

---

**Question #:** 1P**Question:**

I haven't been able to find a format for capability statements. Is it a pretty free form?

**Answer:**

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, provides instructions on the format and types of information that should be included in the capability statements. Potential Offerors are to provide sufficient information in the capability statements in order to demonstrate their capabilities, from a nationwide perspective, that will afford the Government the opportunity to conduct a meaningful evaluation; see Section M.2.1, Phase I – Capability Statements.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #:** 2P**Question:**

There's been a lot of talk about the opt-in, opt-out process for the state. If you move that up a level to the federal level will this be a mandatory on track for federal agencies to join the FirstNet network?

**Answer:**

There's no "opt-in, opt-out" mechanism or provision in the Act for federal agencies. Additionally, FirstNet has conducted and continues to conduct federal consultation and outreach efforts to work with federal entities that may want to obtain services on the NPSBN. However, the NPSBN is not a mandatory service.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

---

**Question #:** 3P**Question:**

Is there any other recommendation that you'd have for rural providers who are entrusted in playing a role in the successful deployment of FirstNet?

**Answer:**

It is FirstNet's intent to issue a single contract for the comprehensive nationwide solution as outlined in the RFP. FirstNet anticipates Offerors will propose a solution that addresses all of the objectives identified in Section C, Statement of Objectives, and in accordance with all relevant sections of the RFP, or otherwise partner with an Offeror that plans to do so. As a courtesy, FirstNet is maintaining a list of those vendors that are interested in subcontracting and partnering opportunities with other potential Offerors. Please review Section L.2.1, Partnering/Teaming List, for more information.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #:** 4P**Question:**

I know there's been a bit more clarification on the capability statements, but for Offerors, how are they expected to outline the meaningful partnerships that they either have in place or that are planned?

**Answer:**

Offerors may articulate their existing and planned rural partnerships in their capability statements in any written format in accordance with Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

---

**Question #:** 5P**Question:**

Do you get a sense that industry has gotten the message that providing great insight into what deployment is going to look like if that's got to shine through in the proposal or does that seem like something that'll come downstream a series of task orders later? It seems to me that for the deployment piece there's so much to do getting pushed downstream, just interested in your insights on that.

**Answer:**

All deployment dates are subject to timely award and delivery of state plans. Section J, Attachment J-8, IOC/FOC Target Timeline, includes nationwide and state milestones. Offerors shall propose timelines for each IOC/FOC milestone. Nationwide milestones will commence with the award of the Day 1 task orders. Any subsequent task order(s) will identify the applicable period of performance. State-level milestones will commence with the award of state and territory task orders. To the extent Delayed FirstNet-Deployed RANs task orders are delayed past April 30, 2017, Offerors' proposed IOC/FOC timelines may be adjusted on a month-for-month basis for up to 900 days following state plan delivery. Moreover, the timelines regarding IOC/FOC phases are stated as "after award," which could apply to subsequent task orders for Delayed FirstNet-Deployed RANs.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #:** 6P**Question:**

The [SPOCs] have expressed concern to me that the 15% as you said was just a base that they encourage more coverage than what you all are going to be grading them on. How does that tie in ultimately to your ability to win over the states with your final proposal if we've got this disconnect between the rural wireless carriers communicating with the [SPOC], communicating with prime?

**Answer:**

The coverage objectives in the RFP are based on and directly informed by the FirstNet consultation process. The 15 percent rural telecommunications provider partnership metric is a minimum nationwide coverage threshold that must be met or may be exceeded in order to receive further consideration for award.

---

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**N/A

---

**Question #: 7P****Question:**

And parallel to this effort, for a couple years now and ongoing is the states (unintelligible) in the NG911 systems. They're building both systems and networks around those systems. Is there a point at which FirstNet and these 9-1-1 systems either have already decided or will decide to coexist, to coordinate, or even merge?

**Answer:**

FirstNet intends to continue closely coordinating with all our public safety stakeholders regarding Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG911). FirstNet will continue to look at how broadband will interact with Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) and 9-1-1 going forward.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**N/A

---

**Question #: 8P****Question:**

From the evaluation perspective, when you're looking at that 15% partnership target would it be satisfactory for a prime to show that they're working with an organization like NTCA as opposed to having those separate contracts directly with the rural providers and would that be satisfactory for the prime to meet that 15% target?

**Answer:**

Section M.2.3.2, Rural Partners and Subcontractors, states, "The Offeror's solution must demonstrate commitment to exercise rural telecommunications provider partnerships for at least 15 percent of the total rural coverage area nationwide at FOC." FirstNet has no requirements or preferences as to how those relationships are exercised.

---

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #: 9P****Question:**

The follow-up to that would be if we work with the plan—potential plan to work as part of the teaming agreement for a capability solution—would we then be able to have that discussion at that time or have that question answered?

**Answer:**

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, provides instructions on the format and types of information that should be included in the capability statements. Potential Offerors are to provide sufficient information in the capability statements in order to demonstrate their capabilities, from a nationwide perspective, that will afford the Government the opportunity to conduct a meaningful evaluation; see Section M.2.1, Phase I – Capability Statements.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #: 10P****Question:**

Does FirstNet plan on being a private entity or a federal entity?

**Answer:**

FirstNet is a federal entity.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #:** 11P**Question:**

I'd like to know if the Integrated Master Schedule is included in the page count.

**Answer:**

Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management, was revised in Amendment 005 and excluded the Integrated Master Schedule from the page limitation.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #:** 12P**Question:**

First, in Volume I in question as part of Amendment 001, it was clarified that the WBS and the PWS should be presented in Section 1 of Volume I. WBS is also referred to in Section 2. I'm just wondering if the WBS should be in both locations.

**Answer:**

Amendment 005 revised Sections L.3.1.1, Section One – General, and L.3.1.2, Section Two – Leadership and Program Management, in order to clarify that the submission of the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) is to be included only in Volume I – Business Management, Section Two – Leadership and Program Management.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #:** 13P**Question:**

For the individual grade identified in J-1 for the coverage objective, Section M states that they'll be evaluated on an individual basis whether or not they're acceptable. As offer solution I'd say one square mile out wire in Alaska surrounded by temporary on-demand coverage, one square mile in the middle left for persistent. An Offeror solution didn't cover that area. Would that be seen as making the whole sub-factor unacceptable?

**Answer:**

FirstNet's coverage objectives are included in the maps and associated attachments in Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definitions. Those areas where FirstNet desires persistent coverage will be evaluated based on how effectively the Offeror's solution addresses FirstNet's persistent coverage objectives. Those areas where FirstNet desires on-demand temporary coverage will be evaluated based on how effectively the Offeror's solution addresses FirstNet's on-demand temporary coverage objectives. As stated in Section M.4.2.1, Coverage and Capacity Maps and Statistics, "... Only those grid blocks that have a reasonable amount of coverage will be considered acceptable." Also, Section M.3, Basis for Award, states, "...the Government reserves the right to remove an Offeror's proposed solution from further consideration if it is determined to be unacceptable in any of the evaluation factors and/or sub-factors."

Therefore, failure to cover all or part of a given one-square-mile grid could affect the evaluation of the overall sub-factor and may be taken into consideration in the overall best value determination for award.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

**Question #:** 14P**Question:**

We've gotten lackluster interest from the big companies so as with regard to that interest, how does the panel, how does FirstNet in showing that they've got the big players, that people who build the towers not just the carriers' participation in this especially with the federal plans that it has?

**Answer:**

It is FirstNet's intent to issue a single contract for the comprehensive solution outlined in the RFP. FirstNet expects Offerors to propose a solution that addresses all of the objectives identified in Section C, Statement of Objectives, and in accordance with all relevant sections of the RFP, or otherwise partner

---

with an Offeror that plans to do so. As a courtesy, FirstNet is maintaining a list of those vendors that are interested in subcontracting and partnering opportunities with other potential Offerors. Please review Section L.2.1, Partnering/Teaming List, for more information.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #: 15P**

**Question:**

Are you interested in seeing capability statements from the small business community and how they would be evaluated against the big players?

**Answer:**

FirstNet will accept capability statements from any potential Offeror that is able to demonstrate a nationwide solution in accordance with the instructions contained in Section L, 2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, and the evaluation criteria as stated in Section M2.1, Phase I – Capability Statements.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #: 16P**

**Question:**

Recognizing the fact that board meetings are open public meetings, can the Contracting Officer provide guidance in regards to participation at next week's board meeting so as to prevent an appearance of conflict?

**Answer:**

Attending a Board Meeting does not cause or give an appearance of a conflict of interest.



---

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #: 17P****Question:**

There are no tabs defined in the J-17 workbook for best server and RSRP layer statistics. Does FirstNet want statistics for these layers and, if so, what statistics specifically do they want for these two layers?

**Answer:**

RSRP or Reference Signal Receive Power should be provided as part of the LTE analysis layers for the coverage maps. It is not required to be included in Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template. Section L, Instructions Conditions, and Notices to Offerors or Respondents, will be amended to reflect this clarification.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

Yes

**RFP Change Description:**

Section L.3.2.1.1.6, Planning Tool Analysis Layers, and Section L.3.2.1.3.1, IOC Coverage Maps and Network Statistics, will be revised in a forthcoming Amendment 008 to read, “The Offeror shall provide network statistics for each of the LTE analysis layers (with the exception of the RSRP, Best Server, and Composite Coverage Map layers) using Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template.”

---

**Question #: 18P****Question:**

I just wanted to understand that there’s any objection to owning for temporary licenses up until the deployment dates to help facilitate adoptions.

**Answer:**

FirstNet evaluates requests for temporary authority on a case-by-case basis depending on the purpose and the need for the authorization. It should be noted that FirstNet has undertaken clearing Band 14 of incumbents, and FirstNet does not wish to create additional incumbency on Band 14 prior to NPSBN deployment.

---

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #:** 19P**Question:**

Does the Government have any insight or estimation around when any technical demos—demonstration—be required as part of the evaluation process?

**Answer:**

It is not known at this time. As stated in Section L.3.1.6, Section Six – Delivery Mechanism for State Plans, “If the Government determines a demonstration of the online tool is required, additional details will be provided at a later date.” The Government will provide notification as soon as possible in order to afford sufficient time to prepare and conduct any demonstration regarding the delivery mechanism.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #:** 20P**Question:**

A recent response that you all had in Q&A talks about the future expansion of the system and that one way to do it was through a task order or a separate RFP. I guess I’m trying to get some information as to how the task order will be handled. I assume that’d be within the same selected Contractor, but if it still was a subsequent RFP, does that change the relationship with the Contractor in terms of the spectrum use or could the Contractor end up with a partner they didn’t really choose?

**Answer:**

In terms of spectrum, in either scenario, the use of the spectrum would be in accordance with a CLA with FirstNet and be subject to the network operation and other requirements set forth in this RFP. Also, if a new RFP is issued for expanded coverage, FirstNet anticipates that the network operation and other requirements would be similar in that RFP. Because the Contractor will still have the use of the spectrum as agreed to under its CLA with FirstNet, allowing another party to construct an expansion area (if FirstNet determined to do this) does not change the Contractor’s relationship regarding the use of spectrum in the areas agreed to pursuant to the Contractor’s CLA with FirstNet. With respect to the

---

Contractor working with others, please note that Section H.5.2, Contractor Interfaces, identifies any relationship among contractors supporting FirstNet. Specifically, it states, “As part of the performance of this contract, the Contractor and/or its subcontractors may be required to work with other Contractors supporting FirstNet.”

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #: 21P**

**Question:**

What percentage of the payments to FirstNet are for FirstNet operating costs versus network recapitalization?

**Answer:**

Payments to FirstNet will be used for authorized purposes in accordance with the Act, including reinvestment in the NPSBN.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #: 22P**

**Question:**

Given the nationwide span of our wireless network, the response to Site Summary tab in Attachment J-17 will include approximately 5.7 million data points. That data, when compiled in one file, will constitute a complete and detailed report of our entire network. Carriers don’t disclose their network architecture for national security reasons. It is unadvisable for FirstNet to have your secure government network architecture in the public sphere. Given the sensitivity of this information, we respectfully request that

Offerors be permitted to provide this information in a “clean room” where Government evaluators can review the materials while not requiring the Offeror to include or distribute copies of the materials as part of their proposal submissions.

**Answer:**

FirstNet is in the process of establishing a method to share sensitive information between FirstNet and Offerors. Once the process is determined, FirstNet will amend the RFP.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

**Question #: 23P****Question:**

Section L states the Offeror shall submit a small business subcontracting plan and should comply with the format contained in Section J-26. In reviewing the template, it offers three choices for Type of Plan. Please clarify that FirstNet will accept as compliant a Government-approved Commercial Subcontracting Plan to satisfy the Small Business Subcontracting Plan requirements of the solicitation. Also, if the Commercial Subcontracting Plan is acceptable, please clarify that the Government-approved Commercial Plan replaces the requirement to complete the J-26 template.

**Answer:**

No, the Government will not accept a Government-approved Commercial Subcontracting Plan. The J-26 should be submitted with Offeror's proposal as instructed in Section L, Instructions Conditions and Notices to Offerors and Respondents, L.3.1.1.2, Small Business Subcontracting Plan Requirements, "The plan submitted under this RFP should comply with the format contained in Section J, Attachment J-26, Sample Small Business Subcontracting Plan." Additionally, the small business subcontracting plan needs to apply to this acquisition regarding what small businesses are anticipated and/or being utilized for this acquisition.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

**Question #: 24P****Question:**

We respectfully request FirstNet confirm the Offeror may use its own existing commercial wireless network build/integration/ development/operation as one of the three Past Performance citations and be compliant with the RFP. If acceptable, please clarify what information is acceptable in boxes 1-9b in J-25.

---

**Answer:**

No, the Government requires all Offerors provide three Past Performance references as stated in Section L, Instructions Conditions and Notices to Offerors and Respondents. The Past Performance should be based on experience and services performed for others. FirstNet will not accept past performance or experience of internal projects performed.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---

**Question #: 25P****Question:**

The unique construct of this RFP obligates the awardee to attract the subscribership of the Public Safety Entities. If the awardee fails to attract sufficient subscribers, the awardee would be liable to FirstNet for disincentive payments and would further suffer low revenues from low subscriber volumes. With that, FirstNet already incentivizes the awardee to ensure competitive pricing, generate subscribership, and, thus, enable the awardee to pay FirstNet the sustainability payments. The Most Favored Customer Pricing Consideration clause at Section H.14, requiring the lowest price for any type of customer receiving broadband LTE services on Band 14 or other bands would skew the incentive construct of the RFP. As such, we request that the MFC provision be removed. Request FirstNet consider removing the MFC provision from the contract requirements.

**Answer:**

The Government declines the request to remove the Most Favored Customer provision from the contract requirements. In accordance with Section H.14, Most Favored Customer Pricing Consideration, Public Safety Entities would pay the lowest price offered by the Contractor for broadband LTE services on Band 14 or other bands. This does not preclude Offerors from incentivizing adoption through discounting commercially available services or subsidized specialized services for public safety customers. The comparison between prices for services offered to Public Safety Entities and other customers will depend on the Contractor's proposal and other service offerings. Offerors are free to propose the specifics of the most favored customer pricing arrangements.

**RFP Change (Yes/No):**

No

**RFP Change Description:**

N/A

---