

ADDENDUM FOUR, QUESTIONS and ANSWERS

Date: April 22, 2020

To: All Bidders

From: Annette Walton/Nancy Storant, Buyers
AS Materiel State Purchasing Bureau

RE: Addendum for Request for Proposal Number 6264 Z1 to be opened June 3, 2020 at 2:00 P.M.
Central Time

Questions and Answers

Following are the questions submitted and answers provided for the above-mentioned Request for Proposal. The questions and answers are to be considered as part of the Request for Proposal. It is the Bidder's responsibility to check the State Purchasing Bureau website for all addenda or amendments.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
1.	6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical Requirements Option A, B and C (Word doc)	SLA 1 through 9	General Operations - Service Level Agreements System Capacities and Performance	16	Option A, B, and C have the same SLA requirements; could the Commission please clarify how the SLA's apply to each option individually?	The SLA requirements apply as written. Even if a bidder is only responding to the NGCS, there is still a network component to that. The SLAs related to devices and capacity apply equally to network and NGCS devices.
2.	6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical Requirements Option C - ESInet and NGCS (Word doc)	GEN SCEN 3	Scenario 3	25	Can the Commission clarify whether this scenario is referring to an SI or LDB change?	The reference is to a spatial interface (SI) change, but it could be either an SI or location database (LDB) in a transitional environment. The errors were discovered in the Contractor's validation process prior to updating either the SI or the LDB, with the understanding that the state will upload data to the Contractor and never have direct access to either the SI or the LDB.
3.	6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP Revision One and Cost Proposal (Word doc)	V.A	Background and Project Scope	28	Regions 1-6 are defined differently in Section V.A and in the Cost Proposal Summary; for example, Region 1 is defined as the South Central / Panhandle in RFP Section V.A and defined as SE in the Cost Proposal Summary. Could the Commission please clarify?	Section V.A. of the RFP is Correct. Please use the revised posted documents: 6264 Z1 Cost Proposal Option A ESInet Revision One, 6264 Z1 Cost Proposal Option B NGCS Revision One, and 6264 Z1 Cost Proposal Option C ESInet and NGCS Revision One.
4.	6264 Z1 ATTACHMENT A	PSAP Host Locations	-	-	Based on the description of each RFP element in section V.B of the main RFP document, the initial RFP solution will connect each regional host to the statewide ESInet. What does the Commission intend for the Standalone PSAPs and Regions 6 and 7 that do not have a host location defined in Attachment A? Can the Commission identify hosted location(s) for Regions 6	The creation and composition of PSAP regions is under local control. However, it is the State's expectation that the remaining standalone PSAPs will join either an existing region or one of two new regions, at the PSAPs discretion. The State anticipates that regions 6 & 7 will be comprised of PSAPs in the northeast corner of the state. The two regions are expected to form by mid-2021 and anticipated host locations have been added to Attachment A Revision One.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					and 7 to maintain consistency with pricing for Regions 1-5? Can the Commission indicate which Region the Standalone PSAPs intend to join?	<p>For purposes of responding to this RFP, please assume the following:</p> <p>The State is of the understanding that the PSAPs in Custer and those included in 'Region 26' (Thomas, Blaine, Loup, Garfield, Wheeler, Valley, Greely and Sherman counties) will become a part of the East Central Region.</p> <p>*Region 6 (Northeast)</p> <p>Knox, Cedar, Dixon, Dakota, Thurston, Stanton, Madison (Host), Wayne, Pierce, and Antelope</p> <p>Region 7 (Metro West)</p> <p>Dodge (Host), Colfax (Host), Cuming and Burt</p> <p>*The Northeast region is finalizing host locations. Norfolk (Madison County) will be one host, while the second host may be one of the following three locations: South Sioux City (Dakota County), Wayne, or Hartington (Cedar County). The State anticipates that the second host will be known prior to the opening of the RFP and an Addendum will be posted once the locations are finalized.</p>
5.	6264 Z1 ATTACHMENT A	PSAP Host Locations	-	-	Is there a timeframe that should be assumed for the deployment of the host locations for Regions 6 and 7 for purposes of developing the project implementation plan?	The State anticipates completion of regions 6 and 7 by the end of 2021. It is expected that all regions are transitioned to the statewide NG911 system by 2023.
6.	6264 Z1 ATTACHMENT A	PSAP Host Locations	-	-	If the requirement is for bidders to provide network to standalone PSAPs, what is the requirement for last-mile diversity and redundancy for standalone PSAPs?	All PSAPs on the NG911 system will be a part of a region. There will not be standalone PSAPs.
7.	6264 Z1 ATTACHMENT A	PSAP Equipm	-	-	Can the Commission provide the call-handling position count at each PSAP?	See Attachment D Nebraska PSAP Trunk, Position, and Call Volume Information.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
	NT A	ent				
8.	6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical Requirements Option C - ESInet and NGCS (Word doc)	ESI 1	Emergency Services IP Network Diversity	30	Can the Commission please clarify whether diverse entrances already exist at any of the identified host locations due to the likelihood that bidders will not be able to perform site walks of the locations prior to bid submission? For sites that have diverse entrances, can the Commission provide information on which carriers are providing IP connectivity through those entrances?	<p>It is the state's understanding that the majority of the host locations do not have diverse entrances into their facilities.</p> <p>The host locations that have diverse entrances are those serving the South East Region, with Windstream serving as the primary carrier in both host locations and the Metro Region, with CenturyLink serving as the primary carrier into both host locations.</p> <p>The North Central, South Central, East Central, Metro West, and North East do not have diverse entrances.</p> <p>The State asks that Bidders differentiate between primary and secondary connections both in the response and pricing matrix.</p>
9.	6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical Requirements Option C - ESInet and NGCS (Word doc)	NGCS 9	Next Generation Core Services Elements (NGCS) Legacy Network Gateway (LNG) Location Information	37	Are NGCS 8 and NGCS 9 duplicates?	<p>Yes, NGCS 8 and NGCS 9 are duplicates NGCS 9 has been deleted in its entirety. Please see; Attachment C Option B Revision One, and Attachment C Option C Revision One.</p>
10.	6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical	NGCS 67	Next Generation Core	59	What expectations does the Commission have for the interface between audio logging recording and i3 Event logging?	<p>At this time, there is no requirement of audio logging occurring within NGCS. Audio logging is done at the host or PSAP level. i3 event logging must interface</p>

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
	Requirements Option C - ESInet and NGCS (Word doc)		Services Elements (NGCS) Event Logging and Management Information System (MIS)			with ECaTS.
11.	6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical Requirements Option C - ESInet and NGCS (Word doc)	NGCS 62	Next Generation Core Services Elements (NGCS) Spatial Interface (SI) Use of the Commission's GIS Data Model	56	<p>1. Describe how the Bidder's solution will use the Commission's GIS data model (Attachment D) without modification to the schema.</p> <p>Can the Commission confirm that this is actually referencing Attachment B?</p>	Yes .NGCS 62 has been corrected. Please use: Attachment C Option B - NGCS Revision One and Attachment C Option C – ESInet and NGCS Revision One.
12.	6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP Revision One	-	Scope of Service	1	<p>"The bidder must identify the proprietary information, mark the proprietary information according to state law, and submit the proprietary information in a separate container or envelope marked conspicuously using an indelible method with the words "PROPRIETARY INFORMATION" or if submitting the proposal or response electronically, as a separate electronic file that is named "PROPRIETARY INFORMATION". "</p> <p>As the proprietary information in bidder's responses may be in a number of</p>	

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					different areas of the response and if bidders provide the bid as requested above, this would oblige the State evaluation team to reference back and forth between two documents as they go through the review of the completed responses. We would like to suggest for the benefit of the evaluation team that bidders provide two full set of response documents; One copy of the full submission for the evaluation team (not to be published publicly) and one redacted version of the completed response (for public publication).	Please submit all proprietary information as required in the RFP.
13.	Addendum 1	-	-	-	Can the State provide what the file size limitation are for bid submission via ShareFile, if any?	None known at this time.
14.			Attachment A	2,3	Will PSAP CPE be upgraded to be i3 capable or will this be an initial RFAI deployment?	The PSC will work with the regions to encourage i3 compatibility, but Bidders shall assume connectivity to CHE with the software versions noted in Attachment A Revision One.
15.			Attachment C	Page 65, SVAL-1	Can the State please confirm that SVAL-1 is an optional requirement?	SVAL-1 is not an optional requirement. Attachment C Option B NGCS - Revision One Attachment C Option C ESInet and NGCS - Revision One.
16.			6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP Revision	Page 29	Is the intent of the "Option A" network to be a standalone WAN for all host locations to communicate and share data; or is the "Option A" network exclusive to provide connectivity from the NGCS's to the host locations?	It could potentially allow for traffic between PSAPs associated with different hosts; however, 911 requests for assistance shall have priority. The regional ESInets will handle traffic between PSAPs in the respective regions. Any non-911 traffic must be public-

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
			One			safety-related (CAD, MIS, etc.). The State recognizes that there would need to be traffic engineering discussions before additional traffic could be added to the network.
17.			Attachment A	2-3	Can the State provide physical addresses for all the Stand Alone PSAPs so that vendors can determine diversity availability to each?	See response to Question 4.
18.			Attachment A	all	Can the State confirm there are no secondary PSAPs that will be connected to the ESInet/NGCS?	At this time, no secondary PSAPs will be connected to the ESInet/NGCS. If they connect in the future, they will connect via a regional host.
19.			Attachment C, Option C	10	NOC/SOC 10 - Does this requirement only apply to ESInet as NGCS is not indicated in this requirement?	It is a general requirement and applies to both ESInet and NGCS. Please use Attachment C – Option A ESInet Revision One; Attachment C Option B NGCS Revision One; and Attachment C Option C ESInet and NGCS Revision One.
20.			Attachment C, Option C	18	SLA 9 – Will the State please reference the Standards Document the 54ms network traffic convergence requirement is derived from?	ITU-T G.8031 and G.8032 implement sub-50ms failover in ethernet networks. Additionally, MPLS networks support Fast Re-Route (FRR) which also is sub-50ms.
21.			Attachment C, Option C	32	ESI 9 - Can the State provide additional documentation on the microwave network and other local/state-owned networks that are being proposed? Are these public safety grade	This requirement was to raise awareness of other networks in the state. Bidders should research all possible providers to provide service to the State. The PSC is unable to provide additional

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					networks?	information specific to the networks.
22.			Attachment C, Option C	33	ESI 11 - Can the state clarify the difference between ESI 10 and ESI 11?	ESI 10 specifies that the Contractor will support ESInet-to-ESInet interconnections. ESI 11 specifies that the Contractor will implement ESInet-to-ESInet and NGCS interconnections as the need arises.
23.			Attachment C, Option C	47	NGCS 38 - SCTP is listed as optional. NGCS 27 includes this and does not state as optional. Can the State clarify?	NGCS 27 refers to the border control function (BCF) and requires that the BCF be able to accept stream control transmission protocol (SCTP) traffic from outside. NGCS 38 refers to the emergency services routing proxy (ESRP), where SCTP traffic is desirable but not required.
24.			Attachment C, Option C	56	NGCS 62 - Reference to Attachment D. Currently no attachment D on the State's website, can the State provide?	See response to Question 11.
25.			Attachment C, Option C	59	NGCS 69 - State references MIS which is usually associated with CPE. Is the State asking for the NGCS provider to manage MIS or continue using the current ECaTs solution with their loggers for CPE?	The requirement is for the event logging in the NGCS to feed into the PSAPs' event logging (ECaTs) to provide a complete record of the call event.
26.			Attachment C, Option C	63	NGCS 77 - Can the State clarify the Ringdown Functionality. Ringdown is currently part of CPE, how does the State propose this be integrated with ESInet?	The requirement is that the NGCS support Ringdown functionality in the event that one or more CHE systems do not support it.
27.			Attachment A	2,3	Will you please add a "Total Position Count" column to the PSAP Table in	See response to Question 7.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					Attachment A?	
28.			6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP Revision One	all	What changes were made with the release of Revision One?	<p>1. The Opening Date and time was corrected to:</p> <p>June 3, 2020 2:pm CT</p> <p>2. Added to the Proprietary Paragraph on Page i. "if submitting the proposal or response electronically, as a separate electronic file that is named "PROPRIETARY INFORMATION".</p> <p>3. Schedule of Events Activity 2 added "Form B"</p> <p>4. Schedule of Events, Activity 8 added ".00 (seconds)" to the time that bids are due.</p>
29.			Attachment C, Option A, B, and C	all	Are there any Mandatory Requirements in Options A, B, or C?	Optional service is called out at NGCS 81. It is understood that Bidders may not have 100% compliance. The evaluation process is designed to select the best solution from those submitted.
30.			Attachment C, Option C	15	NOC/SOC 23 – State indicates they maybe find it beneficial to have a third party NOC/SOC service. Can the State provide additional details such as location, software used, and other technical capabilities on the 3 rd party to allow vendors to price connecting to a 3 rd party NOC/SOC?	This is a requirement to support such a connection in the future should the State determine it is in the State's best interest. Bidders should describe their capabilities for establishing a data-sharing connection.
31.			Attachment C, Option C	25	GEN SCEN 3 – Can the state expand on the scenario described? What kind of changes has the bidder uploaded? Are these software updates? The assumption is that the	<p>See response to Question 2.</p> <p>The reference is to a spatial interface (SI) change,</p>

Question Number	Reference Document	RFP Section Reference	RFP Page Number	RFP Page Number	Question	State Response
					State is responsible for both MSAG and GIS data so they would be responsible for making updates to these. Not sure what kind of bidder updates would result in 15,000 errors being generated.	
32.			6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP Revision One, Section V.B.2.b	29	<p>Can the State provide status of GIS data for the PSAP's throughout Nebraska?</p> <p>Will the State be going to i3 with geospatial day 1 or will it be a slower transition?</p>	<p>The statewide street centerline data is available for download from nebraskamap.gov (search 911)</p> <p>The State is currently working with each PSAP to create the statewide PSAP layer. This is a work in progress and the data is currently out to the PSAPs for input and updates.</p> <p>The State is looking to implement NG911 services as quickly as possible, so it is not required that geospatial routing be available with the initial deployments.</p>
33.			Attachment A	2,3	<p>Can you please provide the number of concurrent calls that each PSAP can currently support?</p> <p>As a follow on, is it the State's desire to maintain this capacity or is there a need to increase the number of concurrent calls for each PSAP? If so, please provide the desired number of concurrent calls by PSAP.</p>	<p>The number of concurrent calls that each PSAP can support is unknown. Please see Attachment D.</p> <p>At this time, it is the expectation of the State that the capacity for concurrent calls remains the same. As greater functionality becomes available (video, images, etc.), it is expected that network capacity can be adjusted to accommodate the additional traffic. Please refer to Req. GEN-4 and SLA-1.</p>
34.			Attachment C	63	Make-Busy Functionality: Is the requirement to continue to use a	The functionality can be provided either way. Some PSAPs may desire the option of a

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					physical device for make-busy operation or can this capability be provided through a portal that would add more functionality and options for make-busy scenarios?	physical switch.
35.			Attachment A	3	Is it the intent of the State to connect each of the individual PSAPs (not currently part of a regional system) to the NGCS via ESInet or will those PSAPs remain on legacy routing until such time that they become part of an existing or new regional system?	See response to Question 4.
36.			6264 Z1 Cost Proposal Option A ESInet Final, 6264 Z1 Cost Proposal Option B-NGCS FINAL3.10.20, 6264 Z1 Cost Proposal Option C ESInet and NGCS final		The cost proposal worksheets require the breakout of fees to seven (7) regions. Section V. A of the Request for Proposal for Contractual Services (6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP final SONYAS.docx) and "Attachment A PSAP Host endpoints equipment and selective router locations" indicate the makeup of the seven (7) regions. Between those two data sources, twelve (12) of the "stand-alone" counties / PSAP locations from Attachment A are not accounted for in one of the seven (7) regions. How should fees for these twelve (12) unaccounted locations be included in the cost proposal? 1. Antelope County	See response to Question 4.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Cedar County 3. City of South Sioux City 4. City of Wayne/Wayne County 5. Dawes County 6. Dixon County 7. Knox County 8. Mid Rivers 911 Center 9. Pierce County 10. Region 26 Council 11. Scottsbluff County 12. Thurston County 	
37.			6264 Z1 Cost Proposal Option A ESInet Final, 6264 Z1 Cost Proposal Option B-NGCS FINAL3.10.20, 6264 Z1 Cost Proposal Option C		<p>When will the remaining “stand-alone” entities join a specific region?</p> <p>Are there any circumstances that would allow a stand-alone to NOT be in a region,</p> <p>and if so, will each stand-alone be their own ‘region’?</p>	See response to Question 4.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
			ESInet and NGCS final			
38.			6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP final SONYAS <i>Scope of Services I.J. Submission of Proposals</i>	i	How should bidders delineate proprietary information? Can bidders submit redacted copies to be used for FOIA requests? The RFP states that The Technical Proposal, Cost Proposal, and Proprietary information should be uploaded as separate files. We are concerned that by separating proprietary details from the Technical Proposal the full response context will not be understood and will therefore make proposal evaluation more difficult.	See response to Question 12.
39.			6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP final SONYAS <i>I.P. Request for Proposal / Proposal Requirements</i>	5	Should item #4 "Completed Sections II through IV" read "through VI" instead?	No. Please use the most recent version of the RFP: "6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP Revision One".
40.			6264 Z1 ESInet and Core	9-27	Are bidders required to indelibly initial the "Accept" or "Reject" boxes in ink, or can bidders type the company	Either is acceptable.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
			Services RFP final SONYAS <i>II. Terms and Conditions</i> <i>III. Contractor Duties</i> <i>IV. Payment</i>		officer's initials?	
41.			6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP final SONYAS <i>V.B. Composition of the Request for Proposal</i>	29	The Commission's intent is to release an RFP soon after the release of the ESInet/NGCS RFP that addresses the connectivity from the host locations to the regional PSAP locations. Please provide the status of the intended RFP, and what the expected relationship with these services providers will be?	The status of releasing an RFP to address Host/Remote connectivity is still in discussion and a decision has not been finalized on the need for releasing such an RFP. Each region has a regional IP network today, and the expectation is that a possible Host/Remote RFP will not change the interaction between the Bidders and these regional IP providers. It is anticipated that the various service providers of the state and regional ESInets will advise one another of outages within their respective networks.
42.			6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP final SONYAS	29	Are there any plans to upgrade call handling equipment to NENA i3-ready call handling?	The PSC will work with the regions to encourage i3 compatibility, but Bidders shall assume connectivity to CHE with the software versions noted in Attachment A Revision One.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
			<i>V.B. Composition of the Request for Proposal</i>			
43.			6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical Requirements Option C <i>GEN SCEN 4, Scenario 4</i>	25	Since the connectivity from the regional host controller to the PSAP's will be part of another RFP, what are the responsibilities of the service provider for this connectivity regarding monitoring, reporting, and maintenance actions?	The Regional IP network and monitoring of such networks is the responsibility of the Regional network service provider. It is anticipated that the various service providers of the State and regional ESInets will advise one another of outages within their respective networks.
44.			6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical Requirements Option C <i>ESI 9, Emergency Services IP Network (ESInet); Special Construction</i>	32	Can the State provide diagrams or schema for the existing network assets so bidder's understand what can be leveraged?	See response to Question 21.
45.			6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical	60	Please provide a copy or link to the existing data-sharing agreement (DSA).	Please see new 6264 Z1 Attachment E Nebraska ECaTs Data Sharing Agreement

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
			Requirements Option C NGCS 70, Next Generation Core Services Elements (NGCS) Event Logging and Management Information System (MIS); Access to Event Logging Data			
46.			6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical Requirements Option C NGCS 71, Next Generation Core Services Elements	61	What needs to be provided for third-party certification proof?	Certification documents are not required. Please see NGCS 71.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
			(NGCS) Event Logging and Management Information System (MIS); NENA Standards Compliance			
47.			RFP document, title page, top section:	Page i	The opening date and time says: "June 3, 3030, 2:00 P.M. Central Time". Question: Should the year be changed to 2020 instead of 3030? Or is there a reason its titled 3030?	See response to Question 28.
48.			RFP document, Section I. Procurement Procedure, part J. Submission of Proposals subsection 2 and Section VI Proposal	Pages 4 and 35	At section 1.J.2 of the RFP, the bid says: "The Technical, Cost Proposals, and Proprietary information should be uploaded as separate files." Additionally, section VI., Proposal Instructions, Part A Proposal Submission, number 2 Technical Approach says: " The technical approach section of the Technical Proposal should consist of the following subsections, which includes subpart f titled "Cost	

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
			Instructions, Section 2.f		<p>Proposal”.</p> <p>Question: Should the cost proposal be included as subpart f in the Technical Approach/Technical Proposal electronic file document, or should it be submitted as a totally separate file?</p>	<p>Please submit the cost proposal as a separate excel file.</p> <p>VI.A.2.f. is hereby deleted.</p>
49.			RFP document, Section I. Procurement Procedure, part P. Request for Proposal/Proposal Requirements, Subpart 4 and Section VI A. Proposal Instructions, Section 1 Corporate Overview & 2 Technical Approach	Pages 5 and 35	<p>At Section 1.P.4, the proposal requirements say The proposals will first be examined to determine if all requirements listed below have been addressed and whether further evaluation is warranted. It goes on to include # 4 “Complete Sections II through IV.”</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In section VI Proposal Instructions, the location to include sections II through IV is not mentioned. Should those sections be included in Section VI, Part 1 for Corporate Overview, or in section VI part 2 for Technical Approach? 2. If in section VI.A.1, Corporate Overview, should the sections be in the order presented in the RFP, or do you want the 	<p>The State lists all required items in section I.P. The order of documents is not prescribed in the RFP document.</p>

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					Sections ii through IV after VI.A.1.j? 3. .If in Section VI.A.2 Technical Approach, where in the letter sequence a. to f. should sections II through IV be inserted?	
50.			ESInet & Core Services RFP Revision One	4	The RFP requests one hard copy labeled "original," but does not specify the number of hard copies. If bidders intend to submit hard copies, how many copies should be provided?	If a bidder chooses to submit a paper document, only one (1) copy marked "original" is needed.
51.			ESInet & Core Services RFP Revision One	20	If the primary contractor lists their subcontractors as additional insured on their insurance policy, does this satisfy the requirements in section G for subcontractors?	Yes, if the Contractor provides equivalent insurance for each subcontractor and verifies the coverage meets the requirements of the RFP.
52.			ESInet & Core Services RFP Revision One	15	Within Section VI. Proposal Instructions, Item 2. Technical Approach provides a list of the subsections that should be included in the Technical Proposal. Item c. states "Attachment C - Technical Requirements Option A, B, and/or C." If a bidder intends to submit a response for Technical Requirements Options A, B, and C, how does the state prefer all three options be submitted?	

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					<p>Does the state want bidders to complete/return separate responses for Option A, B, and C? Or, does the state want only a response submitted for Option C and a separate cost proposal for each option? Please provide clarification. If the state does prefer bidders submit each option separately, should they be provided as separate binders?</p>	<p>Please submit a complete, separate response if responding to more than one option.</p> <p>Yes. Or if submitted electronically, as separate files using the naming convention stated in the RFP.</p>
53.			Attachment C Option A / Attachment C Option B /Attachment C Option C	1	<p>The instructions for Attachment C, Options A, B, and C include instructions indicating "the narrative should provide The Public Service Commission (PSC) with sufficient information to differentiate the bidder's business solution from other bidders' solutions. Bidder shall not refer to other sections as a response. Even if the response is an exact duplicate of a previous response, the details shall be provided in the same paragraph as the requirement." However, ESInet & Core Services Revision One, page 29 indicates "The Bidder may include appendices and reference them from within the proposal response. This is particularly appropriate for lengthy responses on a single subject." The bidder believes this information is contradicting. Please provide clarification as to whether it is</p>	<p>Each Option being bid must include a response to each requirement. Bidders cannot reference a response submitted in another Option. While individual requirement responses may refer to additional documentation in appendices, attachments, etc., an answer may not be scored if it simply refers the reader to the response to an attachment or another requirement.</p>

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					acceptable for bidders to refer to appendixes within their response that are included later within the proposal?	
54.			Attachment C Option B Attachment C Option C	34 37	Req Identifier NGCS 8 and NGCS 9 are identical. Does the state want bidders to answer both requirements or will one be removed?	See response to Question 9.
55.			Attachment C Option B Attachment C Option B	35 38	Req Identifier NGCS 11 states "The bidder's BCF solution shall support transcoding of Baudot tones to real-time text (RTT), as described in IETF RFC 4103. Describe how the solution meets or exceeds the above requirements." Generally, this function is normally conducted by the legacy network gateway (LNG). Can the state please provide clarification on this requirement?	Describe how this functionality is implemented in the proposed solution, including the functional element or elements involved.
56.			Attachment C Option B Attachment C Option C	47 50	Regarding Req Identifier NGCS 45 "An origination network may use an ECRF, or a similar function within its own network, to determine an appropriate route—equivalent to what would be determined by the authoritative ECRF—to the correct ESInet for the emergency call. Describe the functionality of such an ECRF equivalent and document where this functional element resides within the proposed solution." If an origination network is using their own ECRF not provided by the bidder, how is the	This is in reference to originating service providers (OSPs) needing some means of making an initial routing decision. Whether this is implemented by the NGCS provider as an external (to the ESInet) ECRF or by the respective OSP depends on the bidder's interop agreement with the OSP. Describe how the ECRF solution operates in a hierarchical environment.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					bidder expected to describe the functionality of said ECRF? Additionally, if it is in the origination network, how can the NGCS bidder document where this functional element resides? This same requirement is included in	For the remainder of the question, there is missing information. The State is unable to provide a response.
57.			Attachment C Option B Attachment C Option C	47 51	Part of Req Identifier NGCS 49 is a duplicate of NGCS 48. Both contain, at least in part, "Logging of all connections, connection attempts, data updates, ECRF query results, and LoST transactions." Please provide clarification.	Req Identifier NGCS 48 deals specifically with rate-limiting queries and logging when those limits are exceeded. Req Identifier NGCS 49 is a more general list of requirements based on NENA-STA-010.2.
58.			Attachment C Option B Attachment C Option C	47 51	Part of Req Identifier NGCS 49 includes "Location error correction." It is the bidders belief that the ECRF should consume data and optionally detect errors, allowing the GIS staff to act on detected errors and resolve them in the source GIS data. An ECRF can't, and should not, attempt to correct errors as this can introduce a number of problems. Can this requirement please be removed?	This requirement remains and should read, "location error identification." Please use Attachment C Option B NGCS Revision One; and Attachment C Option B ESInet and NGCS Revision One.
59.			Attachment C Option B Attachment C Option C	41 51	Part of Req Identifier NGCS 49 includes "Compliance with NENA 02-010 and NENA 02-014." NENA 02-010 is a legacy schema for GIS and is incompatible with the NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model that is specified in	Bidder must be compliant with all current NENA standards, other industry standards and best practices.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					Attachment B. NENA 02-014 refers to GIS data collection and maintenance standards, of which the ECRF does not do. Can both of these requirements be removed, or updated, to reflect new NENA standards (such as the NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model)?	
60.			Attachment C Option B Attachment C Option C	51 51	Req Identifier NGCS 59 references legacy standards NENA 02-010 and NENA 02-014. Neither of these should apply to the SI. Can these be changed to the CLDXF standard and NG9-1-1 GIS Data Model?	Please see response to Question 59.
61.			Attachment C Option B Attachment C Option C	52 56	Req Identifier NGCS 63 states "Describe how the solution interfaces with other LDB solutions which may participate in or interface with bidder's solution." Please elaborate on how, and more importantly why, one LDB will need to interface with another? There is currently no NENA standard in place for this.	There will be a transition period between legacy routing and geospatial routing. Explain how the proposed solution would deal with multiple ALI/MSAG databases and the locations where ALI steering may be in place.
62.			Attachment C Option B Attachment C Option C	57 57	Req Identifier NGCS 64 states the LDB shall "Shall automatically detect, import and validate customer records (SOI records)." In order to load a legacy SOI record into an LDB, it must be converted to CLDXF. The NENA standards specify using an MSAG Conversion Service (MCS) functional element for this. Is an MCS part of the	The RFP seeks a complete solution. Please submit a response that best meets all current NENA and industry standards.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					requirements of this RFP?	
63.			Attachment C Option B Attachment C Option C	53 56	Req Identifier NGCS 62 refers to the Commission's GIS data model (Attachment D). Can the state please clarify if the GIS Data Model is Attachment B or D?	See response to Question 11.
64.			Cost Proposal Option C ESInet & NGCS Final	1	Each of the three pricing workbooks (including Cost Proposal Option A ESInet Final, Cost Proposal Option B NGCS Final, and Option C ESInet & NGCS Final) define seven regions. However, the diagram in ESInet & Core Services RFP Revision One, Section V. Project Description and Scope of Work (pg. 28) and Attachment A - PSAP Host EndPoints, Equipment, and Selective Router Locations do not definitively define or illustrate the regions to allow for pricing. Can the state please provide clarification as to how the regions should be defined including where the hosts are to be located for the Metro West and Northeast regions?	Please see response to Question 4.
65.			Attachment A - PSAP Host EndPoints, Equipment, and Selective Router	Page not numbered	Eighteen PSAPs are listed as "Stand Alone" in Attachment A. If anticipated regional hosts are not defined for the Metro West and Northeast regions, will ESInet providers be required to bid/provide layer 2 circuits to each of these PSAPs that are not part of a region? How will the state handle the	See response to Question 4.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
			Locations		circuit costs for these sites if/when they join a region?	
66.	Optional Pre-Proposal Conference - Link to Listen to Conference			Media, Slide 5	Slide 5 of the pre-proposal conference presentation lists the proposal due date as June 2, 2020. All RFP documents and the procurement website lists June 3, 2020. Please confirm June 3, 2020 is the proposal due date.	See response to Question 28.
67.	Optional Pre-Proposal Conference - Link to Listen to Conference			Media, Slide 14	During the discussion of slide 14 of the pre-proposal conference presentation, MCP representative Milton Schober stated the RFP lists some older standards and bidders should state their compliance or non-compliance based upon the most current standards. Since the RFP will likely become part of resulting contract we ask that the State update the RFP to list the published standards that are required for compliance. We assume Mr. Schober was referring to Section V, D. General Requirements - Technical.	Please see response to Question 59.
68.			6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical Requirements Option B NGCS 62	53	Does the State plan to leverage the GeoComm Data Hub in place today for most of the regions? If so, how does the State envision GeoComm's Data Hub will interconnect to the required Spatial Interface (SI)?	The State intends to use the statewide aggregated data and will work directly with the PSAPs (or their designated GIS representative) to maintain this layer.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
			Next Generation Core Services (NGCS) Spatial Interface (SI) Use of the Commission's GIS Data Model			
69.	6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP Revision One Schedule of Events			2	Will vendors have the opportunity to ask follow-up questions to those answers released on or about April 16? If so, what is the deadline?	Bidders will be given an opportunity to ask question during a second round of Q&A. Please see posted Revised Schedule of Events.
70.	6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP Revision One Section I,			Page 6 and Page 11	Are the reference Vendor Performance Reports part of the RFP response evaluation process? If so, what is the derivation of the reports?	Vendor Performance Reports may be used for evaluation.. Bidders who have had a contract with the State of Nebraska may be evaluated on any performance reports submitted to State Purchasing Bureau.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
	R. Evaluation of Proposals; and Section II, H. Vendor Performance Reports					
71.	V. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE OF WORK			Page 28	In order to assure proper sizing for traffic engineering, network bandwidth and data throughputs, we will need data on busy hour call attempts and average call durations. Can the State please provide this information?	The State is unable to provide this information at this time. The State is in the process of receiving 2019 call volume numbers from PSAPs statewide and will post the data with the 2 nd round of Q&A.
72.	V. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE OF WORK			Page 28	During the pre-bid meeting there was mention of a new Metro West region with Colfax and Dodge Counties as participants. Can the State please provide a list of all the members that will be participating in this new region?	See response to Question 4.
73.	V. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE OF WORK			Page 28	During the pre-bid meeting there was mention of a new North East region with Wayne County, City of South Sioux City and City of Norfolk as participants. Can the State please provide a list of all the members that will be participating in this new	See response to Question 4.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					region?	
74.	Attachment C Technical Requirements – Option C			Requirement Identifier ESI 9 Page 32	Can the State please provide details and/or a diagram of the meet points of this microwave network?	See response to Question 21.
75.	Attachment C Technical Requirements – Option C			Requirement Identifier ESI 10 Page 33	Are there any plans or knowledge to support the connection to prospective neighboring ESInet's?	The State intends to implement this requirement in the future.
76.	Attachment C Technical Requirements – Option C			Requirement Identifier NGCS 8 Page 37	Requirement Identifier NGCS 8 and NGCS 9 appear to be the same requirement. Are these duplicate requirements?	See response to Question 9.
77.	Attachment C Technical Requirements – Option C			Requirement Identifier NGCS 32	Is there, or will there be, a Statewide geospatial project to position the PSAPs for true i3 geospatial routing? If yes, can you share those details relating to schedules, milestones,	See response to Question 32.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
				Page 45	etc.?	
78.	Attachment C Technical Requirements – Option C			Requirement Identifier NGCS 1 Page 34	The RFP mentions transitional and end states for the NGCS network. What are the State’s expectations regarding what defines the transitional state(s) and the end state?	The transitional period is the time between the start of routing on tabular data and the migration of the last region on tabular routing to full geospatial routing. Full geospatial routing is the end state.
79.	Attachment C Technical Requirements – Option C			Requirement Identifier NGCS 1 Page 34	Does the State expect the NGCS network to receive calls directly from TDM trunks (i.e., is the contractor expected to provide the necessary gateways in this case)?	The State requires a complete solution. If gateways are necessary, the contractor must provide all equipment.
80.	Attachment A – PSAP Host EndPoints, Equipment and Selective Router Locations			Attachment A	Can the State provide detailed information on the downstream connection (i.e., PSAPs and regions) as to what terminating equipment is available at the regions, which PSAPs require direct connections and which directly connected PSAPs are IP-capable?	Only regions will be connecting to the statewide ESInet. The known call handling equipment type and model for each region is the level of detail that the State has listed on Attachment A – Revision One
81.	Attachment C Technical			Requirement	NGCS-14 requires the LNG to generate reports that can be loaded	This can be done through a central reporting function.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
	Requirements – Option C			Identifier NGCS 14 Page 39	into a spreadsheet. Is it necessary for the LNG to do this directly or can this be done through a central reporting function?	
82.	Attachment C Technical Requirements – Option C			Requirement Identifier NGCS 32 Page 45	Can the State provide more information on how many PSAPS – and for how long – tabular routing will be required? What is the limitation driving the need for tabular routing?	The State intends to transition to geospatial routing as soon as possible. The limiting factor at the moment is the current status of the statewide PSAP layer.
83.	Attachment C Technical Requirements – Option C			Requirement Identifier NGCS 70 Page 60	The RFP calls for both ECaTS and NENA i3 event reporting. Can the State provide any detail on how these are expected to interwork?	The RFP requires bidders to comply with NENA i3 event reporting. The requirements call for the proposed solution to interface with ECaTS. The contractor will be required to communicate with ECaTS to achieve this functionality.
84.	Attachment C, Option A Attachment C, Option B			12	Req Identifier NOC/SOC 15 describes that a NMIS – Management System should interface with the Incident Management System, and that the	Historical data includes but is not limited to, network and system performance data, bandwidth utilization, latency, jitter, packet loss, MOS scores, CPU and memory utilization, and outage-related data.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
	Attachment C, Option C				Contractor shall maintain historical information for the term of the contract and provide copies of the data to the Commission at the end of the contract. Can the Commission clarify the scope of the historical information? Are we correct in interpreting this to mean the historical incident management information and related logging errors and not all logs?	
85.	Attachment C, Option B Attachment C, Option C			53 56	Req Identifier 62 refers to "regions." How many different regional GIS datasets can we expect to receive? Does the state envision these regional GIS datasets to be aggregated into a single statewide dataset for use in the ECRF/LVF?	The State currently anticipates 7 regions as part of the statewide ESInet. The State envisions these datasets will be aggregated into a statewide dataset. The State will provide the aggregated dataset to the Contractor.
86.	6264 Z1 Cost			summary	For clarification, will the five year total cost (cell	Yes.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
	Proposal Option A, B, C Excel Workbooks			tab	<p>B20 in the option C pricing workbook) be the figures that are used for cost comparison between vendors?</p> <p>Or, does the renewal pricing also play a part in the cost scoring?</p>	No.
				N/A	<p>Will a faster implementation schedule save the State money on legacy costs? If so, are those cost savings going to be considered as part of the evaluation process when scoring the proposals? If it will be considered in scoring the proposals, will that be considered in the points awarded under Part 2 – Technical Approach or under Part 3 – Cost Proposal Points?</p>	<p>Cost evaluation is not weighted to include implementation timeline. The implementation timeline is evaluated on the technical response.</p>
				N/A	<p>Additionally, it is our interpretation that if these legacy cost</p>	N/A. Please see response above.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					savings are not factored in, the vendor with the slowest implementation schedule is likely to have the lowest cost proposal allowing them to score the maximum points in pricing. Is this interpretation correct?	
87.	Attachment A			page 1	Will the State provide location information for the 2 host sites for the Northeast Region? Locations of the host sites will both determine diversity and connection types that can be used to connect the ESInet to this region	See response to Question 4.
88.	Attachment C, Option C, SEC-3			pages 4-5	This requirement states: "The matrix shall identify whether the bidder's proposed solution Complies (C), Complies Partially (CP), Complies with Future Capability (CFC) or Does Not Comply (DNC), or Not Applicable (N/A) (as indicated in the NENA checklist) with the identified requirement(s) for each category included in the checklist." Each category contains varying numbers of requirements. Please explain how the	Please see Attachment C – Option A ESInet Revision One, Attachment C – Option B NGCS Revision One, and Attachment C – Option C ESInet and NGCS Revision One.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					<p>State would like the bidders to determine the response. For example, suppose Section 3. Authentication/Password Policy has 54 requirements: 30 are Complies, 8 are Complies Partially , 0 are Complies with Future Capability, 1 is Does Not Comply, and 15 are N/A. For this example, can the State explain how bidders should determine which category to check for Section 3 in the checklist?</p>	
89.	Attachment C, Option C, SEC-3			pages 4-5	<p>This requirement states: “Bidder shall provide details to support the responses for each category in the response box below.” What kind of details is the State requesting?</p> <p>Does the State want an explanation for each requirement in a section?</p> <p>Does the State want a breakdown of how many of each type of response is in each section? Please explain.</p>	See response to Question 88.
90.	6264 Z1 Technical Requirements Option B NGCS 49 -	NGCS 49	Next Generation Core Services Elements (NGCS) Emergency Call Routing Function	51	<p>When logging of all connections, connection attempts, data updates, ECRF query results, and LoST transactions:</p> <p>What format of log file is required as well as any duration for retention, or settings to support such, requirements that may exist for the</p>	The file format is not specified. The tools provided for viewing logs should be capable of reading the native format of each device, be it text, XML, JSON, or something else, and displaying the output in human-readable format. Records must be maintained for the length of the contract including all renewals and extensions. Please also see Section II.U. Contract Closeout.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
			(ECRF) Supported Functions		State?	
91.	6264 Z1 ATTACHMENT A	PSAP Equipment			Would the Commission provide the following 9-1-1 call volumes for each PSAP; Avg. Busy Hour, Peak Call Volume and Annual Call Volume?	See response to Question 71.
92.	6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP Revision One and Cost Proposal (Word doc)	I.C	Schedule of Events	2	Please confirm that the bid due date is 6/3/20 per the RFP. 6/2/20 was shown during the pre-bid meeting.	See response to Question 66.
93.	6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical Requirements Option C -ESInet and NGCS (Word doc)	Gen SCEN	GEN SCEN 4	25	Vendors were request to provide connectivity to Host Sites for each of the regions. The scenario specifies connectivity to a PSAP. Would the State want to modify the Scenario using host site rather than a PSAP?	Yes, replace "PSAP" in Scenario 4 with "Host A". Please use Attachment C Option A – ESInet, Attachment C Option B – NGCS, and/or Attachment C Option C – ESInet and NGCS.
94.	6264 Z1 Attachment C Technical Requirements	NGCS 39	Next Generation Core Services Elements	47	Our understanding is that the i3 standard will soon be updated from i3 v2 to i3 v3, and furthermore that there are significant differences	Please see response to Question 59.

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
	ts Option C -ESInet and NGCS (Word doc)		(NGCS) NENA Compliance Chart		between the two standards. Since no PSAP CPE supports v2 at this time, our expectation is that the State would prefer vendors be able to support i3 v3 once ratified, and therefore vendors could also address compliance to i3 v3 as an option?	
95.	Attachment C, Option C			Page 10	NOC/SOC 10: Does this requirement only apply to ESInet as NGCS is not indicated in this requirement?	See response to Question 19.
96.	Attachment C, Option C			Page 47	NGCS 38: Is SCTP a protocol which is optional or required?	See response to Question 23.
97.	Attachment C, Option C			Page 56	NGCS 62-1: Please provide or direct as to where Attachment D is located	See response to Question 11.
98.	Attachment C, Option C			Page 63	NGCS 77-2: Please provide the requirements and definition of an NGCS “ringdown” feature. This is typically a feature in Call Handling and in order to understand the request, please provide desired functionality.	See response to Question 26.
99.	6264 Z1 Cost Proposal Option C - ESInet and NGCS				Is it understood that complete pricing may not be provided until all locations are identified?	See Response to Question 4.
100.	Attachment C, Option C				There is no reference to the number of POI’s required. Can the State	Please provide a response that best meets the requirements of the RFP.

Question Number	Reference Document	RFP Section Reference	RFP Page Number	RFP Page Number	Question	State Response
					provide guidance on this requirement?	
101.	Attachment C, Option C				Please provide a position count and/or concurrent call counts that need to be supported per Aggregated Call Handling location.	See Attachment D
102.	PROCUREMENT PROCEDURE, J. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS			4	<p>The State is accepting either electronically submitted responses or paper responses for this RFP.</p> <p>For bidders submitting electronic responses: 1. Bidders submitting electronically can upload the response here: a. https://nebraska.sharefile.com/r-r11ba33e3ee24b63b</p> <p>Questions: In sections J. it discusses submitting each section of the RFP as well as lists the separate solutions Option A (ESInet), Option B (NGCS), and Option C (ESInet, & NGCS).</p> <p>1. Will the state accept two solutions of the same service?</p> <p>How should a vendor submit these options?</p> <p>2. Should there be two separate</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Submit a complete, separate, response, cost proposal, and Technical response for each.</p> <p>Yes.</p>

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					<p>RFP submissions and two separate pricing options?</p> <p>3. How do you want the separate RFP's named?</p> <p>4. If a Vendor submits two options will the scoring be a weighted average or seen as a completely separate submission?</p>	<p>Please see Section I.J.3. "Submission of Proposals" of RFP 6264 Z1 ESInet and Core Services RFP Revision One.</p> <p>Each proposal will be scored independently.</p>
103.	<p>I. SUMMARY OF BIDDER'S PROPOSED PERSONNEL/MANAGEMENT APPROACH</p>			35	<p>The bidder should identify the specific professionals who will work on the State's project if their company is awarded the contract resulting from this solicitation.....</p> <p>.....Resumes should not be longer than three (3) pages. Resumes should include, at a minimum, academic background and degrees, professional certifications, understanding of the process, and at least three (3) references (name, address, and telephone number)</p> <p>b. SUBCONTRACTORS If the bidder intends to subcontract any part of its performance hereunder, the bidder should provide:</p> <p>i. name, address, and telephone number of the</p>	

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					<p>subcontractor(s); i. specific tasks for each subcontractor(s); ii. percentage of performance hours intended for each subcontract; and iii. total percentage of subcontractor(s) performance hours.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>1. In section I. as apart of the resume section it states that you are requesting 3 personal references for each resume submitted. (name, address, and telephone number), this would be considered personal confidential information to these individuals. Knowing that the RFP is considered public information these individuals may not want their personal information publicized and attached to the RFP. Would the state accept the name of the reference omitting address, telephone number and upon award the vendor would provide additional information about the references so they may be contacted if the state feels it is</p>	<p>Question1:) The address and telephone numbers do not need to be submitted with the proposal, but must be submitted by the selected vendor upon award.</p>

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Reference Document</u>	<u>RFP Section Reference</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>RFP Page Number</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>State Response</u>
					<p>necessary?</p> <p>2. In the section outlined above "SUBCONTRACTORS If the bidder intends to subcontract any part of its performance hereunder, the bidder should provide:" name, address, and telephone number of the subcontractor(s). This too would be considered personal confidential information to these individuals. Knowing that the RFP is considered public information these individuals may not want their personal information publicized and attached to the RFP. Would the state accept the name of the reference omitting address, telephone number and upon award the vendor would provide additional information about the references so they may be contacted if the state feels it is necessary?</p> <p>3. Would the state accept the general corporate address and phone number of the subcontractors company to fulfill the requirement of this RFP in the outlined section.</p>	<p>Question 2:) The address and telephone numbers of subcontractors do not need to be submitted with the proposal, but must be submitted by the selected vendor upon award.</p> <p>Question 3: Yes, if the State would be able to contact the actual subcontractor(s) to be used to fulfill this contract using the given address and phone number.</p>

This addendum will become part of the proposal and should be acknowledged with the Request for Proposal response.