

7840000 ITS – NETWORK DEVICES
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Chris Birosak
863-519-2507
chris.birosak@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (6-29-12)

Under the “Warranty” portion of each specification, we noticed the proposed changes are eliminating the verbiage from each ITS spec that requires the Contractor to, “ensure that all equipment warranties are fully transferable from the Contractor to the Department.” We have a concern that some equipment vendors might have a clause that their warranty is non-transferable. This language makes it the Contractor’s responsibility to ensure all vendor equipment warranties are transferable. If you keep this language in the specifications it should be changed to have the warranties transferable to the Department or maintaining agency. Thanks!

Response: The warranty language has been moved to 608-2; 781, 782, 784 and 785 reference Section 608 in regard to warranties.

Jani Rautaneva
Teleste LLC
1-512-868-2009
jani.rautaneva@teleste.com

Comments: (7-3-12)

1. 784-1 Managed Field Ethernet Switch

The following comments are based on our new Managed Field Ethernet Switches which will be available for shipping on Q4, 2012.

784-1.2.1 → OK

784-1.2.2 → OK, except IEEE 802.3u which we currently don’t list in our switch specs

784-1.2.3 → OK, we use SFP/LC and support also Gigabit SFPs (with auto-detect)

784-1.2.4 → OK, our switches have 8 copper ports

784-1.2.5 → Mostly OK, we offer two models, either for layer-2 or layer-3 operation. We support RMON, but SMON is currently not supported.

784-1.2.6 → OK

784-1.2.7 → OK

784-1.2.8 → Partially OK, our switches are compliant with EN, IEC, UL, FCC, DNV, but have not yet been NEMA TS2 certified.

784-1.3 → Our switches can be either mounted on 19” shelve or Din rail.

Our standard warranty is 36 months from the date of shipment which can be extended to 60 months from date of shipment. The challenge with “from the date of final acceptance” is that as a vendor we don’t have control over the project schedule including potential delays between receipt of products and final acceptance.

Response:

2. 784-3.2.2. We respectfully request FDOT to consider separating hardware encoder and software decoder into two separate line items as opposed to requiring each encoder to be supplied with software decoder with full PTZ support.

Arguments supporting separation of hardware encoder and software decoder into two line items:

- 1) Standard H.264 and MPEG video streams can be decoded with freeware players such as VLC.
- 2) Stand alone decoders don't provide centrally managed control for user rights and arbitration. Having that many SW decoders with full PTZ capability "floating around" could create security risk especially from PTZ camera control point of view.
- 3) FDOT uses SunGuide central software primarily for software decoding and PTZ. Therefore we believe that SW decoder with full PTZ supplied with each encoder would not be necessary in practice.
- 4) Encoders could be offered at lower price point without being bundled with SW decoder with PTZ capability.
- 5) Since the proposed specifications states in section 784-3.3 "DVD may be hardware or software based" it is conflicting that SW based decoder should be provided free of charge whereas HW based decoder is separate pay item.

Response:

3. 784-3.2.6.2

Software- based decoder. Currently we don't offer SDK/API for standalone software decoder with PTZ. Decoding is based on ffdshow which is readily available for third party integration. Further camera manufacturers should provide their SDK/API for integration with their cameras unless they support industry standard ONVIF. For example Teleste encoders are available with either SNMP or ONVIF support.

Response:

4. 784-3.2.7.

As a default our encoders support ONVIF for integration with third party systems. SNMP support is also available as an alternative to ONVIF. However, only one can be selected at the time.

Response:

5. 784-4.4.

Teleste hardware encoders have 3 year warranty from the date of shipment and Teleste software warranty is 90 days for the media. The challenge with "from the date of final acceptance" is that as a vendor we don't have control over the project schedule including potential delays between receipt of products and final acceptance.

Response:

Comments: (date)

Response:
