



**Questions and Answer Set #5
Request for Proposals (RFP)
Local Telecommunications Services
RFP# 060B3490013
November 14, 2013**

Ladies/Gentlemen:

The Department of Information Technology received the following questions by e-mail for the above referenced RFP. These are answered below for all Offerors:

83. Pricing Proposal Forms

The Pricing Proposal Form spreadsheets, when printed, may be difficult and cumbersome to print and read. Would the State of Maryland be willing to accept the Pricing Sheets in electronic format only?

Answer: Yes, the State would be willing to accept pricing sheets in an electronic format. However, offerors must send a hard copy of the signed Calculation Summary tab.

84. RFP Section 2.13.2

Producing an Inventory report for each active account billed under the resulting contract equates to pulling thousands of reports for each reporting period.

a) Is this what the State intends?

Answer: No.

b) Can the State agree to a single report that includes all accounts instead of thousands of individual reports?

Answer: Yes, See answer to question 33 and Amendment #4 Item #9

85. RFP Section 2.13.2

We are unable to pull a report that includes the associated LATA.

a) Could the State please describe how it intends to use the LATA information for each phone and/or circuit number so that we can determine if there is a solution?

Answer: To audit/validate that when an account has items from multiple LATAs, we need to know which price sheet to use to verify the billing rates.

b) Would the State consider a separate report with LATA designations?

Answer: Yes, the State would consider this as an acceptable replacement as long as the report covered: all accounts under the resultant contract and all items from all invoices had the billing name, account number, item description, billing address, service address, LATA and billed price.

c) Would the State be willing to work with the Contractor's Project Manager to develop a mutually agreeable approach to this requirement as part of the Project Management Plan?

Answer: Yes, and the report shall have the same requirements as the inventory report.

86. RFP Section 2.13.3

We can partially meet this requirement. We can provide report information for services for which information is available in our system(s). Reporting is by Account, not by contract. Information is available, and contained on multiple reports within our online portal, not necessarily on one report. Would the State agree to work with the Contractor to account for this requirement as part of a mutually agreeable Project Management Plan?

Answer: This is a duplicate question. See answer to question 82.

87. RFP Section 2.13.4

We can partially meet this requirement. We can provide a report on trouble ticket metrics. Our standard trouble ticket metrics include items a and c, but do not include items b, d & e. However, we may be able to provide items b, d, and e on a case by case basis, particularly for chronic outages or high visibility locations. Would the State consider a mutually agreeable approach to Trouble Ticket Metrics as a part of the Project Management Plan?

Answer: Yes, the State is willing to accept a mutually agreeable approach.

88. RFP Section 2.7.2.2 (a, b & c)

Our web portal contains a module for Service Order Tracking, but does not currently meet all requirements of this section. Would the State agree to the development of a mutually agreeable Service Order Tracking Plan as a part of the Project Management Plan?

Answer: Yes, the State is willing to accept a mutually agreeable approach.

89. RFP Section 2.9.2 (a)

We can partially meet this requirement. We can accept trouble ticket reporting via telephone and the web, but not via email. Would the State please consider removing email as a mechanism to report a trouble?

Answer: No. Offerors should indicate in the Technical Response either that they cannot meet all of the requirements, or list those services where they do meet the requirements.

90. RFP Section 2.15.4

Our normal procedure does not include the addition of the LATA associated with each service billed on an invoice.

- a) Could the State please describe how it intends to use the LATA information associated with each service billed on an invoice so that we can determine if there is a solution?

Answer: To audit/validate that when an account has items from multiple LATAs, we need to know which price sheet to use to verify the billing rates.

- b) Would the State consider a separate matrix or report with LATA designations?

Answer: No. The intent of this requirement is to allow the Authorized Representative to quickly determine if invoicing is correct, and if not, the level of auditing which may be required.

- c) Would the State be willing to work with the Contractor's Project Manager to develop a mutually agreeable approach to this requirement as part of the Project Management Plan?

Answer: Yes, the State is willing to accept alternatives as long as the alternative allows the Authorized Representative to quickly determine if invoicing is correct, and if not, the level of auditing which may be required.

91. RFP Section 2.15.7

We will not be able to contract away our back billing rights. Can the State please remove this requirement or amend to be consistent with COMAR and PSC regulations?

Answer: The State does not understand the question. Please explain why this is inconsistent with COMAR and PSC regulations. Please identify the specific provisions and indicate the reason for the inconsistency.

92. RFP Section 2.5.1.1

Follow Up Question. Please refer to the State's document Q and A Set #3, Question # 55. We believe it is highly likely the Transition In will be well along by the 270 day mark. It is also likely that much of the work will include data gathering/confirmation, that to some extent will be beyond the control of the contractor. It is also

likely that Transition In orders will be issued on an individual order basis per account, and not in a batch as the State might assume.

We are willing to work with the State toward the initial target, but are not able to assure completion and acceptance of Transition In for all accounts covered under the contract within that window. Would the State be willing to work with the Contractor to develop a mutually agreeable Transition In Project Plan to include an initial time line of 270 days, and allowance for mitigating risks?

Answer: Yes, the State would be willing to accept a mutually agreeable Transition In Project Plan to allow for mitigating risks as long as pricing is applied to all accounts in the resulting contract by July 1, 2014.

93. RFP Attachment 2, Contract, Section 4.2

Our normal invoicing procedure is to bill for monthly recurring access services (like Centrex and PRIs) one month in advance, and usage charges one month in arrears.

a) Does this meet the requirement?

Answer: Yes.

b) If not, would the State please amend this section to allow monthly access charges one month in advance, with usages charges one month in arrears?

Answer: See answer to question 93 a).