA511 currently exchange information; however, all other platforms operate independently. GDOT does not have a consolidated system interaction diagram because the existing systems are not integrated. This is another reason we are seeking a turnkey solution that includes a proposed integration framework and data-exchange architecture.
7.	Can GDOT provide an inventory of currently available APIs, interfaces, and integration mechanisms for systems anticipated to participate in Phase 1? For each system integration, please identify: • Interface type (REST, SOAP, Event Stream, Webhook, File-based, etc.)	Background	The availability of APIs, interfaces, and integration mechanisms will depend on what current vendors are willing to share and coordinate with GDOT IT. At this time, GDOT cannot provide a definitive inventory. Respondents should assume that vendor engagement and technical discovery will be required as part of the proposed turnkey solution.

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
	• Authentication method • Documentation availability • Real-time vs batch capabilities • Data exchange direction		
8.	Can GDOT provide the current incident lifecycle and operational workflow, including: • Incident creation • Incident updates • Escalation processes • Agency notifications • Transfers between organizations • Closure processes • Publication to GA511	Background	GDOT will provide its current Standard Operating Guidelines (SOGs) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), which outline the existing incident lifecycle and operational workflows, including creation, updates, escalation, notifications, transfers, closure, and publication to GA511.
9.	Can GDOT describe the desired operational workflow for multimedia interactions (text, images, and video), including intake, review, storage, sharing, incident creation, and coordination activities?	Background	GDOT is seeking a workflow that enables the intake, review, storage, and sharing of multimedia interactions—including text, images, and video—with PSAPs, wrecker companies, and motorists. The solution should include a records management capability that securely stores all multimedia content and supports its use in incident creation and coordination activities.
10.	Please provide estimated daily and peak volumes for: • Voice interactions • Text interactions • Image submissions • Video sessions • Incident events • API transactions	Background	GDOT does not currently have reliable estimates for daily or peak volumes across these interaction types. This information will need to be validated through discovery and coordination with existing vendors and operational stakeholders. Respondents should propose assumptions and scalable design parameters as part of their turnkey solution, with the expectation that volume modeling will be refined during Phase 1.
11.	Should respondents assume GIS remediation, NG9-1-1 GIS readiness activities, data quality improvements, and GIS dataset modernization are within the scope of this initiative?	Background	Respondents should not assume that GIS remediation, NGCS GIS readiness activities, data quality improvements, or GIS dataset modernization are within the scope of this initiative. GDOT has not yet determined the level of GIS work that may be required, and this will need to be

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
			evaluated in coordination with existing stakeholders and vendors as part of the turnkey solution approach.
12.	For systems anticipated to participate in Phase 1, will GDOT provide vendor coordination, technical documentation, and integration environment access, or should respondents assume third-party vendor engagement and implementation activities will be required?	Background	GDOT cannot guarantee the availability of vendor coordination, technical documentation, or integration environment access for all systems anticipated to participate in Phase 1. Respondents should assume that third-party vendor engagement, coordination, and implementation activities will be required as part of their turnkey solution. GDOT will support these efforts where possible but expects respondents to lead the integration process.
13.	What data retention requirements should respondents assume for: • Voice recordings • Text communications • Images • Videos • Incident records • Audit logs	Background	All data—including voice recordings, text communications, images, videos, incident records, and audit logs—should be retained for a minimum of three years and stored off GDOT property in a secure environment that meets applicable state and federal requirements.
14.	Can GDOT provide expected non-functional requirements, including: • Availability requirements • Performance requirements • Response time expectations • Scalability expectations • Latency requirements • Recovery Time Objectives (RTO) • Recovery Point Objectives (RPO) • Geographic redundancy requirements	Background	GDOT does not have predefined non-functional requirements for availability, performance, scalability, latency, or disaster-recovery parameters at this time. Respondents should propose these requirements as part of their turnkey solution, including recommended RTO/RPO targets and geographic redundancy. GDOT will validate and refine these parameters during the discovery and design phases in coordination with stakeholders and existing vendors.
15.	Can GDOT describe the desired future-state experience for TMC operators, dispatch personnel, and citizens interacting with the platform, including expectations for self-service, assisted-service, AI-assisted	Background	GDOT has not yet defined a detailed future-state experience for TMC operators, dispatch personnel, or citizens. Respondents should propose the envisioned user experience as part of their turnkey solution, including

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
	operations, and omnichannel engagement?		recommendations for self-service capabilities, assisted-service workflows, AI-enabled operational support, and omnichannel engagement. GDOT will refine the desired future-state model during discovery and design in collaboration with the selected vendor.
16.	What agent-facing capabilities are desired for TMC operators and dispatch personnel, including: • Unified agent desktop • Incident context visibility • Knowledge assistance • Suggested responses • Real-time transcription • Call summarization • Multilingual support • AI-assisted operations	Background	GDOT has not yet defined the detailed agent-facing capabilities for TMC operators or dispatch personnel. Respondents should propose these capabilities as part of their turnkey solution, including recommendations for a unified agent desktop, incident context visibility, knowledge assistance, suggested responses, real-time transcription, call summarization, multilingual support, and AI-assisted operations. GDOT will refine the desired feature set during discovery and design in collaboration with the selected vendor.
17.	For AI-enabled capabilities, which use cases are considered priorities for Phase 1 and future phases? • Real-time agent assistance • Conversational virtual agents • Incident classification • Incident correlation • Knowledge retrieval • Automated publishing • Translation • Call summarization • Automatic dispositioning • Predictive analytics	Background	For Phase 1, GDOT considers the following AI-enabled capabilities to be priority use cases: real-time agent assistance, translation services, predictive analytics, incident classification, call summarization, and KPI generation. Additional AI capabilities may be evaluated for inclusion in future phases.
18.	Beyond voice, text, image, and video interactions, does GDOT anticipate supporting additional engagement channels during Phase 1 or future phases, including: • Web chat • Mobile applications • Email • Social media	Background	Yes. GDOT anticipates supporting additional engagement channels in Phase 1 and future phases, including web chat, mobile applications, email, social media, messaging platforms, and other digital channels as part of a comprehensive omnichannel strategy.

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
	• Messaging platforms • Other digital engagement channels		
19.	What potential risks, red flags, or areas of concern should vendors identify regarding the proposed engagement, scope, governance, timeline, or implementation approach? Or What are the current call center challenges, pain points, and desired outcomes for this initiative	Requested Information	GDOT expects respondents to identify potential risks or areas of concern related to the proposed engagement, including scope clarity, governance, timeline feasibility, and integration complexity. Current call center challenges include limited system interoperability, manual workflows, inconsistent data sharing, and the absence of unified tools to support operators. The desired outcome of this initiative is to modernize operations through a turnkey solution that enhances coordination, improves efficiency, strengthens data quality, and delivers a more seamless experience for operators, dispatch personnel, and the public.
20.	What limitations or challenges should the State be aware of when adopting your solution in a complex government environment?	Requested Information	Vendors should anticipate typical challenges associated with deploying solutions in a complex government environment. These may include navigating multi-layered governance structures, coordinating with multiple stakeholders and third-party vendors, adhering to strict security and compliance requirements, and integrating with legacy systems that may have limited documentation or interface capabilities. Respondents should identify any solution specific limitations or risks and outline mitigation strategies as part of their proposed turnkey approach.
21.	What factors should the State consider when evaluating whether a vendor is the right fit for future phases of this initiative?	Requested Information	When evaluating vendor fit for future phases, the State should consider factors such as the vendor's ability to operate effectively in a complex, multi-stakeholder government environment, their demonstrated success with large-scale integrations, and their capacity to support long-term modernization efforts. Additional considerations include the vendor's scalability, adaptability to

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
			evolving requirements, commitment to open standards, strength of their governance and project-management approach, and their ability to deliver continuous innovation across future phases of the initiative.
22.	What dependencies, assumptions, or prerequisites should be addressed before moving forward with a formal procurement or implementation effort?	Requested Information	Before moving forward with a formal procurement or implementation effort, several dependencies, assumptions, and prerequisites should be addressed. These include confirming stakeholder alignment on scope and objectives, validating integration requirements with existing vendors, ensuring access to current system documentation, and establishing governance and decision-making structures. The State should also assess data readiness, security and compliance requirements, operational constraints, and any resource or funding dependencies. Clarifying these items upfront will help reduce risk and support a smoother procurement and implementation process.
23.	What is the expected scope of AI-enabled capabilities (e.g., virtual agents, agent assist, conversational analytics, quality management)?	Requested Information	For Phase 1, GDOT expects the scope of AI-enabled capabilities to focus on the following priority use cases: real-time agent assistance, translation services, predictive analytics, incident classification, call summarization, and KPI generation. Additional AI capabilities—such as virtual agents, conversational analytics, quality management, and automated publishing—may be evaluated for inclusion in future phases as the platform matures.
24.	What evaluation criteria will be used to determine vendor suitability for a future RFP?	Requested Information	The purpose of this RFI is to help the State determine the evaluation criteria that should be used in a future RFP. GDOT is seeking industry input to better understand the capabilities, risks, and differentiators that should inform vendor evaluation and selection. The insights gathered through this RFI will shape the

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
			criteria used to assess vendor suitability in subsequent procurement phases.
25.	What are the anticipated timelines, budget considerations, and procurement approach for future phases?	Requested Information	GDOT has not yet established specific timelines, budget parameters, or a defined procurement approach for future phases of this initiative. These elements will be informed by the insights gathered through this RFI, internal planning efforts, and coordination with statewide procurement authorities. Respondents should not assume predetermined schedules or funding levels; instead, the State will use the information collected to shape a realistic roadmap and procurement strategy for subsequent phases.
26.	What is your proposed staffing model for this engagement, including the mix of onshore and offshore resources? Please identify which project activities would be performed by each team and how knowledge transfer, collaboration, and service quality will be managed.	Requested Information	GDOT has not defined a preferred staffing model for this engagement. Respondents should propose an approach that includes the recommended mix of onshore and offshore resources, along with a clear description of which project activities each team will perform. Proposals should also outline how knowledge transfer, collaboration, and service quality will be managed throughout the engagement. GDOT will evaluate proposed staffing models during procurement to ensure they align with project needs, security requirements, and operational expectations.
27.	Q35 was deferred to June 12th. In addition to daily incident, API, GIS, and multimedia transaction volumes, can GDOT also provide: average handle time (AHT) per call, average peak concurrent call volume during major incidents, and estimated inbound multimedia transactions (images, video streams) per month? These figures are required to produce accurate consumption-based pricing.	Q&A #35	GDOT has provided two (2) PDFs for review that contain the currently available information. Additional metrics such as average handle time (AHT), peak concurrent call volume during major incidents, and estimated inbound multimedia transaction volumes have not yet been established.

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
28.	Of the 61–67 users identified across the 7 locations, how many are expected to be concurrently active during normal operations versus during a declared emergency?	Initial Q&A	During normal operations, GDOT expects approximately 25 concurrent users during 1st-shift TMC operations, 10 during 2nd shift, and 5 during 3rd shift. While some roles overlap, personnel generally work 8-hour shifts. For CHAMP operations, normal activity levels include approximately 12 concurrent users during 1st shift and 8 during 2nd shift, with similar overlap and 8-hour staffing patterns. Concurrent usage may increase during declared emergencies, depending on incident severity and operational needs.
29.	For the field user population referenced in Q33 (HERO, CHAMP, maintenance personnel, tow operators, contractors) what is the estimated total number of users, and is the expectation that they access the system via mobile app, web browser, or dedicated hardware?	Q&A #33 – “Are mobile or field users expected to access the system?”	HERO operations are fully staffed at approximately *100–150 personnel across four rotating shifts, and CHAMP operations are staffed at approximately 80–125 personnel across two shifts using a 4-on/4-off schedule to maintain 24-hour coverage. GDOT is still finalizing the expected user counts for tow operators, maintenance personnel, and contractor groups. The expectation is that all field users regardless of role should be able to access the system through multiple channels, including a mobile application, a web browser, and dedicated hardware or software as appropriate for their operational environment.
30.	Q51 confirmed that the scope is to integrate with the existing PSAP Call Handling Equipment rather than replace it. Can GDOT identify the specific PSAP CHE platform and version currently in use, and confirm whether that platform supports API-based integration with third-party systems?	Q&A #51 – “Is the scope to replace PSAP CHE or integrating with existing PSAP CHE?”	GDOT can confirm that the intent is to integrate with the existing PSAP Call Handling Equipment rather than replace it. However, GDOT is not identifying the specific CHE platform or version as part of this RFI. Respondents should outline their integration approach and identify any assumptions or dependencies related to API-based connectivity with modern PSAP systems. Platform-specific integration requirements will be validated during later procurement and design

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
			phases in coordination with the State and its PSAP partners.
31.	Q5 identified Cisco WebEx as the current call-handling platform. Are there specific requirements to integrate with the existing Cisco WebEx deployment as part of this initiative, and if so, what version or release is currently deployed?	Q&A #5 –“What is TMC's current infrastructure? Network, CAD, Mapping, Call handling system, Radio, and RMS?”	GDOT is not requesting integration with the existing Cisco WebEx deployment as part of this initiative. Vendors should propose their recommended approach without assuming any dependency on the current WebEx platform or version.
32.	Q14 confirmed that Parsons iNET and GA511 primarily rely on custom APIs for incident ingestion and data exchange. Can GDOT make the iNET API documentation, data dictionary, or integration specifications available to responding vendors? Understanding the existing API schema is required to scope integration development effort and cost accurately.	Q&A #14 –“What traffic data standards are currently used (TMDD, DATEX II, NTCIP, CAP, custom APIs, etc.)?”	GDOT (TMC) will need to coordinate with GDOT IT and Parsons to determine whether iNET or GA511 API documentation, data dictionaries, or integration specifications can be shared with respondents. Any available documentation will be reviewed internally and shared as appropriate during later phases.
33.	Q23 confirmed statewide GIS datasets are not currently NG911-compliant. Has GDOT engaged with the Georgia Emergency Communications Authority (GECA) regarding the statewide GIS remediation effort, and is that remediation expected to be in scope for this procurement or handled as a separate initiative?	Q&A #23 –“Are statewide GIS datasets already NG9-1-1 compliant?”	GDOT has not yet engaged with the Georgia Emergency Communications Authority (GECA) regarding statewide GIS remediation. Any NGCS related GIS alignment or remediation would be considered in future phases and is not expected to be in scope for this procurement.
34.	Q21 confirmed radio interoperability is expected to include console integration, logging/recording, and situational awareness. Is the L3Harris system a P25 Phase I or Phase II trunked system, and does GDOT have an existing L3Harris API license or console integration	Q&A #21 –“Is radio interoperability expected to include console integration, logging	The L3Harris system in use is a Phase II P25 trunked system. GDOT does not currently have an existing API license or console-integration agreement in place that vendors can leverage. Any required licensing or integration agreements with L3Harris would need to be evaluated and

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
	agreement that a responding vendor could leverage as part of this solution?	recorders, or situational awareness/event sharing only?"	coordinated as part of future phases of this initiative.
35.	Q41 confirmed the solution must support MFA, SSO, Active Directory/Entra ID, BSIEM integration, and SOC monitoring. Is GDOT's Active Directory deployment on-premises, Azure AD (Entra ID) cloud-native, or hybrid, and does GDOT have existing federation to AWS (via AWS IAM Identity Center or SAML 2.0)?	Q&A #41 – "Must the solution support MFA, SSO, Active Directory/Entra ID, BSIEM integration, or SOC monitoring?"	This is an area that will require further coordination with GDOT IT. At this time, I have not confirmed whether GDOT's Active Directory environment is on-premises, cloud-native in Azure AD (Entra ID), or operating in a hybrid configuration, nor whether any existing federation with AWS is in place. These details will be evaluated in future phases of the initiative in collaboration with GDOT IT and statewide technology governance teams.
36.	What SIEM platform is referenced by 'BSIEM integration' in Q41 (e.g., Splunk, Microsoft Sentinel, QRadar), and what log-ingestion method does it currently use (syslog, API, agent-based)?	Q&A #41 – "Must the solution support MFA, SSO, Active Directory/Entra ID, BSIEM integration, or SOC monitoring?"	This is another area that will require coordination with GDOT IT. At this time, GDOT TMC has not confirmed which SIEM platform is referenced by "BSIEM integration" in Q41, nor the specific log-ingestion methods currently in use—such as syslog, API-based ingestion, or agent-based collection. These details will be validated in future phases of the initiative in collaboration with GDOT IT and statewide cybersecurity teams.
37.	For the 99.998% uptime requirement stated in Q52, what are the defined Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO) in the event of a regional AWS outage or a disaster affecting one of the 7 TMC locations?	Q&A #52 – "Is there a preference of Cloud or Premise CHE? And if Cloud, are there approved hosting environments?"	GDOT has not yet established specific Recovery Time Objective (RTO) or Recovery Point Objective (RPO) targets associated with the 99.998% uptime requirement. Determining appropriate RTO and RPO values—particularly for scenarios involving a regional AWS outage or a disruption affecting one of the seven TMC locations—will require coordination with GDOT IT, statewide technology governance teams, and future solution partners. These parameters will be defined in later phases of the initiative as part of the broader disaster-recovery and business-continuity planning effort.

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
38.	For the multimedia capabilities required at launch (text-to-511, images, video, telematics, IoT feeds per Q42), what is the expected maximum multimedia payload size (e.g., video clip duration and resolution, image file size), and what retention period is required for stored multimedia?	Q&A #42 – “Which multimedia capabilities are required at launch (text-to-911, images, video, telematics, IoT feeds, etc.)?”	GDOT has not yet established maximum multimedia payload sizes or retention requirements for the launch-phase capabilities referenced in Q42, including text-to-511, images, video, telematics, and IoT feeds. Determining appropriate limits such as video clip duration and resolution, image file size, and storage retention periods will require coordination with GDOT IT, cybersecurity teams, and operational stakeholders. These parameters will be defined in future phases of the initiative as part of the broader data management, storage, and performance engineering strategy.
39.	Beyond the 99.998% uptime SLA, are there specific performance requirements for the call-handling and incident-ingestion workflows — for example, call-answer time, API response latency, time-to-publish to GA511, or incident-to-dispatch handoff time?	General Question	Beyond the 99.998% uptime requirement, GDOT has not yet established specific performance targets for call-handling or incident-ingestion workflows. Metrics such as call-answer time, API response latency, time-to-publish to GA511, or incident-to-dispatch handoff time will need to be developed in coordination with GDOT IT, operational stakeholders, and future solution partners. These requirements will be defined in later phases of the initiative as part of the broader performance-engineering and service-level framework.
40.	What observability and monitoring expectations does GDOT have beyond the basic SOC/SIEM integration confirmed in Q41 — for example, real-time dashboards for call-center supervisors, incident-volume trending, system-health metrics, or custom alerting thresholds?	Q&A #41 – “Must the solution support MFA, SSO, Active Directory/Entra ID, BSIEM integration, or SOC monitoring?”	GDOT has not yet established detailed observability or monitoring requirements beyond the SOC/SIEM integration referenced in Q41. Expectations for capabilities such as real-time dashboards for call-center supervisors, incident-volume trending, system-health metrics, or configurable alerting thresholds will need to be developed in coordination with GDOT IT, operational leadership, and future solution partners. These requirements will be defined in later phases of the initiative as part of the broader monitoring, analytics, and operational-visibility strategy.

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
41.	For the phased implementation approach confirmed in Q36, does GDOT envision each phase as an independently funded and procured increment, or as a single multi-phase contract with defined phase gates?	Q&A #36 - "Is statewide scaling required at initial deployment or phased over time?"	GDOT has not yet determined whether the phased implementation approach will be executed as independently funded and procured increments or as a single multi-phase contract with defined phase gates. This decision will require coordination with GDOT TMC, GDOT IT, procurement, and leadership. The appropriate contracting structure will be defined in future phases of the initiative based on funding strategy, project governance, and the final solution architecture.
42.	Q45 confirmed AI and automation capabilities are desired (incident correlation, automated publishing, NLP/transcription). Are there specific AI/ML use cases GDOT has prioritized for Phase 1 versus deferred to later phases, and are there any constraints on AI model training using operational data?	Q&A #45- "Are AI or automation capabilities desired (incident correlation, automated publishing, NLP/transcription, etc.)?"	GDOT has not yet prioritized specific AI or machine learning use cases for Phase 1 versus later phases. Capabilities such as incident correlation, automated publishing, NLP-based transcription, and other automation features referenced in Q45 will require further coordination with GDOT IT, operations leadership, and future solution partners to determine appropriate sequencing. GDOT has not yet established any constraints or governance rules related to training AI/ML models using operational data. These considerations including data-handling policies, privacy requirements, and model-training restrictions will be defined in future phases of the initiative in alignment with statewide data governance and cybersecurity standards.
43.	For the analytics, dashboards, and reporting capabilities confirmed in Q44, does GDOT prefer embedded operational dashboards (e.g., supervisor real-time queue views, call-handling KPIs) within the call-	Q&A #44- "Are analytics, dashboards, and	GDOT anticipates the need for both embedded operational dashboards within the call-center application and separate executive level analytics delivered through a BI platform. The specific mix and prioritization of these capabilities will

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
	center application, or executive/strategic analytics accessed separately via a BI tool?	reporting capabilities required?"	be defined in later phases of the initiative in coordination with GDOT IT and operational leadership.
44.	Regarding the confirmed requirement for BSIEM integration and SOC monitoring (Q&A #41): Does GDOT envision the SIEM/SOC monitoring capability as embedded within the primary vendor's turnkey solution, or is there an expectation that a specialist cybersecurity subcontractor may deliver the security monitoring component as part of the overall team?	Cybersecurity	GDOT has not yet determined whether SIEM/SOC monitoring capabilities should be embedded within the primary vendor's turnkey solution or delivered by a specialized cybersecurity subcontractor as part of the overall team. This decision will require coordination with GDOT IT, statewide cybersecurity leadership, and procurement teams. The appropriate delivery model will be defined in later phases of the initiative based on GDOT's security operations strategy, existing enterprise tools, and governance requirements.
45.	What specific SIEM capabilities does GDOT require — log aggregation only, or full behavioral analytics, correlation rules, automated alerting, and incident investigation? Does GDOT have a preferred SIEM platform, or is this vendor-determined?	Cybersecurity	GDOT has not yet defined the specific SIEM capabilities required for this initiative. Whether the expectation is limited to log aggregation or includes advanced functions such as behavioral analytics, correlation rules, automated alerting, or incident-investigation tooling will need to be determined in coordination with GDOT IT and statewide cybersecurity leadership. GDOT has also not identified a preferred SIEM platform at this stage, so platform selection and capability scope remain vendor-neutral. These requirements will be clarified in future phases of the initiative as part of the broader security-architecture and monitoring strategy.
46.	Given the hybrid deployment model (Q&A #37) and 7 physical locations plus remote/field users (Q&A #29, #33), what are the security monitoring requirements for ensuring consistent visibility across on-premises, cloud, and mobile access points?	Cybersecurity	GDOT has not yet defined detailed security monitoring requirements for ensuring consistent visibility across on-premises systems, cloud hosted components, and remote or field-based users. Establishing expectations for unified monitoring such as endpoint visibility, network telemetry, cloud native logging, identity access monitoring, and mobile access oversight will require

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
			coordination with GDOT IT and statewide cybersecurity leadership. These requirements will be developed in future phases of the initiative as part of the broader enterprise security architecture and monitoring strategy.
47.	With HERO, CHAMP, maintenance personnel, tow operators, and contractors requiring system access (Q&A #33), what identity governance requirements does GDOT anticipate for managing access provisioning, role-based permissions, and access revocation across this diverse user population?	Cybersecurity	GDOT has not yet defined detailed identity-governance requirements for managing access across HERO, CHAMP, maintenance personnel, tow operators, contractors, and other external user groups. Expectations for access provisioning, role-based permissions, periodic access reviews, and timely access revocation will need to be developed in coordination with GDOT IT, cybersecurity leadership, and operational stakeholders. These requirements will be established in future phases of the initiative as part of the broader identity and access management strategy and governance framework.
48.	Does GDOT require a formal security operations framework (e.g., NIST 800-53, NIST CSF, or an equivalent state standard) for the NG9-1-1 environment, or will security requirements be defined during the RFP phase?	Cybersecurity	GDOT has not yet identified a required security-operations framework such as NIST 800-53, the NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF), or an equivalent state standard for the NGCS environment. The specific security controls, compliance expectations, and governance model will be defined during the RFP phase in coordination with GDOT IT, statewide cybersecurity leadership, and applicable state standards. Vendors should expect that final requirements will align with Georgia's enterprise security policies and industry best practices for mission-critical public-safety systems.
49.	Regarding the requirement for 99.998% uptime with fully managed security (Q&A #52): What incident response SLAs does GDOT anticipate for security events — and will the selected vendor be expected	Cybersecurity	GDOT has not yet established specific incident response SLAs for security events associated with the 99.998% uptime requirement. Expectations such as response time, escalation timelines, and containment or remediation targets will need to be developed in coordination with GDOT IT and statewide cybersecurity

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
	to provide 24/7 SOC coverage or defined-hours monitoring?		leadership. GDOT has also not yet determined whether the selected vendor will be required to provide full 24/7 SOC coverage or a defined hours monitoring model. These requirements will be clarified in future phases of the initiative as part of the broader security-operations and service-level framework.
50.	Are teaming arrangements between a primary NG9-1-1 platform vendor and specialist subcontractors (e.g., cybersecurity/SIEM, identity management, analytics) an acceptable and evaluated response structure for the eventual RFP?	Commercial / Procurement	Yes, teaming arrangements between a primary NGCS platform provider and specialized subcontractors may be considered an acceptable response structure. However, the Department has not finalized the requirements, evaluation criteria, or proposal structure for future solicitation. Any future RFP will specify the allowable proposal structures, subcontracting requirements, and evaluation criteria that will govern proposal submissions and evaluations.
51.	Will one-on-one vendor sessions be available to firms offering complementary cybersecurity, SIEM, and security monitoring capabilities — or are sessions limited to primary platform vendors?	Commercial / Procurement	GDOT has not yet determined whether one on one vendor sessions will be limited to primary platform vendors or extended to firms offering complementary cybersecurity, SIEM, or security monitoring capabilities. The structure and scope of vendor engagement sessions will be defined in coordination with GDOT IT, procurement, and program management leadership as the initiative progresses. Additional guidance on eligibility and participation will be provided in future phases.
52.	What is the anticipated timeline from RFI close (July 27, 2026) to RFP release?	Commercial / Procurement	Information is unavailable at this time
53.	UPDATED RESPONSE: While the fundamental role of an ESInet is the delivery of 9-1 1 calls to Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs), it is capable of supporting additional public safety and service traffic if designed with adequate capacity,	NextGen Solutions and Services- Sec. 4, subsection B	GDOT ATMS platform is Parsons' iNET. Key capabilities include: • Integration of data from multiple sources (sensors, cameras, CV/AV systems, detectors) • AI/ML-enhanced traffic and incident management • Multi-agency operational collaboration • Scalability for statewide

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers														
	security, and prioritization. Within this framework, what specific applications and networking protocols are utilized by the TMC's Advanced Transportation Management System (ATMS) for statewide data sharing? Furthermore, how many GDOT or other Georgia State facilities are currently integrated into this network, and has GDOT established specific bandwidth requirements or calculations for this real-time traffic data?		deployments • Support for connected-vehicle (CV) and autonomous-vehicle (AV) integrations Parsons' iNET provides a unified platform for gathering, standardizing, and distributing data, enabling agencies to share real-time information across jurisdictions. There are a total of 108 county and cities integrated into NaviGator.														
54.	Updated Response: What are the anticipated daily incidents, API, GIS, and multimedia transaction volumes? Answer Below: <table><tr><td>Average Carbyne Uses Per Calendar Day Jun/July2025</td><td>97</td></tr></table> <table><tr><td>Type</td><td>Total Incidents June and July</td><td>Avg per Calendar Day</td></tr><tr><td>Stall</td><td>13312</td><td>218</td></tr><tr><td>Crash</td><td>19689</td><td>323</td></tr><tr><td>Accident</td><td>8</td><td>0</td></tr></table>			Average Carbyne Uses Per Calendar Day Jun/July2025	97	Type	Total Incidents June and July	Avg per Calendar Day	Stall	13312	218	Crash	19689	323	Accident	8	0
Average Carbyne Uses Per Calendar Day Jun/July2025	97																
Type	Total Incidents June and July	Avg per Calendar Day															
Stall	13312	218															
Crash	19689	323															
Accident	8	0															
55.																	

#	Questions	Referenced Section	Answers
56.			
57.			
58.			
59.			
60.			
61.			
62.			