

RETURN THIS AMENDMENT TO THE ISSUING OFFICE AT:



Department of Administration
Division of General Services
7th Floor State Office Building
PO Box 110210
Juneau, AK 99811-0210

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: July 2, 2014

RFP TITLE: Core Telecommunications Services

AMENDMENT 1

PROPOSAL DUE DATE/TIME: 4:00pm Alaska Time, July 14, 2014.

IMPORTANT NOTE TO OFFERORS: In order for your proposal to be considered responsive, this amendment, in addition to your original proposal and any other required documents, must be signed, dated, and received by the issuing office of the Division of General Services prior to the time set for receiving proposals. Only the following items referenced in this amendment are to be changed. All other sections of the RFP remain the same.

Jason Soza
Contracting Officer
PHONE: (907) 465-5684
TDD: (907) 465-2205
FAX: (907) 465-2189

NAME OF COMPANY

SIGNATURE DATE

The following questions and answers are provided for informational purposes.

1. The initial contract term is only two years, with four one-year extensions at the sole discretion of the state. The short length of the contract limits the flexibility of a vendor to make up-front capital investments that will pay long-term dividends in terms of performance and savings to the state.

The term has been modified to an initial five-year term with two one-year renewal options.

2. The state has requested separate proposal packages for each of the four service bundles and apparently contemplates that it may award contracts to multiple vendors for the different bundles. The disaggregation of the RFP into separate proposals for each service, like the short contract term, will limit the ability of a vendor to make truly transformative and innovative proposals that leverage cross-service functionality to improve service and cost savings. The RFP itself notes the possibility of this leveraging, but is not structured to achieve this goal.

As discussed during the pre-proposal conference, the ability for a vendor to propose on multiple service bundles is not restricted. If a vendor feels that they can add value by offering more than one service bundle, this should be documented in the Value Assessment Plan portion of the submittal.

3. Exhibit 1 to the RFP contains 19 pages of detailed specifications, standards and requirements for the requested telecommunications services and retains State authority over strategic and operational planning for these services. A core principle of Best Value is that the client leverages the expertise of the vendor and minimizes its management, direction, and control of the vendor. The breadth of the project specifications and the retention of state control are contrary to this principle.

Exhibit 1 represents the state's best guess at the services required as a result of this RFP.

A vendor may propose scope additions, reductions, or other modifications as part of their Value Assessment Plan.

4. Is the Service Plan (Attachment C) the same as the Project Capability (PC) Submittal as described in the Best Value Standard? Also, the Service Plan does not appear in the Evaluation Summary or shortlisting criteria. Will the Service Plan be evaluated for shortlisting offerors or evaluating shortlisted offerors? If so, how?

The Service Plan is not the same as the Project Capability and is not an evaluated item.

5. Please confirm that an entity can use a corporate client for more than one reference (and survey questionnaire), so long as each reference is for a distinct service or project. Also, please reconsider the restriction on using the state for more than one reference under the same terms. This restriction unreasonably prejudices individuals that have worked with the state for an extended period.

A corporate client may be used as more than one reference as long as each reference is for a distinct service or project.

The restriction on the number of state references has been removed.

6. The Best Value Standard limits references to five for each organization and three for each critical individual. The RFP, in contrast, allows offerors to submit up to ten references for each organization and individual. Please explain how the number of references / number of surveys impacts scoring for past performance.

The Best Value process can be modified as needed for individual solicitations.

7. Please clarify whether the state intends that an offeror submit a separate Reference List and Past Performance Information Score for each Service Bundle. If an offeror submits ten completed surveys for each of the four entities for each of the four Service Bundles, that would be a total of 160 surveys.

The reference requirement has been reduced to five for each organization/individual.

As a reminder, the same reference can be used across service bundles or the four entities, as appropriate and applicable.

8. The Cost Proposal (Attachment I) combines the costs of all four Service Bundles and hourly rates for a "Total Evaluated Cost." Assuming the state decides to evaluate proposals for each Service Bundle separately, will it evaluate the price of each proposal using this Total Evaluated Cost, the base proposal for the applicable Service Bundle, or some other figure?

Attachment I - Cost Proposal has been modified for clarity.

The extended cost for each service bundle and associated hourly rates will be compared to like service bundles.

9. Please describe the "linear matrix model" that will be used by the procurement officer to analyze proposals and shortlist offerors.

As mentioned during the pre-proposal conference, the "linear matrix model" is simply a method that assigns the maximum number of points available for an evaluation area to the submittal with the highest 1/5/10 score. Each lower-scored proposal will receive a proportional percentage of the maximum number of points available.

10. Is an offeror required to disclose as a possible conflict of interest if a consultant, contractor, or other third party hired by the offeror and working on the RFP response is also a current state employee, or was a state employee within the last two years?

Per RFP Section 8.13, Offerors shall disclose all possible conflicts of interest, specifically including current employees of the state or those employed within the past two years.

11. There is no place on any of the Attachment forms for a Vendor Tax ID. How should an offeror submit its Vendor Tax ID to the procurement officer?

Per RFP Section 8.26, this information must be submitted with the proposal or "within five days of the state's request." The state will request this information during the Clarification phase.

12. How does the "Formula Used to Convert Cost to Points" relate to the "linear matrix model" referenced in the RFP?

The formula use to convert cost to points is slightly different than the formula that is used in the linear matrix model. The cost formula gives the highest number of points to the lowest cost whereas the linear matrix model gives the highest number of points to the submittal with the highest average 1/5/10 score assigned by the evaluators.

*The formula to convert cost to points is:
(lowest cost * max points) / next higher cost*

*The formula used in the linear matrix model is:
(max points / highest submittal score) * next lower score*

13. The RFP references both an Alaska Bidder Preference of 5% and an Alaska Offeror Preference of 10%. Please confirm which preference will be used in the evaluation process and explain how it will be used.

Both preferences may be used as well as any other applicable preferences.

The 5% Alaska Bidder Preference applies only to the qualifying cost for evaluation purposes.

If an offeror qualifies for the Alaska Bidder Preference, they will also qualify for the Alaska Offeror Preference, which is 10% of the overall available points. Since there are 1,000 points available in this RFP, the Alaska Offeror Preference is worth 100 points. A qualifying offeror, one who qualifies for the Alaska Bidder Preference, will receive these 100 points while an offeror who does not qualify will not.

14. Section 5.5, Shortlisting Offerors, Page 14, Item 5, uses the term "duration." Will the State please clarify its definition here of "duration"?

Duration will not be considered in shortlisting and the RFP has been updated to reflect this.

15. The RFP requires that "The offeror must identify all known federal requirements that apply to the proposal, the evaluation, or the contract." Where would the state like these to be identified?

These may be identified in the Service Plan.

16. The RFP states "The Contractor shall designate a 'chief engineer' who will act as a gatekeeper for system design and planning." Is this the same as the aforementioned "System Engineer"? This appears to be a different definition. Please clarify.

The chief engineer is distinguished from system engineers as the gatekeeper or responsible individual for all system designs and planning.

There may be several system engineers representing components of the RFP but only one chief engineer.

17. The RFP states "The Offeror certifies that their offer will remain open and valid for at least 120 days." However, this requirement is given as 90 days in Section 8.12, item G, page 22. Please clarify.

The offer must remain open and valid for at least 120 days. The reference to 90 days has been corrected.

18. Regarding cost reasonableness, what is the process of evaluation in cases where the Best Value pick is over 10%? Please specify how the Cost Form and Cost Reasonableness margin of 10% will be applied when vendors write to different scopes of work or when Phase I responses are based on widely varying solutions.

If the highest ranked offeror's cost is more than 10% higher than the second ranked offeror's cost, the state simply reserves the right to approach the second ranked offeror. Doing so is not automatic.

Service bundle costs will be compared directly to each other to determine cost reasonableness.

Offerors should propose to the RFP as written. Any variations should be included in the Value Assessment Plan with associated costs or cost reductions.

19. The phone count by third party/core is inconsistent with Attachment J Asset Inventory. Please clarify.

RFP Exhibit 2, Section 2.2, page 55 reflects the most recent summary of phone counts.

Attachment J - Asset Inventory phone count estimate gives offerors a representation of distribution and volume.

20. The RFP states "...systems and services specified in Exhibit 1, Section 2.3... For these services, the actual utilization of these resources will be measured and billed based upon the monthly installed base of the specific number of telephones in use by authorized State personnel or their representatives. The unit charges will be based upon a fully loaded, installed asset including all activities described in this RFP" (emphasis added). In addition, Exhibit 1 Project Details and Desired Outcomes, Section 2.3 Wired Telephone Services, page 44, states "The Contractor will also provide services by third party Local Exchange Carriers (LECs), for example Centrex, local access trunks, long distance, etc." Does the State intend this to mean

that the third party LEC will be billing the tariff rate directly or that the charges must under the "fully loaded charge"?

This section refers to the obligation of the offeror to plan and facilitate acquisition of LEC services which, after quote and approval of the state, will be deployed and direct-billed to ETS or the customer agency.

21. Regarding first call resolution: What is the current percentage target and number of calls resolved on a monthly basis? Can the State please provide a 12-month trend report?

RFP Exhibit 2, Section 2.9, End User Support Services outlines the annual number of contacts or calls for service.

Attachment K - Service Level Agreements further outlines the expectations for service contacts.

22. What is the expected scope of the co-location space required?

Generally, co-located equipment is less than a half rack of units in any location. Rarely, after the submission of a plan by the offeror and approval by the state, five or fewer locations have temporarily reached as high as three racks of equipment.

23. Does the current VTC platform use separate connectivity back to the core? If so, what are the connections, and can you please provide usage reports by location?

The current Video Teleconference network is a separate WAN service. Locations and monthly overall usage reports are located in Attachment J - Asset Inventory.

24. How many Private Rate Interfaces (PRIs) does the State have today to support its 17,000+ users?

There are over 800 leased and owned PRIs, session initiation protocol (SIP) and plain old telephone system (POTS) lines / connections from many vendors serving various purposes throughout the core phone system. There are over 200 similar lines in rural locations outside the core system.

25. The RFP states that the state may wish to co-locate equipment with the vendor and that it does not expect to pay cost for such space during the contract term. Please confirm that the state is referring to co-location with the vendor's equipment in state facilities, such as telephone or server closets. If the state anticipates it may wish to co-locate its equipment in the vendor's facilities as well, please describe the nature and scope of the co-location services.

The state may wish to co-locate equipment with the provider in provider owned locations. The state does not expect to pay any lease cost for unit, rack or floor space used as co-location space during the life of this agreement.

26. Does the state expect the cost of all equipment replacement, upgrades, and software releases as part of the "Technology Refresh" to be included in the offeror's pricing, including for existing

state-owned equipment (e.g. video conferencing room system endpoints)? If so, does this include the initial contractual term and potential optional renewal periods? Also, please confirm that the RFP requires the vendor to keep software at a level supported by the manufacturer, not at the current release.

The state expects the provider to be responsible for the creation of a plan, schedule, scope, bill of materials for various technology refresh efforts, including leased or owned equipment during the life of the contract, including all renewals.

This RFP requires the provider to maintain software at a level recommended and supported by the manufacturer.

27. For economic reasons, *no* company currently provides directory assistance with staff located in Alaska. Please reconsider the requirement that directory assistance service must be provided from service centers in Juneau, Anchorage, and Fairbanks. Also, please clarify whether the state is requiring that the vendor locate staffing for Wired Telephony Services other than directory assistance in Juneau, Anchorage, and Fairbanks.

For directory assistance, please state how you intend to provide this service.

For services such as placing phones on desks, meeting customers, and so on, the state requires contractor staff to be located in Juneau, Fairbanks, and Anchorage, as appropriate.

Offerors may propose alternative solutions in the Value Assessment Plan.

28. Some terms appear to be used interchangeably making it unclear as to what components are to be included in the pricing response, for example:
- A) RFP Page 34 § 2.1 Table reference 2b - “Internet connectivity” is defined as “internet access”;
 - B) RFP Page 47 § 2.4.6 - “Broadband and remote access” is defined as an “internet access solution”;
 - C) RFP Page 57 § 2.2 - “Internet access (ISP)” is defined using language that appears identical to the definition of “Internet connectivity” in the Service Component table (p.34)

Please clarify the use of these terms and the specific service elements that you expect to be priced in Attachment I, Section 2 related to Data Network Services.

RFP Exhibit 1, Section 2.1, Table 2b Internet connectivity – Refers to bandwidth-on-demand internet services that are managed, dedicated and secure, currently terminating in the DMZ space of our network in Anchorage and Juneau.

RFP Exhibit 1, Section 2.4.3 Provide Bandwidth on Demand is directly related to RFP Exhibit 1, Section 2.1, Table 2a Core Backbone Network connectivity and 2b Internet connectivity.

RFP Exhibit 1, Section 2.4.6 Provide Broadband and remote access (DSL, cable modem, wireless etc.) refers to internet services in locations on or off the SOA Wide Area Network outside of the DMZ space.

29. Will the successful Offeror be expected to provide PSTN connectivity (i.e. PRIs, SRSTs, facsimile, local lines, PSTN) as part of the Wired Telephony Service Component? Is the pricing for PSTN connectivity functionality intended to be encompassed within the core contract with ETS, or is it paid for by the individual agencies?

Generally, these circuits are purchased outside the core contract. The successful vendor is tasked to plan and facilitate acquisition of LEC services which, after quote and approval of the State of Alaska, will be deployed and then direct billed to ETS or the customer agency. The successful vendor is also tasked with monitoring performance of these circuits. Circuits may or may not be those of the successful vendor.

30. With regard to Attachment I Cost Form: would the State please clarify the differences between (B) Internet Connectivity, (D) Broadband Access, and (E) Internet Access?

Please refer to Question 28.

31. The RFP states "...The State is not responsible and will not pay local, state, or federal taxes. All costs associated with the contract must be stated in U.S. currency." AND "... provide cost allocation reports for customer groups as identified and specified by the State of Alaska billing hierarchies. These reports will be provided in electronic format and specified by the State, and shall include all calculation, any applicable taxes and provide monthly billing for current and past services as well as track payments and balances." These two statements appear to be in conflict.

There are some exceptions to this -- the state is not responsible for state taxes levied by the State of Alaska, but may be subject to taxes levied by other states. In addition, there are federal taxes the state is responsible for, though they likely will not be applicable to this solicitation (coal, "Gas Guzzler", air cargo/passenger, and leaking underground storage tank trust fund tax).

32. The RFP states "Billing and Chargeback: The State will continue to provide billing and chargeback services for those functions and services that the Enterprise Technology Services Division continues to provide to State agencies. The Contractor will be required to assume all other billing functions as delineated as a direct bill to customer agency and defined per the requirements specific to each service bundle and must provide all billing in an electronic format as specified by the State." Does 'direct billing to customer agency' include those that are outside of the Contractor's LEC area, or will that LEC bill direct to the agency? Will this be one format for all state agencies, or (since they are billed individually) will each have their unique record format? If outside of the LEC area, will billing also be required in this electronic format? Can the State provide an example of this required format?

Generally, the determination of "who delivers or who pays" occurs during the SOA approval part of the quote, approval, delivery service process. In many cases, agencies will pay a direct billed cost to a 3rd party vendor.

Any electronic formats for billings, invoices, etc. will be developed by the successful vendor in coordination with state staff.

33. The RFP states "...Contractor's primary role being to determine what telecommunications resources are needed to satisfy the State's requirements and service levels, acquire those resources, and maintain an accurate inventory of telecommunications resources and assets. Asset records shall be integrated into the State of Alaska asset management system." If the asset is direct billed by a LEC, will this also be part of the 'maintain inventory of telecommunications resources and assets'?

Yes, a task of the contract is the recording of assets as they go into service.

34. The RFP states "...Ad Hoc Reports, including billing reports, will be periodically requested and must be compiled and distributed to the State's management in an electronic format. Reports must be compiled and published on all functions, including performance, Service Level Agreements (SLAs), cost management, and subcontractor relationships on a Statewide and department-level basis. These reports must include the measurement of the Contractor's actual performance against the required service levels. The Contractor will be required to provide reports in formats, content, and frequency as directed by the State." Can the State provide an example of this format? Will this include LEC services billed directly?

Yes, the state will work with the successful vendor to meet state requirements in coordination with state staff.

No, this does not include billing from other entities once a service is established.

35. The RFP states "Provide cost allocation reports for customer groups as identified and specified by the State of Alaska billing hierarchies. These reports will be provided in electronic format as specified by the State, and shall include all calculations, any applicable taxes and provide monthly billing for current and past services as well as track payments and balances." Is this a different file than the electronic billing file mentioned in other areas in the RFP?

Possibly. As mentioned, the state will work with the successful vendor to identify which electronic information must be submitted, the state's requirements for this information, and the best method and format for submission of the information. It may be possible, for example, that multiple reports could be combined or some other more efficient process created.

36. The RFP states "On a monthly basis, coordinate and reconcile all local, long distance, calling card, data network, ISP, and videoconferencing service billing by the 10th day after the closing of the billing month. Using the formats required by the State Agencies' Fiscal offices, provide electronic billing statements to agencies at the organizational level required by each agency (i.e. department, division or office). An electronic copy of all billing must be sent to ETS Fiscal."

Can the State provide an example of the format required? Are there multiple formats? Will this include LEC services billed directly?

Yes, the state will work with the successful vendor to meet state requirements in coordination with state staff.

No, this does not include billing from other entities once a service is established.

37. The RFP states "... Update inventory and asset database, in a timely manner, to reflect upgrades." Does this include assets installed by LECs and direct billed by LECs? Is this a system the State currently owns or one we would need to provide?

Yes, this is a task of the vendor under this agreement and includes all assets as they are deployed.

This information will be entered into the state's existing Service Desk Manager (SDM) system.

38. The RFP states "...systems and services specified in Exhibit 1, Section 2.3... For these services, the actual utilization of these resources will be measured and billed based upon the monthly installed base of the specific number of telephones in use by authorized State personnel or their representatives. **The unit charges will be based upon a fully loaded, installed asset** including all activities described in this RFP." AND "The Contractor will also provide services by third party Local Exchange Carriers (LECs), for example Centrex, local access trunks, long distance, etc." **Does the State intend this to mean the third party LEC will be billing the tariff rate directly, or that the charges have to fall under the fully loaded charge? (emphasis added)**

Please see RFP Exhibit 2, Section 2.3. This section refers to the obligation of the offeror to plan and facilitate acquisition of LEC services which, after quote and approval of the state, will be deployed and then direct billed to ETS or the customer agency.

39. The RFP states "... Provide periodic summary for Juneau, Anchorage and Fairbanks systems. Include total minutes of usage for all systems. Provide Intrastate and Interstate summary of total minutes for all other State of Alaska locations." How frequent is 'periodic'? Can the State confirm 'minutes' - long distance and not local or on-net minutes?

Periodic is monthly and annual. This includes usage of all systems components, including toll bypass.

40. Demonstrations are identified as a component of Phase I and also Phase II. Could the State clarify when service demonstrations will be required?

Demonstrations are mentioned only in RFP Section 6.2 Required Activities / Deliverables, Item 7a. This item states that the State may request a demonstration of systems, but doesn't explicitly require it. There are no scheduled demonstrations in Phase I and Phase II of this solicitation.

41. On Attachment I Cost Form: Recommend the State remove the line item "buckets" which feed the per Service Component total costs and instead provide a bottom line, all-encompassing cost figure per Service Component to allow Offerors to maximize creative and comprehensive solutions.

Attachment I – Cost Proposal has been modified for clarity.

The following changes/additions are required:

1. **SECTION 1.3: PROJECT TERM: *Delete*** this section in its entirety and replace with the following:

The length of this contract will be for an initial term of 5 years, with up to 2 one-year optional renewal periods that may be exercised at the sole discretion of the State.

2. **SECTION 1.4: PROJECT BUDGET: *Delete*** this section in its entirety and replace with the following:

The total budget for this project is \$10,000,000 per year.

Historically, this amount can be broken down by service bundle as shown in the following table. These figures are provided for informational purposes only and do not represent a minimum or maximum for each service bundle:

1	<i>Wired Telephony Services</i>	<i>\$5,000,000</i>
2	<i>Data Network Services</i>	<i>\$2,500,000</i>
3	<i>Video-Conferences Services</i>	<i>\$1,000,000</i>
4	<i>End-User Support Services</i>	<i>\$1,500,000</i>

3. **SECTION 3.1: DATE, TIME, AND LOCATION: *Delete*** this section and replace with the following:

All proposal packages MUST be received no later than 4:00pm Alaska Time on July 14, 2014. Proposals received after this deadline will NOT be accepted. The proposal package must be delivered to the Procurement Officer (Section 2.1). The State is not responsible for the timeliness of mailed documents, nor will the State accept any proposal delivered to a different location.

4. **SECTION 4.8: PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION (ATTACHMENTS F, G, H): *Delete*** “Reference List Requirements (Attachment F)” and replace with the following:

Reference List Requirements (Attachment F)

- *For each entity, the Offeror must prepare and submit a list of clients that will evaluate each entity's performance.*
- *The Project Manager and the Systems Engineer can use the same past references as the Firm, provided that they were used on those particular projects.*
- *The maximum number of references that can be submitted is 5 for each entity. The number of returned surveys will be analyzed along with the survey scores.*
- *The past projects must be completed (the client must be able to respond to the survey questions).*
- *The past projects do not have to be similar to each other or to the scope of this project.*

- *The entity cannot have multiple people evaluate the same service (each project for that particular entity must be different).*
- *The end user/client must complete the survey (the Offeror cannot have other consultants or third parties evaluate the entity's performance).*

5. **SECTION 5.2: EVALUATION SUMMARY:** *Delete* the table and replace with the following:

<i>Evaluation Category</i>	<i>Points</i>
<i>Past Performance Information (Firm, Primary Subcontractor, Project Manager & Systems Engineer)</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Risk Assessment Plan</i>	<i>175</i>
<i>Value Assessment Plan</i>	<i>125</i>
<i>Interviews (Project Manager & Systems Engineer)</i>	<i>300</i>
<i>Multiple Bundle Incentive</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Alaska Offeror Preference</i>	<i>100</i>
<i>Price</i>	<i>200</i>

Total 1,000

A new section, Section 5.9, has been added to address the Multiple Bundle Incentive.

6. **SECTION 5.5(5): SHORTLISTING OFFERORS:** *Delete* this subsection in its entirety and replace with the following:

5. *The Procurement Officer will create a linear matrix model to assist in analyzing and prioritizing the responsive Proposals based on the submitted information. The model will analyze: Cost, Risk Assessment Plan, Value Assessment Plan, Past Performance and Information. This model will assign points based on the normalized distance that a score is from the best score.*

7. **SECTION 5.9: MULTIPLE BUNDLE INCENTIVE:** *New section* to read as follows:

Offerors who submit an offer for more than one service bundle shall receive points based on the following schedule:

<i># of Proposed Service Bundles</i>	<i>Incentive Points</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>4</i>	<i>50</i>

8. **SECTION 8.12(g): OFFEROR'S CERTIFICATION:** *Delete* this subsection in its entirety and replace with the following:

(g) that the offers will remain open and valid for at least 120 days; and

9. **EXHIBIT 1, SECTION 2.1 MAIN SERVICE COMPONENTS:** *Delete* Table item 2b. Internet Connectivity in its entirety and replace with the following:

Internet connectivity: Managed, dedicated and secure high bandwidth internet connectivity in at least two locations.

10. **EXHIBIT 1, SECTION 2.1.2: TERMS OF RELATIONSHIP AND DISENTANGLEMENT:** *Delete* the first paragraph of this section in its entirety and replace with the following:

The term of any contract resulting from this RFP is subject to budget appropriations. For purposes of this RFP, assume an initial term of 5 years, with an option for the State, at its sole discretion, to extend the term for up to 2 additional one-year renewal terms.

11. **EXHIBIT 1, SECTION 2.4.4: PROVIDE VIRTUAL PRIVATE NETWORKS:** *Delete* this section in its entirety and replace with the following:

Support and maintain existing State's Secure Socket Layer Virtual Private Network (SSL VPN) for the secure and controlled transport of SOA information allowing only authorized individuals access to their business information. Design, deploy and maintain SSL or other VPN services on a client, site or city basis. SSL VPN services are often used to leverage internet services in rural communities.

12. **ATTACHMENT A – PROPOSAL COVER SHEET:** Under the **Service Bundle** heading, delete “(Circle one.)” and replace with:

(Circle all that apply to this proposal.)

13. **ATTACHMENT I – COST PROPOSAL:** *Delete* this attachment and replace with Attachment I – Cost Proposal included in this amendment. Failure to use the new Cost Proposal may result in your proposal being found non-responsive.

ATTACHMENT I – COST PROPOSAL

SECTION 1 – BASE PROPOSAL

Please provide the total annual cost for each service bundle covered by this proposal in the “Annual Cost” column and multiply that figure by 5 years for the “Extended Cost” column. Failure to provide an annual cost for a service bundle that a vendor has indicated is covered by this proposal on Attachment A may result in a finding of non-responsiveness for that service bundle.

No	Description	Annual Cost		Extended Cost
1	Wired Telephony Services	\$	x 5 years =	\$
2	Data Network Services	\$	x 5 years =	\$
3	Video-Conferencing Services	\$	x 5 years =	\$
4	End-User Support Services	\$	x 5 years =	\$

SECTION 2 – HOURLY RATES

Please provide an hourly rate for each general labor category below in the “Hourly Rate” column and multiply that figure by the estimated hours for the “Extended Cost” column. These rates will apply to all service bundles indicated on Attachment A. If differing rates apply across service bundles, separate proposals must be submitted.

Labor Category	Hourly Rate	Estimated Hours	Extended Cost
Administrator	\$	x 3,000 =	\$
Dispatcher / NOCC Tech	\$	x 4,000 =	\$
Procurement / Logistics Technician	\$	x 4,000 =	\$
Lead Technician / Supervisor	\$	x 2,000 =	\$
Network Administrator	\$	x 5,000 =	\$
Lead Engineer / Security Specialist	\$	x 2,000 =	\$
Project Manager	\$	x 5,000 =	\$
Total Hourly Rates Cost:			\$

SECTION 3 – VALUE ADDED OPTIONS / IDEAS

Please provide estimated impacts associated with each Value Added Idea that you have proposed in Attachment E (if any). These ideas will be discussed during the Clarification Period.

No	Description	Impact to Cost (\$)
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		