
Question #: 11**RFP Section Reference:**

Section J, Attachment J-7, Operational Architecture, Section 1.3, Operational Architecture – FirstNet Functions, Sub-Paragraph A1.9, Covered Leasing Agreements

Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, Section 1.2, Terms and Conditions, Sub-Paragraph 2.3

Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, Section 1.2, Terms and Conditions, Sub-Paragraph 3.1, subparagraph (iv)

Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, Section 1.2, Terms and Conditions, Sub-Paragraph 4.1

Question:

A1.9 States, FirstNet is “Responsible for creating the framework for the secondary use of Band 14, negotiating Covered Leasing Agreements with the Contractor and other stakeholders, and monitoring the agreements.”

J-20, Section 2.3 cites “this is not a spectrum lease” and “the Contractor is expressly prohibited from subleasing spectrum authorized to FirstNet”.

J-20, Section 3.1, part (iv) cites, “FirstNet shall make all policy decisions regarding the NPSBN”.

J-20, Section 4.1, cites, “... contractor shall be solely responsible for ... all licenses (except for station license WQQE234), permits, consents, authorizations or other rights required for the use of the Network Capacity, including with respect to the NPSBN and the provision of wireless services to any PSE user or secondary user....”

Will the Authority please explain the process, including roles and responsibilities, of the Contractor and FirstNet in negotiating and implementing Covered Lease Agreements with secondary user organizations to monetize the related excess network capacity?

Answer:

The question inaccurately describes the relationships between the Contractor and organizations other than FirstNet as a Covered Leasing Agreement. The Act provides that only FirstNet may enter into Covered Leasing Agreements, which are defined in the Act as agreements between FirstNet and secondary users that must construct, manage, and operate the NPSBN in return for permitting access to network capacity on a secondary basis for non-public safety service. With regard to the NPSBN, the Contractor will be considered the secondary user for purposes of the Covered Leasing Agreement. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 1428(a)(2). *See also* Final Interpretations of Parts of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, 80 Fed. Reg. 63523, 63531-2 (Oct. 20, 2015) (interpreting certain provisions relating to Covered Leasing Agreements). Secondary users, however, also include any user that seeks access to or use of the network for non-public safety services. *See* Final Interpretations of Parts of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, 80 Fed. Reg. 63523, 63528 (Oct. 20, 2015).

As a result of being permitted to access network capacity under a Covered Leasing Agreement, the Contractor, as a secondary user, will have discretion in determining how to monetize the excess network capacity and provide secondary use of the network for non-public safety services in accordance with the terms of the contract, including entering into user or subscription agreements with non-public safety end users and agreements with other secondary users, such as third-party vendors, that will require access to the network capacity to reach non-public safety end users in certain geographic areas. While in such instances the Contractor is not permitted to sublease the spectrum or enter into Covered Leasing Agreements, the Contractor may enter into agreements with such secondary users for use of the excess capacity. FirstNet does not anticipate being directly involved in such agreement negotiations, provided all such arrangements are consistent with the terms of the Covered Leasing Agreement between FirstNet and the Contractor as set forth in Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, which will be incorporated into and made part of the contract.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 13

RFP Section Reference:

Section J, Attachment J-7, Operational Architecture, Section 1.3, Operational Architecture – FirstNet Functions, Sub-Paragraph A1.9, Covered Leasing Agreements

Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, Section 1.2, Terms and Conditions, Sub-Paragraph 2.3

Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, Section 1.2, Terms and Conditions, Sub-Paragraph 3.1, subparagraph (iv)

Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, Section 1.2, Terms and Conditions, Sub-Paragraph 4.1

Question:

A1.9 States, FirstNet is “Responsible for creating the framework for the secondary use of Band 14, negotiating Covered Leasing Agreements with the Contractor and other stakeholders, and monitoring the agreements.”

J-20, Section 2.3 cites “this is not a spectrum lease” and “the Contractor is expressly prohibited from subleasing spectrum authorized to FirstNet”.

J-20, Section 3.1, part (iv) cites, “FirstNet shall make all policy decisions regarding the NPSBN”.

J-20, Section 4.1, cites, “... contractor shall be solely responsible for ... all licenses (except for station license WQQE234), permits, consents, authorizations or other rights required for the use of the Network

Capacity, including with respect to the NPSBN and the provision of wireless services to any PSE user or secondary user....

Will the Authority please confirm that neither FirstNet nor its representatives will be involved the negotiation of any arrangements between the Contractor and secondary user entities (e.g., other operators, MVNO's, rural roaming partners) for the purchase and use by such entities (or their end user customers) of the Network's available excess capacity in the states that the contractor builds?

Answer:

The question inaccurately describes the relationships between the Contractor and organizations other than FirstNet as a Covered Leasing Agreement. The Act provides that only FirstNet may enter into Covered Leasing Agreements, which are defined in the Act as agreements between FirstNet and secondary users that must construct, manage, and operate the NPSBN in return for permitting access to network capacity on a secondary basis for non-public safety service. With regard to the NPSBN, the Contractor will be considered the secondary user for purposes of the Covered Leasing Agreement. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 1428(a)(2). *See also* Final Interpretations of Parts of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, 80 Fed. Reg. 63523, 63531-2 (Oct. 20, 2015) (interpreting certain provisions relating to Covered Leasing Agreements). Secondary users, however, also include any user that seeks access to or use of the network for non-public safety services. *See* Final Interpretations of Parts of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, 80 Fed. Reg. 63523, 63528 (Oct. 20, 2015).

As a result of being permitted to access network capacity under a Covered Leasing Agreement, the Contractor, as a secondary user, will have discretion in determining how to monetize the excess network capacity and provide secondary use of the network for non-public safety services in accordance with the terms of the contract, including entering into user or subscription agreements with non-public safety end users, and agreements with other secondary users, such as third-party vendors, that will require access to the network capacity to reach non-public safety end users in certain geographic areas. While in such instances, the Contractor is not permitted to sublease the spectrum or enter into Covered Leasing Agreements, the Contractor may enter into agreements with such secondary users for use of the excess capacity. FirstNet does not anticipate being directly involved in such agreement negotiations, provided all such arrangements are consistent with the terms of the Covered Leasing Agreement between FirstNet and the Contractor as set forth in Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, which will be incorporated into and made part of the final contract.

In addition, the Government encourages the Contractor to establish relationships with third-party vendors/subcontractors in order to meet FirstNet's objectives, including relationships with rural providers to ensure access to the NPSBN in rural areas. FirstNet acknowledges that these third parties may require access to network capacity to provide services both to public safety and non-public safety users. FirstNet will not be directly involved in the agreements between the Contractor and third-party subcontractors to furnish supplies or services for performance, provided any such agreements are consistent with the terms of the contract. (*See* FAR 42.505(b)).

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:N/A

Question #: 31 – *Please note, the answer to this question hereby supersedes the one issued in Amendment 001***RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definitions, 2nd paragraph and Figure 1, Coverage Objective Map**Question:**

There is considerable state to state variation in state-defined persistent coverage objectives. When scoring proposals, will FirstNet be taking into consideration how well the proposals address all of the coverage inputs or will they consider only the uniformly derived FirstNet baseline coverage? If all persistent coverage inputs will be considered (FirstNet Baseline, State Input, Federal Input), how will FirstNet assign value to satisfying these different input objectives?

Answer:

As stated in Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definitions, Section 1, Coverage Objectives, “The coverage objective map reflects coverage objectives based on data from the following four categories:

- **FirstNet Baseline** – Original coverage objective map developed by FirstNet, further described in Section 3, Coverage Objective Map Methodology
- **State Inputs** – Areas of interest identified by states, territories, and tribal nations that were not addressed in FirstNet’s baseline
- **Federal Inputs** – Areas of interest from federal entities, not identified by the FirstNet baseline or state inputs
- **On-Demand Temporary** – Areas where there are rare occurrences for the need of coverage

The FirstNet baseline ... indicates areas where persistent coverage is desired. On-demand temporary solutions are adequate for the other areas identified."

The FirstNet Coverage Objectives indicate areas where persistent coverage is desired at a minimum. As stated in Section M.4.2.1, Coverage and Capacity Maps and Statistics, “The Offeror’s proposed solution will be evaluated for each of the 56 states and territories using the information provided by the Offeror through coverage maps as well as network statistics included in Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template. The Government will evaluate the maps and statistics against the coverage objectives specified in Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definitions ... The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s proposed solution using a quantitative approach for each of the following coverage and capacity elements:

- **Non-Band 14 Area Coverage** – The amount of land mass that is covered with non-Band 14 coverage solutions

-
- **Non-Band 14 Population Coverage** – The amount of population that is covered with non-Band 14 coverage solutions
 - **Band 14 Area Coverage** – The amount of land mass that is covered with Band 14 coverage solutions
 - **Band 14 Population Coverage** – The amount of population that is covered with Band 14 coverage solutions
 - **Band 14 Network Capacity** – The amount of designed network capacity for first responders and secondary users”

Each of the above elements in the quantitative approach will be weighted equally. Other elements of an Offeror's coverage will be evaluated qualitatively referencing the objectives as set forth in Section C, Statement of Objectives, and the requirements and recommendations specified in Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 35

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-19, State Plan Template

Question:

The individual Draft State Plans will be submitted with the proposals and an award will be made based in part upon these draft plans. Consequently, FirstNet and the State will be in a relatively weak position to negotiate changes to the Draft State Plans. Given this timing, what practical opportunity will a given state have to review and revise the awardee's proposed draft plan for their state?

Answer:

Draft state plans are not required to be submitted as part of the Offeror's proposal. However, Section J, Attachment J-19, State Plan Template, identifies information that will be included within the state plans obtained from the Offeror's proposed solution. Following award, FirstNet anticipates working collaboratively with the Contractor to prepare the details of the state plan, based on the proposed solution, that will be presented to the governor of each state and territory in accordance with Section 1442(e)(1) of the Act. Although not required under the Act, FirstNet intends to provide each state and territory a limited window of opportunity to preview the state plan prior to submission to the governor.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 46**RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity**Question:**

In Attachment J-10 (Cybersecurity) there are over 100 references to the word ‘should’ and just three references to the word ‘must’. Can FirstNet please clarify the intended definition of the word ‘should’ as its use could undermine the desired inclusion of actual Cybersecurity in any final solution delivered to FirstNet.

Answer:

While the RFP is an objectives-based procurement intended to provide maximum flexibility to Offerors while ensuring the greatest value for public safety, the Act mandates certain requirements. Those requirements that are not objectives but are firm requirements that must be met or exceeded are set forth in Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR. Those items that are noted in the FCC TAB RMTR as “recommended requirements” and include the word SHALL must be met. For those items that are noted in the FCC TAB RMTR as “recommended requirements” and include the word SHOULD instead of SHALL, Offerors are strongly encouraged to address them in their solution. SHOULD statements throughout the RFP, including Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, will be viewed similarly. MUST statements and SHALL statements are equivalent.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 47**RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity**Question:**

Can FirstNet please give guidance to what it considers are the minimum mandatory requirements for Cyber? Is the entirety of J-10 meant to be the minimum cyber requirements?

Answer:

While the RFP is an objectives-based procurement intended to provide maximum flexibility to Offeror while ensuring the greatest value for public safety, the Act mandates certain requirements. Those requirements that are not objectives but are firm requirements that must be met or exceeded are set forth in Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR. Those items that are noted in the FCC TAB RMTR as “recommended requirements” and include the word SHALL must be met. For those items that are noted in the FCC TAB RMTR as “recommended requirements” and include the word SHOULD instead of SHALL, Offerors are strongly encouraged to address them in their solution. SHOULD statements throughout the RFP, including Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, will be viewed similarly. MUST statements and SHALL statements are equivalent.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 50**RFP Section Reference:** No Request for Proposal (RFP) reference noted in question submitted**Question:**

The centralization of the network architecture in a central core seems to create the potential for catastrophic failure at that core site. How is this vulnerability being or to be addressed?

Answer:

There is no requirement to have the NPSBN Core in a single physical location. The Offeror's Core design should align with the IOC/FOC milestones described in Section J, Attachment J-8, IOC/FOC Target Timeline as described in Section 3.2.2.4, Architecture and Infrastructure, including:

- Core redundancy and failover to meet availability objectives
- Geo-redundancy and failover to meet availability objectives
- Geo-diverse transport to meet availability objectives

Therefore, the mitigation of any vulnerability should be identified within the Offeror's proposal in accordance with the instructions contained in Section L, Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors and Respondents.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 51**RFP Section Reference:** No Request for Proposal (RFP) reference noted in question submitted**Question:**

Are there any mechanisms to ensure the security of the Contractor's Network Backhaul facilities?

Answer:

As described within Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4.1, Industry Best Practices, "The solution should protect the S1 interface (between the base station and Core) and all other communications planes between Evolved Node Base stations (eNodeBs) and Core sites, including S1, X2, and all other management and timing plane communications between these devices." Offerors should describe their solutions in accordance with instructions set forth in Section L.3.2.2.6.1, Public Safety

Security, seventh bullet, End-to-End Protection of Data, and Section L.3.2.2.6.2, Architecture Security, fifth bullet, Transport.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 54

RFP Section Reference: No Request for Proposal (RFP) reference noted in question submitted

Question:

Is it anticipated that public safety users will initially use this in data only mode while continuing to use their Motorola and other networks?

Answer:

A decision to use the NPSBN for voice and/or data service is a decision resting solely at the discretion of the agency making the decision. Section J, Attachment J-8, IOC/FOC Target Timeline, provides the details pertaining to the target IOC/FOC timeline for the NPSBN.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 55

RFP Section Reference: No Request for Proposal (RFP) reference noted in question submitted

Question:

Is integration of the network with satellite providers anticipated, desired, or helpful in evaluating preferred awardees?

Answer:

Offerors will be evaluated on their entire NPSBN solution with respect to FirstNet’s stated objectives in accordance with the evaluation criteria as set forth in Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award. Coverage objectives can be met by proposing the use of satellite, terrestrial, or other innovative approaches, or any combination thereof. Also, as stated in Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definitions, Section 1, Coverage Objectives, “The FirstNet baseline, . . . , indicates areas where persistent coverage is desired. On-demand temporary solutions are adequate for the other areas identified.”

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 56**RFP Section Reference:** No Request for Proposal (RFP) reference noted in question submitted**Question:**

Will the amount of debt on an applicant's balance sheet be weighed against an applicant as a risk factor, weighed in favor of an applicant as evidence of borrowing experience, or not be relevant at all?

Answer:

As detailed in Section M.4.1.5, Section Five – Financial Standing, among other sections of the RFP, FirstNet will evaluate the financial standing of the Offeror to determine the financial sustainability and risk of the proposal. Any debt will be considered as part of an Offeror's financial history and will be considered in the evaluation of financial standing. Also, as stated in Section M.4, Evaluation Factors, “The evaluation will consist of a determination and analysis of ... risks of each proposed solution. Risk will be included in the evaluation of each factor (and/or sub-factors) and will not be evaluated as a separate factor.” Therefore, this would include and consider any/all proposal information submitted when assessing any risks based on the Offeror's proposed solution with regard to financial standing (e.g., debt).

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section M.4.1.5, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to read, “The Offeror's proposed approach must demonstrate its ability to satisfy financial sustainability requirements. ...”

Question #: 59**RFP Section Reference:** No Request for Proposal (RFP) reference noted in question submitted**Question:**

Will security risks associated with private non-public safety users on the network be considered a detriment in making this award?

Answer:

As stated in Section M.4, Evaluation Factors, “The evaluation will consist of a determination and analysis of ... risks of each proposed solution. Risk will be included in the evaluation of each factor (and/or sub-factors) and will not be evaluated as a separate factor.” Therefore, this would include and consider any/all proposal information submitted when assessing security risks based on the Offeror's proposed solution. If in fact, the use of the network by non-public safety users or devices impairs in any way the primary usage

of the NPSBN or impacts the stated objectives for mission-critical operations, then appropriate actions must be taken to preserve the integrity of the network for the public safety users.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 62

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-7, Operational Architecture, 1st Paragraph

Question:

Will FirstNet provide licensing priority to local public safety entities that determine the network priority access for Major Planned Events use case or will this be a requirement for the contract prime?

Answer:

As stated in Section C.3, Program Description, "... the NPSBN will provide to public safety agencies both national and local control over prioritization, preemption, provisioning ..."

The Offeror shall propose a framework and solutions for meeting public safety capacity and coverage needs during planned or unplanned events. These solutions shall incorporate Quality of Service, Priority, and Preemption (QPP) functionality to ensure public safety access to network services during emergencies in cases of network congestion.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 63

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-7, Operational Architecture, 1st Paragraph

Question:

Will FirstNet provide monitoring of spectrum usage over time to maintain equitable access for public safety entities or will this be a requirement for the contract prime?

Answer:

In accordance with Section C, Statement of Objectives, Section C.5, Objectives, Objective #10, Priority Services, the Offeror is "to provide a solution that allows the assignment of ... preemption (QPP) parameters to user profiles ..." ensuring public safety has priority usage, when needed. Additionally, Section J, Attachment J-6, Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan, Section 1, Purpose of the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan, states, "The Contractor shall provide a Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) that defines what the Government and the Contractor must do to ensure the Contractor has

performed in accordance with the performance metrics/standards as agreed upon in the contract ... The Contractor is responsible for management and quality control actions required to meet the terms of the contract. The Government reserves the right to perform, with the Contractor, quality assurance (QA) and surveillance in order to verify contract performance standards are achieved and maintained throughout the life of the contract.”

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 64

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-7, Operational Architecture, 1st Paragraph

Question:

Will FirstNet provide dynamic monitoring of spectrum in the case of FEMA Type 3: Multi-jurisdictional use case or will this be a requirement for the contract prime?

Answer:

In accordance with Section C, Statement of Objectives, Section C.5, Objective #10, Priority Services, the Offeror is “to provide a solution that allows the assignment of ... preemption (QPP) parameters to user profiles ...” ensuring public safety has priority usage, when needed. Additionally, Section J, Attachment J-6, Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan, states, “The Contractor shall provide a Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) that defines what the Government and the Contractor must do to ensure the Contractor has performed in accordance with the performance metrics/standards as agreed upon in the contract ... The Contractor is responsible for management and quality control actions required to meet the terms of the contract. The Government reserves the right to perform, with the Contractor, quality assurance (QA) and surveillance in order to verify contract performance standards are achieved and maintained throughout the life of the contract.”

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 67**RFP Section Reference:**

Section M.2.1, Phase 1 - Capability Statements, 2nd and 3rd Bullets

Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definitions

Question:

The RFP states in the Nationwide Coverage and Capacity evaluation criteria "... ability to provide Band 14 and non-Band 14 coverage and capacity in each of the 56 states and territories, including rural and non-rural areas". In the Rural Partnership Criteria "... utilizing existing infrastructure to the maximum extent economically desirable to speed deployment in rural areas."

Will the Authority release or make available all the SLIGP information it received from US States and Territories documenting the type, quantity, location, and other key details of the existing Government and Public Safety site infrastructure and assets (e.g., fiber rings, towers)?

Has the Authority received or compiled any information relating to the ability of US States (and their included jurisdictional units) and Territories to make any of such site infrastructure and assets available to FirstNet and/or the winning bidder without obtaining changes in state, local or territorial law, rules or regulations governing use of government or publicly owned property?

If so, will the Authority make such information available to prospective bidders or invited bidders? Having a better or clear understanding of the details and locations of these assets and their availability for use under existing law, rules and regulations will help bidders develop better and more realistic coverage analysis across the nationwide network. This information will improve the accuracy of all bids and the efficiency of bidder pricing approaches. It will result in a more complete and accurate solution for FirstNet.

Answer:

The collection of public assets data within the states or territories is not an authorized expense under the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) State and Local Implementation Grant Program (SLIGP) (see

http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/phase_2_recipient_instructions_3-23-15.pdf, page 9).

The Contractor will be required to comply with state, local, or territorial law, rules, or regulations governing the use of government or privately owned property. Offerors may propose solutions using government and private facilities to meet FirstNet's stated objectives.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 68**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.2.2.6, Security**Question:**

The RFP references multiple security standards and policies. How does the Authority envision that conflicts between varying security standards will be reconciled? Will the Authority provide a hierarchy of security standards to enable bidders to develop and drive the overall security design and solution?

Answer:

Offerors are expected to propose a cybersecurity approach that is consistent with the objectives described in Section C, Statement of Objectives, and Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity. There is no hierarchy among the security standards suggested, and the approach may vary across Offerors.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 69**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.2.2.1.3, Identity, Credential, and Access Management, 4th Bullet**Question:**

Does FirstNet require two-factor authentication (for priority use or all use) on the network?

If so, is there a preference to the form of that second factor, i.e., a software or hardware based approach?

Answer:

The Offeror should provide authentication mechanisms that may include both software and hardware methods that may or may not be device dependent, to provide the necessary security while at the same time providing ease of use for public safety. Offerors should propose a solution that meets or exceeds the objectives appropriate to the operational circumstances, devices, and applications.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 70

RFP Section Reference: Section L.3.2.2.1.3, Identity, Credential, and Access Management, 5th Bullet

Question:

The RFP references dynamic attribute-based access control (ABAC).

Will federal agencies, federal users, and/or federal visitors be required to access locally controlled, non-federal applications and resources? Or will federal agencies, federal users, and/or federal users access federal applications and resources on the FirstNet network?

Answer:

FirstNet is not prescriptive on which applications and resources that users, including federal users, may need to access to fulfill their mission. Any requirements for authorized access are either specified by the owner or administrator of those applications and resources or may be included in any subsequent task order as appropriate unless otherwise stated within the terms and conditions of the IDIQ contract or Day 1 task orders.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 71

RFP Section Reference: Section L.3.2.2.1.3, Identity, Credential, and Access Management, 7th Bullet

Question:

Does the Authority believe that built-in, off-the-shelf device multi-persona functionality is sufficient to meet FirstNet requirements or is a third party application required?

Answer:

Section L.3.2.2.1.3, Identity, Credential, and Access Management, seventh bullet, states that Offerors should describe how their proposed solution supports multiple users sharing a device. FirstNet anticipates that Offerors will propose the best implementation for multi-profile devices.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 72

RFP Section Reference: Section L.3.2.2.4.2.4, Transport Security, 1st Paragraph

Question:

Must all network traffic be encrypted as it traverses the entire network? Is standard 3GPP encryption sufficient for over-the-air network traffic or is additional encryption required by the Authority?

Answer:

The objective is to encrypt all end-to-end (E2E) traffic as specified in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4.1, Industry Best Practices. The encryption defined in 3GPP is considered to be the minimum requirement, but additional submissions that propose innovative encryption techniques that meet or exceed 3GPP encryption would be considered during the evaluation in accordance with Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 73

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, Section 1.3.7, Security

Question:

If user plane traffic was to be encrypted end-to-end, what cipher suites would be acceptable? What decision body will determine whether it is required, and will that be a scope change for the solution provider?

Answer:

The cipher suites defined per 3GPP are the minimum requirement as described in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4, Cybersecurity Architecture.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 74**RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, Section 1.3.7, Security

Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, Section 1.4.8, Security

Question:

The RFP states, “The NPSBN SHALL comply with TS 33.310 as the authentication framework for Public Key Infrastructure to authenticate these network interfaces.”

Will the contractor be responsible for developing the entire key management framework and infrastructure for the solution?

Answer:

Offerors should propose a complete security solution, including a key management framework, consistent with Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 75**RFP Section Reference:**

Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, Section 1.3.7, Security

Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, Section 1.4.8, Security

Question:

The RFP states, “In order to ensure secure and interoperable interfaces between the NPSBN and external elements (e.g. all SGi, Rx and Srvs services as shown in Figure 2), these interfaces shall be protected with a FirstNet-approved security mechanism.”

Will the Authority please clarify what is meant and required by the term “FirstNet-approved security mechanism”?

Answer:

In accordance with Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, a FirstNet-approved security mechanism shall meet or exceed 3GPP standard protections.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 77

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, Section 1.4.8, Security

Question:

Are the “SHOULD” statements in section 1.4.8 of “Recommended Minimum Technical Requirements to Ensure Nationwide Interoperability for the Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network” interpreted as mandatory requirements for the Offeror?

If they are not mandatory requirements, will the Authority please provide the weighting for the evaluation of solutions that do meet these “should” statements?

Answer:

The Government is not assigning numeric weights to the evaluation factors for this acquisition. All factors and sub-factors were identified along with their relative importance in accordance with FAR 15.304. Those items that are noted in Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, as “recommended requirements” and include the word SHALL must be met. For those items that are noted in the FCC TAB RMTR as “recommended requirements” and include the word SHOULD instead of SHALL, Offerors are strongly encouraged to address them in their solution.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 78

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, Section 1.4.8, Security

Question:

The RFP provides the following information:

(p 44) Equipment used in the NPSBN SHOULD support AES and SNOW 3G algorithms.

(p 45) FirstNet SHOULD establish the security controls and policy for inter-domain security and require that all parties (e.g. public safety agencies) who connect to the NPSBN utilize FirstNet approved cipher suites.

(p 46) FirstNet SHOULD consider using IPSec interfaces that utilize IKEv2 and utilize PKI to authenticate the peers of the IPSec Security Associations.

(p 47) When EPS elements are located in trusted locations without wide area communication links between them, the use of network domain security SHOULD be optional.

(p 48) Network interfaces between domains SHOULD be monitored and intrusion detection/prevention tools SHOULD be deployed.

(p 49) The developed security mechanisms SHOULD permit local entities to hide the topologies and address spaces of their networks.

Does this set of references refer to using Network Address Translation (NAT) inside a local entity? Or is another security mechanism envisioned by the Authority?

Answer:

As defined in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4, Cybersecurity Architecture, network architecture should, at a minimum, implement the recommended requirements in the 3GPP standard specifications. Also, Section L.3.2.2.6.2, Architecture Security, instructs the Offeror to propose its approach to secure and protect the architectural components of the NPSBN and the inter-domain interfaces, including network address translation support and other characteristics, such as security management and logging, private encryption key management infrastructure, security policies and practices, fraud prevention and revenue assurance, protection between users, protection against signaling storms, and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) spam.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 79

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 1, Cybersecurity Objectives, Last Paragraph

Question:

The RFP states, “Security mechanisms layered by a jurisdiction on top of the NPSBN SHOULD NOT inhibit interoperability for users visiting from outside of the security domain in which it is implemented.”

Does this statement refer to the ability for a visitor to connect to the network and communicate with his/her home services? Please clarify.

Answer:

The question submitted referred to Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 1, Cybersecurity Objectives, Last Paragraph. However, the correct reference is Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, Section 1.4.8, Security, sub-item (50). This statement refers to both a visiting resource connecting to the network in another jurisdiction as well as the ability for a visiting resource to access its services from the network in another jurisdiction.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 81

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.1, Public Safety Needs, 1st Bullet, Usability

Question:

The RFP states, “Security controls, policies, and procedures should provide protection without impacting operability or interoperability.”

All security controls impact operability and interoperability in some way. Does FirstNet envision performance metrics that measure the system with and without “security” in place?

What are the penalties for security impacting operability and interoperability?

How will the performance thresholds be determined and how will the prime contractor be notified of these performance thresholds?

Answer:

The question submitted referred to Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2, NPSBN Cybersecurity Concepts, first bullet. However, bullets do not appear in the text until Section 2.1, Public Safety Needs; therefore, FirstNet assumes the correct reference is to Section 2.1, Public Safety Needs, first bullet, and we are responding accordingly. Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.1, Public Safety Needs, states how security controls, policies, and procedures should provide protection without impacting operability or interoperability. It also outlines mission primacy—the concept that the mission of public safety (to protect lives and property from clear and present danger) should take primacy over protection of the network.

Regarding performance objectives, Section J, Attachment J-9, QASP Surveillance Matrix Template, Section 1, Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan Matrix Template, requests the Offeror to include a QASP in their response, detailing the performance metrics/standards they will provide. Proposed performance metrics/standards should align with the deliverables specified in the Offeror’s proposed Deliverables Table (Section J, Attachment J-16, Deliverables Table), and be attentive to the FirstNet objectives as defined in Section C, Statement of Objectives.

The Offeror’s proposed solution should include performance metrics that take into consideration the security parameters stated within the RFP. Also, the Offerors should propose metrics, as well as associated incentives and disincentives and any proposed thresholds, regarding security operability and interoperability; these should be identified in the Offeror’s QASP Surveillance Template (see Section J, Attachment J-9, QASP Surveillance Template). Moreover, the Offeror’s proposed solution should include monitoring and reporting mechanisms. Criteria for remedies for non-conformance and disincentives are provided in Section J, Attachment J-6, Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan, Section 5.2, Remedies for Non-Conformance, and Section 5.3, Disincentive Payments. These sections include the framework of interaction between the FirstNet Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR) and the Contractor’s Program Manager.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 83**RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity**Question:**

Will the NPSBN security requirements have to meet the FBI's CJIS security requirements? Or simply be able to support applications that meet those requirements?

Answer:

For those items that are noted in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, as “recommended requirements” and include the word SHOULD, Offerors are strongly encouraged to address them in their solution. As stated in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.1, Public Safety Needs, seventh bullet, Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS), “Traffic and transactions governed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s CJIS Security Policy will transit and potentially be acted upon within the NPSBN.” Any necessary protective mechanisms will need to be in place to ensure this can be accomplished. However, those requirements would be included in any subsequent task order, as appropriate, unless otherwise stated within the terms and conditions of the IDIQ contract or Day 1 task Orders.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 84**RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity**Question:**

Will the NPSBN have to be PCI DSS compliant? Or simply be able to support applications that meet those requirements?

Answer:

For those items that are noted in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, as “recommended requirements” and include the word SHOULD, Offerors are strongly encouraged to address them in their solution. Therefore, yes, the NPSBN should be able to support applications that are Payment Card Industry (PCI) Data Security Standard (DSS) compliant, consistent with Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.1, Public Safety Needs. However, those requirements would be included in any

subsequent task order, as appropriate, unless otherwise stated within the terms and conditions of the IDIQ contract or Day 1 task orders.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 85

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity

Question:

Will the NSBPN have to be HIPAA compliant? Or simply be able to support applications that meet those requirements?

Answer:

For those items that are noted in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, as “recommended requirements” and include the word SHOULD, Offerors are strongly encouraged to address them in their solution. As stated in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.1, Public Safety Needs, sixth bullet, Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA), “Traffic and transactions governed by HIPAA and subsequent related laws will transit and potentially be acted upon within the NPSBN.” Associated protective mechanisms will need to be in place to ensure this can be accomplished. However, those requirements would be included in any subsequent task order, as appropriate, unless otherwise stated within the terms and conditions of the IDIQ contract or Day 1 task orders.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 86

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.2, Dedicated Cybersecurity Program

Question:

The RFP in this section lists several complex, compound requirements that are covered in more detail elsewhere in the appendix.

Should offers treat Section 2.2 as text and not specific security requirements?

Answer:

No, Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.2, Dedicated Cybersecurity Program, should be considered as general text. The section includes objectives of the security program for the NPSBN rather than specific requirements.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 88

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4.2, Devices and Applications, Last Sub-Bullet

Question:

Does the statement, “The device local storage must be encrypted with OS capability” mean that standard OS-level full device encryption is required?

Answer:

Yes, operating system (OS)-level full device encryption is required, rather than an over-the-top application.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 89

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4.2, Devices and Applications, 2nd Bullet, Authentication of Users and Applications, Last Sub-Bullet

Question:

The RFP states, “Device-specific biometric authentication (e.g., fingerprint, retina) should be integrated for supplemental authentication of certified access to the application.”

Does the Authority require that all devices support biometric authentication?

What is the penalty if the solution does not support biometric authentication for supplemental authentication/access?

Is there a fallback in the case of gloves, dim lighting, and/or mission priority, etc.?

Will the Authority please clarify how they envision this supplemental authentication approach working in an operational environment?

Answer:

For those items that are noted in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, as “recommended requirements” and include the word SHOULD, Offerors are strongly encouraged to address them in their solution. Therefore, no, FirstNet does not require biometric authentication for all devices. FirstNet anticipates support for a number of authentication mechanisms to provide necessary security while at the same time providing ease of use for public safety. Also, within their proposed solution, the Offeror should identify their authentication approaches working in the operational environment.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 90

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4.2, Devices and Applications, 3rd Bullet, Embedded Applications, 1st Sub-Bullet

Question:

Why are “latency sensitive” applications called out as needing to be pre-installed by various Original Equipment Manufacturers?

Will the Authority please clarify that it is acceptable for FirstNet-designated latency sensitive applications to be installed as required via the most appropriate method and entity?

Answer:

For those items that are noted in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, as “recommended requirements” and include the word SHOULD, Offerors are strongly encouraged to address them in their solution. While pre-installed applications generally have better performance than those installed after market, there is no firm requirement based on latency.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 91

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4.2, Devices and Applications, 6th Bullet, Device Security Solutions

Question:

The RFP states a number of solutions referenced in the “Device security solutions” section.

Does the Authority intend that the contractor is to specify the appropriate device security solutions based on the adopted cybersecurity framework and relevant risk model?

Is it fair to assume that the device security solutions will not be one-size-fits-all but will be able to be tailored based on mission requirements and acceptable risk by the user base?

Answer:

Yes, the Offeror should specify the device security solutions it deems appropriate; multiple solutions may be proposed.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 92

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.6, Cybersecurity Guidance

Question:

Will the Authority please provide suggestions for which frameworks to work from?

Will the contractor be empowered to develop the NPSBN cybersecurity framework from these multiple frameworks?

Will the Authority please confirm that this process would be subject to early design review to protect from a substantial amount of rework if the developed framework did not meet FirstNet’s expectations?

Answer:

As noted in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.6 Cybersecurity Guidance, “There is considerable cybersecurity guidance available from industry, government, and standards organizations that should be considered when developing the NPSBN cybersecurity solution. There is no single solution or guidance that addresses all cybersecurity challenges. When considering the complexity of the NPSBN and the fact that its components, users, and usage falls into many different cybersecurity areas of practice, the NPSBN cybersecurity solution should employ multiple frameworks to address these needs.” The Offeror should propose in their solution the cybersecurity framework it believes is appropriate to meet or exceed the objectives as defined in Section C, Statement of Objectives.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 93**RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4.2, Devices and Applications**Question:**

The RFP repeatedly states, "... solution should include but is not limited to the following elements."

Will the Authority please clarify how it intends to address the inclusion or request for inclusion of additional security requirements beyond those listed in the RFP and ultimately priced by the Offeror?

Answer:

The phrase "... solution should include but is not limited to the following elements" (as stated in Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4.2, Devices and Applications) indicates an illustrative example of the expectations tied to the specific security objective. The Offeror is free to expand beyond those items provided in the example. However, any additional requirements that pertain to security post-award could be included in any subsequent task order, as appropriate, unless otherwise stated within the terms and conditions of the IDIQ contract, or a modification to an existing task order(s) executed via a change management process and a formal modification.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 98**RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-19, State Plan Template, Section A.7, Network Implementation**Question:**

In areas of the State Plan template where FirstNet indicates they will provide text can you clarify the delineation of responsibilities between FirstNet and the contractor on 1) content development, 2) responsibility for compliance with stated specifications, 3) integration into the contractor's master schedule?

Answer:

1. FirstNet will provide the content for those sections marked “FirstNet-provided text” at the time of the Day 1 Task Order 2 (State Plan Development and Refinement) award (see Section B.2.1.2, Task Order – State Plan Development and Refinement), if content is included in the state plan.
2. Nothing in these sections has a compliance aspect.
3. The Offeror’s proposed solution should integrate the state plan creation schedule into its master schedule regarding the Day 1 Task Order 2, (reference Section B.2.1.2, Task Order – State Plan Development and Refinement).

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 101**RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.1, Public Safety Needs, 11th Bullet, Authentication**Question:**

To meet Public Safety needs FirstNet desires to follow industry best practice for all areas related to the cybersecurity architecture. FICAM (Federal Identity, Credential, and Access Management) is the most well-established certification for strong authentication. We recommend that FirstNet add FICAM to the Authentication bullet as follows:

Authentication – Authentication methodologies on the network and for devices should allow public safety easy access but provide a high level of security. The solution must include federated Identity, Credential, and Access Management (ICAM) in concert with appropriate multifactor and step-up authentication approaches. Solutions must meet the FICAM Trust Framework.

Answer:

FirstNet does not require the solution to meet the Federal Identity, Credential, and Access Management (FICAM) Trust Framework. However, Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.3, Federal Requirements, describes an objective that solutions should support federal users in meeting their applicable federal cybersecurity standards and requirements.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 102

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4.2, Devices and Applications, 7th Bullet, Bring Your Own Stuff

Question:

How will you authorize/approve devices introduced to the environment via the Bring Your Own Stuff approach?

Answer:

In accordance with Section C, Statement of Objectives, Section C.5, Objectives, Objective #4, Device Ecosystem, the Offeror’s proposed solution shall provide information pertaining to “The ecosystem shall support Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) ...” and Section L.3.2.2.3.5, Device Approval Process, “The Offeror shall propose an approach to carrier acceptance... which can be used to certify public safety functionalities and features of mobile devices before the device is deployed on the NPSBN.”

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 103

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.4.2, Devices and Applications, 7th Bullet, Bring Your Own Stuff

Question:

How will you Implement control objectives to ensure the BYOD Devices you are allowing to connect have met the FirstNet NPSBN requirements for Security & Compliance?

Answer:

In accordance with Section C, Statement of Objectives, Section C.5, Objectives, Objective #4, Device Ecosystem, the Offeror’s proposed solution shall provide information pertaining to “The ecosystem shall support Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) ...” and Section L.3.2.2.3.5, Device Approval Process, “The Offeror shall propose an approach to carrier acceptance... which can be used to certify public safety functionalities and features of mobile devices before the device is deployed on the NPSBN.”

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 104**RFP Section Reference:**

Section C.5, Objectives, 12th Bullet, Integration of Existing Commercial/ Federal/State/Tribal/Local Infrastructure to Support NPSBN Services

Section L.3.2.1, Coverage and Capacity

Question:

For good reasons, FirstNet seeks to integrate into the network existing assets where economically desirable. FirstNet further states that it seeks to place an “emphasis on assets owned and operated by rural telecommunications providers.” FirstNet establishes a 15% baseline requirement for these types of rural partnerships.

Although referencing rural telecommunications providers, the RFP does not specifically refer to rural electric cooperatives, who cover 75% of the land mass of the United States, and in many cases may have hardened infrastructure that could be incorporated into the network. This seems contrary to the plain meaning of Section 6206 (c), which requires FirstNet to “enter into agreements to utilize to the maximum extent economically desirable, existing commercial or other communications infrastructure.”

Is FirstNet interested in the use of electric cooperative assets in rural America as well as telecommunications providers’ assets, including communications towers, rights of way and dark fiber, or does FirstNet intend to favor only commercial carrier infrastructure in satisfying the 15% partnership requirement? If FirstNet does not intend to incorporate rural electric cooperative assets into the network through the 15% partnership requirement, please explain why. Does FirstNet intend to take any steps to ensure that rural electric cooperatives with existing infrastructure are included in the rural buildout?

Answer:

FirstNet intends to issue a single award that provides a comprehensive network solution and meets the objectives as stated in Section C, Statement of Objectives, and associated Section J attachments, including those objectives related to rural deployment. FirstNet interprets a “rural provider” or “rural telecommunications provider” to mean an entity that provides either exclusively or the vast majority of its telecommunications or broadband services in a geographic area that falls within the definition of the term “rural” as defined in the Act as interpreted by FirstNet. See First Responder Network Authority, Final Interpretations of Parts of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, 80 Fed. Reg. 63523, 29 (October 20, 2015), <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-10-20/pdf/2015-26621.pdf>. Therefore, if the rural electric cooperative does not meet the definition of “rural telecommunications provider,” then its assets can be used as part of the NPSBN deployment, but they would not be included as part of the 15 percent. Parties, including rural electric cooperatives and rural providers, that are interested in this acquisition should participate in accordance with the instructions contained in the solicitation or otherwise seek to partner or subcontract with other potential Offerors.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section J, Attachment J-14, Terms of Reference, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to include the following definition, “Rural telecommunications provider means an entity that provides either exclusively or the vast majority of its telecommunications or broadband services in a geographic area that falls within the definition of the term “rural” as defined in the Act as interpreted by FirstNet. See First Responder Network Authority, Final Interpretations of Parts of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, 80 Fed. Reg. 63523, 29 (October 20, 2015), <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-10-20/pdf/2015-26621.pdf>.”

Question #: 107**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.2.1, Coverage and Capacity**Question:**

It appears that the 15% requirement for rural partnerships is a minimum threshold.

How did FirstNet determine the 15% benchmark? Wouldn't rural America be better served if the RFP required a nationwide bidder to seek a greater than 15% partnership level, specifically including the involvement of rural electric cooperatives with existing infrastructure, established membership bases, and a demonstrated, longstanding commitment of service to rural America,?

Answer:

As stated in Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award, specifically Section M.2.3.2, Rural Partners and Subcontractors, “The Offeror’s solution must demonstrate commitment to exercise rural telecommunications provider partnerships for at least 15 percent of the total rural coverage nationwide.” The 15 percent requirement is a minimum threshold and is based on geography. Therefore, the Offeror’s proposed solution must demonstrate it meets or exceeds this minimum threshold.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 108**RFP Section Reference:** B.2.1.1, Task Order 1 - Delivery Mechanism for State Plans and B.2.1.2, Task Order 2 - State Plan Development and Refinement**Question:**

Please confirm that FirstNet expects the selected contractor to begin performing Task Orders 1 and 2 concurrently, immediately following award.

Answer:

Yes, the Government anticipates the Contractor commencing performance on the Day 1 task orders immediately following award.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 109

RFP Section Reference: B.2, Pricing Schedules and Task Orders

Question:

Please confirm that FirstNet is requesting that all 56 State Plans be delivered by April 30, 2017 (assuming a November 1, 2016 award date).

Answer:

Section B.2, Pricing Schedules and Task Orders, provides an estimated date of April 30, 2017, for award of Initial FirstNet Deployed RAN States task orders. The objectives regarding the delivery mechanism for state plans are contained in Section J, Attachment J-18, Delivery Mechanism Objectives for State Plans.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 110

RFP Section Reference: Section C.5, Objectives, 12th Bullet, Integration of Existing Commercial/Federal/State/Tribal/Local Infrastructure to Support NPSBN Services

Question:

This objective calls for integration of existing infrastructure. Does FirstNet consider it acceptable for Respondents to contact states directly to identify existing infrastructure?

Answer:

Yes, Offerors may contact states and territories about existing infrastructure in order to develop their proposed solutions.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 111

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definition, Section 1, Coverage Objective Map (Layer File)

Question:

Please clarify the meaning of the “State-Local” attribute entries of 0, 1, 2, 3 of the Coverage Objectives from the .mpk file.

Answer:

Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definitions, attribute entries of 0, 1, 2, 3 in the Coverage Objectives .mpk file correspond to colors on the legend. The values are stored as numbers in the attribute table as opposed to text strings for ease of data manipulation.

“State-Local” Attribute Column

- 0 – None (not identified in FirstNet baseline or in State Input)
- 1 – FirstNet Original Baseline
- 2 – State Input
- 3 – State Input LMR or Commercial Coverage

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definitions, Section 1, Coverage Objectives, is being revised in Amendment No. 002, to read, “The following values are stored as numbers in the attribute table as opposed to text strings for ease of data manipulation.

“State-Local” Attribute Column

- 0 – None (not identified in FirstNet baseline or in State Input)
- 1 – FirstNet Original Baseline
- 2 – State Input
- 3 – State Input LMR or Commercial Coverage”

Question #: 112

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definition, Section 2, Coverage Definition, 4th Paragraph

Question:

Does FirstNet have a specific in-building penetration loss value for measurement of in-building coverage performance?

Answer:

No, FirstNet does not have a specific in-building penetration loss value measurement of in-building coverage performance. This leaves the submission of variables for the link budget to the discretion of the Offeror in its proposed solution. Design variables, including in-building penetration, should use appropriate values to achieve FirstNet’s objectives, as described in Section C, Statement of Objectives. Per L.3.2.1.2.3, NPSBN Deployment, “The Offeror shall describe the general design methodologies used to provide indoor and outdoor coverage. Specifically, the Offeror shall articulate with statistics the level of in-building coverage available at each IOC/FOC milestone for Band 14 and any non-Band 14 technologies using Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template.”

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 113

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definition, Section 3, Coverage Objective Map Methodology

Question:

The additional coverage input beyond the FirstNet baseline from various states appears to vary substantially. How should the Respondents treat the state input? Is it required that the Respondents meet all state coverage objectives?

Answer:

The FirstNet Coverage Objectives indicate areas where persistent coverage is desired at a minimum. The FirstNet baseline, as modified by state, territory and tribal inputs, indicates areas where persistent coverage is desired. Those desires may have been derived from a variety of different data sets as well as stakeholder inputs. FirstNet recognizes the varied approaches taken by states and territories and the challenges of meeting objectives that, for example, may be derived from aggregate LTE coverage and/or LMR coverage. FirstNet’s coverage and capacity evaluation is a comprehensive quantitative and qualitative approach to evaluate the overall proposed nationwide solution. Specifically, the quantitative analysis includes the following:

- Non-Band 14 Area Coverage – The amount of land mass that is covered with non-Band 14 coverage solutions
- Non-Band 14 Population Coverage – The amount of population that is covered with non-Band 14 coverage solutions
- Band 14 Area Coverage – The amount of land mass that is covered with Band 14 coverage solutions
- Band 14 Population Coverage – The amount of population that is covered with Band 14 coverage solutions

- Band 14 Network Capacity – The amount of designed network capacity for first responders and secondary users

FirstNet is looking for an Offeror to provide a solution that best achieves the objectives as described in Section C, Statement of Objectives, and associated Section J attachments. Also, refer to Section M.4.2.1, Coverage and Capacity Maps and Statistics.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 114

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-4, System and Standards Views, Section 4.1, SV-1 RAN to Core Interface (Interface #2), Figure 3

Question:

It appears this figure is incorrect as it shows the devices interface.

Answer:

Yes, the figure is incorrect. Section J, Attachment J-4, System and Standards Views, Section 4.1, SV-1 RAN to Core Interface (Interface #2), Figure 3, SV-1 RAN(s) to Core, is being corrected in Amendment 002 to illustrate the system view for RAN to Core interface (Interface #2).

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

The diagram in Figure 3, SV-1 RAN(s) to Core, of Section J, Attachment J-4, System and Standards Views, Section 4.1, SV-1 RAN to Core Interface (Interface #2), is being amended to illustrate the system view for RAN to Core interface (Interface #2), that is concisely defined in Section 4.2, StdV-1 RAN to Core Interface (Interface #2) of the same attachment in this Amendment 002.

Question #: 116

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template, Network Capacity Tab, Total Projected PS Demand (GB/month)

Question:

How will the Projected PS Demand for each county be estimated/determined and by whom?

Answer:

As noted in Section L.3.2.1.1.5, Band 14 Network Capacity, FirstNet is requesting the Offeror to provide the projected demand for each county using as a baseline 2015 demand survey data referenced in Section

J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definitions, Section 4.3, Demand Map. Also, Section L.3.2.1.1.5 states, “The Offeror shall describe its proposed process used to forecast Band 14 demand at FOC.”

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 117

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template, DL SINR Distribution Tab, DL SINR % Area Covered (Sq. mi)

Question:

It appears that a number is missing from cell I3. Please confirm.

Answer:

The missing cell value is “< -4” which will be corrected in this Amendment 002.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template, is being updated to correct the missing cell I3 with the “< -4” cell value, in this Amendment 002.

Question #: 118

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template, UL SINR Distribution Tab, UL SINR % Area Covered (Sq. mi)

Question:

It appears that a number is missing from cell I3. Please confirm.

Answer:

The missing cell value is “< -4” which will be corrected in this Amendment 002.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template is being updated to correct the missing cell I3 with the “< -4” cell value.

Question #: 120

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-19, State Plan Template, Section 4.3.1, Persistent Coverage

Question:

This section asks the Contractor to “Provide a composite coverage map with tiered bands to represent areas of expected in-building, in-vehicular, and handheld outdoor coverage.” Are these tiers intended to address the GoS Tiers referred to in Section 4.6.2 of the FCC TAB RMTR? If yes, what guidelines should be followed in the response? If no, where are the recommended GoS Tiers to be addressed?

Answer:

Section J, Attachment J-19, State Plan Template, identifies desired elements to determine how these items will ultimately be included in a state plan. The maps and format required for the RFP may not be the same maps and format that will be delivered to states and territories by the Contractor post-award. As noted in Section J, Attachment J-18, Delivery Mechanism Objectives for State Plans, FirstNet’s objectives for the state plan delivery mechanism include, among many things, a method to deliver easily understood, interactive maps, as appropriate. The Grade of Service (GoS) tiers will be defined post-award between FirstNet and the Contractor within the Day 1 Task Order 2, State Plan Development and Refinement.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 122

RFP Section Reference: Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements

Question:

Will the list of Respondents submitting Capability Statements be made public?

Answer:

41 U.S.C. § 2102, “Prohibitions on Disclosing and Obtaining Procurement Information” prohibits publicly disclosing any source selection information. Therefore, the list of those who submitted capability statements will not be released to the public.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 123**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.2.5, Submission of Proposals**Question:**

Will the list of Respondents submitting Proposals be made public?

Answer:

41 U.S.C. § 2102, “Prohibitions on Disclosing and Obtaining Procurement Information” prohibits publicly disclosing any source selection information. Therefore, the list of those who submitted proposals will not be released to the public.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 125**RFP Section Reference:** Section M.2.1, Phase I Capability Statement**Question:**

The RFP states that the evaluation process is a multi-phased approach. The Capability Statements are due on 3/17 and subsequent notifications will be issued to all Offerors that submit a capability statement. When will the notifications be issued? With proposals due on 4/29, this creates a very tight schedule for the Offerors that are invited to submit a proposal.

Answer:

The notification identified in Section M.2.1, Phase I – Capability Statements, will be provided as soon as practicable upon completion of evaluation of the submissions. Also, Amendment No. 001 extended the due date for submission of capability statements (March 31, 2016) and submission of proposals (May 13, 2016).

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 126

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-26 Sample Small Business Subcontracting Plan, Section 1: Subcontracting Plan Outline

Question:

It is stated that the Department of Commerce has a 37% subcontracting goal for Small business along with 5% for SDV, 3% Hubzone, 5% women owned & 3% SDVOSB. Is the total subcontracting goal the addition of these percentages for a total of 50% or is 37% the total goal? Is either one of these percentages the small business set aside goal for FirstNet?

Answer:

No, none of these percentages are small business set aside goals for FirstNet. The applicable percentage for small businesses is 37 percent; the other goals are applicable to those specific individual socio-economic programs. These small business subcontracting goals are Department-of-Commerce-wide goals.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 127

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-26 Sample Small Business Subcontracting Plan, Section, Section 1.3, Goals

Question:

Are the goals stated in percentages here of the total contract revenue amount or total subcontract revenue amount?

Answer:

The goals stated within Section J, Attachment J-26, Sample Small Business Subcontracting Plan, Section 1, Subcontracting Plan Outline, represent the Department of Commerce's (DOC) goals for its total contract dollars awarded overall, within DOC, in the Government fiscal year 2015 within those socio-economic programs.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 128**RFP Section Reference:**

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements

Section L.2.5, Submission of Proposals

Question:

Based on the current timeline as stated in the instructions section L, capabilities statements are due March 17 with final proposal to follow approx. 6 weeks later on April 29th giving bidders 6 weeks to finalize their final proposals. Can FirstNet consider extending the April 29th deadline to give bidders more time to finalize their final proposals assuming they make it through the capability statement down select process?

Answer:

Amendment No. 001 extended the capability statement submission due date to Thursday, March 31, 2016, and proposal submission due date to Friday, May 13, 2016.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 129**RFP Section Reference:** Section B.4.3, Excess Network Capacity**Question:**

In B.4.3 “Excess Network Capacity” is defined as “network capacity that is unused by Public Safety Entities”. Can the customer please add this definition of “Excess Network Capacity” as a Defined Term in Section 1.2 of Attachment J-20 Terms and Conditions?

Answer:

No, please refer to Section 1.2, Terms and Conditions, Sub-Paragraph 2, Use of Network Capacity, of Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section J, Attachment J-14, Terms of Reference, is being revised to include the following definition, “Excess network capacity is defined as capacity not used by Public Safety Entities (PSEs).”

Question #: 130**RFP Section Reference:**

Section B.4.4, FirstNet Operational Sustainability, 2nd Paragraph

Section H.11, Technology Refresh/Enhancement Proposals, 1st Paragraph

Section J, Attachment J-13, Pricing Template

Question:

Section H.11 states that the Government may solicit “Technology Refresh/Enhancement (TRE) Proposals” during the performance of the contract for “changes and/or enhancements within the service areas and/or service lines contained in this contract”.

Section B.4.4.4 states that the FirstNet minimum Payments will be used in part “for establishing a network re-investment reserve fund”.

In reference to the TRE Proposals and Network Re-Investment Reserve Fund, should offerors include any pricing in Attachment J-13 for network re-investment, refresh, or enhancement?

Answer:

The reference to Section B.4.4.4 is incorrect as this does not exist within Section B. The correct reference is Section B.4.4, FirstNet Operational Sustainability. No, Offerors should not include any pricing for these currently unknown enhancements in Section J, Attachment J-13, Pricing Template. In accordance with Section C, Statement of Objectives, among other sections of the RFP, Offerors are responsible for the building, deployment, operation, and maintenance of the NPSBN. The Government may solicit technology refresh and enhancement proposals during the period of performance of the contract. Offerors should not include any pricing for these currently unknown enhancements in Section J, Attachment J-13, Pricing Template. Any 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 #: 131

RFP Section Reference: Section H.8, Title to Materials

Question:

Can the Government please confirm that the term “FirstNet data” as discussed and defined in Section H.8 of the RFP does not include proprietary data, market analytics, or revenue, associated with the Contractor’s provision of secondary services using excess network capacity?

Answer:

This is correct; the term “FirstNet data” does not include proprietary data, market analytics, or revenue associated with the Contractor’s use of excess network capacity.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 133

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, Section 1.3.3, Testing

Question:

Will the Government provide the requirements for “Interface Conformance Testing” during the solicitation period?

Answer:

No. The Offeror should propose its solution regarding a test strategy for “Interface and Conformance Testing” that meets FirstNet’s objectives as described in Section C, Statement of Objectives. The details and verification strategy for Interface Conformance Testing shall be defined by the Offeror in Section J, Attachment J-12, Test Strategy Template, to cover FCC TAB item FCC-001-20-F.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 134

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, Section 1.3.3, Testing

Question:

Will the Government provide the requirements for the “First Office Application (FOA)” process during the solicitation period?

Answer:

No. The Offeror should propose its solution regarding a First Office Application (FOA) process that meets FirstNet’s objectives as described in Section C, Statement of Objectives. The details and verification strategy for the FOA process shall be defined by the Offeror in Section J, Attachment J-12, Test Strategy Template, to cover FCC TAB item FCC-001-63-F.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 135**RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-3, FCC TAB RMTR, Section 1.4.3, Testing**Question:**

Will the Government provide the requirements for “FirstNet-required Performance Testing” of infrastructure equipment during the solicitation period?

Answer:

No. The Offeror should propose its solution regarding a test strategy for “FirstNet-Required Performance Testing.” The details and verification strategy for FirstNet-Required Performance Testing shall be defined by the Offeror in Section J, Attachment J-12, Test Strategy Template, to cover FCC TAB item FCC-001-22-F.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 136**RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-4, System and Standards Views, Section 3.3, StdV-2 Devices Interface Roadmap**Question:**

Should IOPS be defined as "Isolated E-UTRAN Operation for Public Safety" as opposed to “Input/Output Operations Per Second”?

Answer:

Yes, IOPS refers to Isolated E-UTRAN Operation for Public Safety. It is being corrected in Amendment 002.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section J, Attachment J-4, System and Standards Views, and Section J, Attachment J-14, Terms of Reference, are being revised to clarify that “IOPS” refers to “Isolated E-UTRAN Operation for Public Safety.”

Question #: 139**RFP Section Reference:**

Section J Attachments J-6, Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (All)

Section J, Attachment J-9, Quality Assurance Matrix Template (All)

Section L.3.1.7, Section Seven – Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan

Question:

Can the Government please confirm that proposal data provided in the Attachment J-6 and Attachment J-9 format to meet the L.3.1.7 requirement is exempt from the Volume I page limitation?

Answer:

Yes, Section J, Attachment J-6, Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan, is “exempt” from the page limitation stated in Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management, is being amended to read, “... Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) reference in Section L.3.1.4, Section Four – Customer Care and Life-Cycle Sustainment ...”

Question #: 140**RFP Section Reference:**

Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, Section 1.2, Terms and Conditions, 3rd Bullet, Operations of the NPSBN, 1st Sub-Bullet (3.1), 3rd Sub-Sub-Bullet (iii)

Question:

Section J-20 states that “the Contractor agrees and acknowledges that FirstNet shall have unfettered use of and access to all NPSBN facilities and equipment”. Will the Government accept an Offerors’ demarcation of the contractor’s assets and FirstNet assets in the proposal?

Answer:

FirstNet is prohibited from relinquishing its rights under the license issued to it by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Although FirstNet does not intend to own NPSBN assets, as an FCC licensee it will retain the right to use and access equipment and facilities used to provide services over the NPSBN. See Intermountain Microwave, 12 FCC.2d 559, 24 RR 983 (1963). In the context of this right, FirstNet will work with the Contractor to ensure that the security and integrity of all operations are maintained, including appropriate demarcation between NPSBN and other networks.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 141

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, Section 1.2, Terms and Conditions, 3rd Bullet, Operations of the NPSBN, 1st Sub-Bullet (3.1), 3rd Sub-Sub-Bullet (iii)

Question:

Section J-20 states that “the Contractor agrees and acknowledges that FirstNet shall have unfettered use of and access to all NPSBN facilities and equipment”. Can the Government please define FirstNet’s expectation for the ownership of elements of the Network?

Answer:

FirstNet is prohibited from relinquishing its rights under the license issued to it by the FCC. Although FirstNet does not intend to own NPSBN assets, as an FCC licensee it will retain the right to use and access equipment and facilities used to provide services over the NPSBN. See Intermountain Microwave, 12 FCC.2d 559, 24 RR 983 (1963). In the context of this right, FirstNet will work with the Contractor to ensure that the security and integrity of all operations are maintained, including appropriate demarcation between NPSBN and other networks.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 142

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, Section 1.2, Terms and Conditions, 3rd Bullet, Operations of the NPSBN, 1st Sub-Bullet (3.1), 3rd Sub-Sub-Bullet (iii)

Question:

Section J-20 states that “the Contractor agrees and acknowledges that FirstNet shall have unfettered use of and access to all NPSBN facilities and equipment”. Can the Government please define what is meant by “unfettered” access, and how will this access be managed as to not interfere with the contractor’s responsibility to operate and maintain the NPSBN?

Answer:

FirstNet is prohibited from relinquishing its rights under the license issued to it by the FCC. Although FirstNet does not intend to own NPSBN assets, as an FCC licensee it will retain the right to use and access equipment and facilities used to provide services over the NPSBN. See Intermountain Microwave, 12 FCC.2d 559, 24 RR 983 (1963). In the context of this right, FirstNet will work with the Contractor to ensure that the security and integrity of all operations are maintained, including appropriate demarcation between NPSBN and other networks.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 143

RFP Section Reference: Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements

Question:

Section L.2.4 states “The 50-page limit excludes the papers identified below”, however no papers are identified in L.2.4. Can the Government please define the items excluded from the Capability Statement page limit?

Answer:

The sentence, “The 50-page limit excludes the papers identified below” is being deleted from Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, in this Amendment 002.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, 1st paragraph, is hereby amended, as incorporated in Amendment No. 002, to delete the sentence, “The 50-page limit excludes the papers identified below.”

Question #: 144

RFP Section Reference: Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements

Question:

Does the Capability Statement requirement for “Public safety use and adoption of the NPSBN” include all requirements of L.3.1.3?

Answer:

No, the Government does not expect extensive details as required in Section L.3.1.3, Section Three – Public Safety Customer Acquisition. Potential Offerors are to provide sufficient information in the capability statements in order to demonstrate their capabilities and afford the Government the opportunity

to conduct a meaningful evaluation. Also, this will allow for more meaningful feedback; see Section M.2.1, Phase I – Capability Statements.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to include the following language: “The capability statement should provide information detailing:

- **Public safety use and adoption of the NPSBN** – Information demonstrating the Offeror’s ability to successfully drive adoption and use of the NPSBN by public safety users.
- **Nationwide coverage and capacity** – Information demonstrating the Offeror’s ability to provide Band 14 and non-Band 14 coverage and capacity in each of the 56 states and territories, including rural and non-rural areas.
- **Rural partnerships** – Information demonstrating the Offeror’s existing and planned partnerships with rural telecommunications providers, including commercial mobile providers, utilizing existing infrastructure to the maximum extent economically desirable to speed deployment in rural areas.
- **Ability to monetize network capacity** – Information demonstrating the Offeror’s strategy and demonstrating its ability to monetize network capacity, which may include a secondary user customer base and sales/distribution channels to reach primary and secondary users.
- **Financial standing** – Information demonstrating the Offeror’s approach and financial standing. Additionally, information demonstrating its ability to develop, implement, sustain, and enhance the NPSBN based on the Initial Operational Capability (IOC)/Final Operational Capability (FOC) milestones set out in Section J, Attachment J-8, IOC/FOC Target Timeline.”

Question #: 145

RFP Section Reference: Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements

Question:

Does the Capability Statement requirement for “Nationwide coverage and capacity” include all requirements of L.3.2.1.1 and L.3.2.1.3?

Answer:

No, the Government does not expect extensive details as required in Section L.3.2.1.1, Coverage and Capacity Maps and Statistics, and Section L.3.2.1.3, IOC Milestones for Coverage and Capacity. Potential Offerors are to provide sufficient information in the capability statements in order to demonstrate their capability and afford the Government the opportunity to conduct a meaningful evaluation. Also, this will allow for more meaningful feedback, see Section M.2.1, Phase I – Capability Statements.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to include additional information with regard to information submission.

Question #: 146**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements**Question:**

Does the Capability Statement requirement for “Nationwide coverage and capacity” require the submission of Maps and Statistics identified in Section L Tables 2-5?

Answer:

No, the Government does not expect extensive details as required in Section L with regard to maps and statistics contained in tables 2-5. Potential Offerors are to provide sufficient information in the capability statements in order to demonstrate their capability and afford the Government the opportunity to conduct a meaningful evaluation. Also, this will allow for more meaningful feedback, see Section M.2.1, Phase I – Capability Statements.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to include additional information with regard to information submission.

Question #: 147**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements**Question:**

Can the Government please confirm that any maps or Attachment J-17 sheets submitted to meet the “Nationwide coverage and capacity” requirements are excluded from the Capability Statement page limit?

Answer:

No, the Government does not expect extensive details as required in Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template. Potential Offerors are to provide sufficient information in the capability statements in order to demonstrate their capability and afford the Government the opportunity to conduct a meaningful evaluation. Also, this will allow for more meaningful feedback, see Section M.2.1, Phase I – Capability Statements.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to include additional information with regard to information submission.

Question #: 148**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements**Question:**

Does the Capability Statement requirement for “Rural partnerships” includes the submission of Attachment J-2? Can the Government please confirm that Attachment J-2 is excluded from the Capability Statement page limit?

Answer:

No, the Government does not expect extensive details as required in Section J, Attachment J-2, Nationwide and Rural Coverage Compliance Checklist. Potential Offerors are to provide sufficient information in the capability statements in order to demonstrate their capabilities and afford the Government the opportunity to conduct a meaningful evaluation. Also, this will allow for more meaningful feedback; see Section M.2.1, Phase I – Capability Statements.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to include additional information with regard to information submission.

Question #: 149**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements**Question:**

Does the Capability Statement requirement for “Financial Standing” include all requirements of L.3.1.5? Can the Government please confirm that all financial statements and credit ratings submitted in response to this requirement are excluded from the Capability Statement page limit?

Answer:

No, the Government does not expect extensive details as required in Section L.3.1.5, Section Five – Financial Standing. Potential Offerors are to provide sufficient information in the capability statements in order to demonstrate their capabilities and afford the Government the opportunity to conduct a meaningful evaluation. Also, this will allow for more meaningful feedback; see Section M.2.1, Phase I – Capability Statements.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to include additional information with regard to information submission.

Question #: 151**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements**Question:**

Will the Government please allow the submission of a PDF soft copy of the Capability Statement instead of MS Word? The PDF file type is better for preventing hard copy and soft copy content conflict.

Answer:

Yes, Adobe PDF soft copy file format is acceptable.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, 2nd paragraph, is hereby amended, as incorporated in Amendment No. 002, and is being revised to read, "... and on two flash drives in Adobe PDF or Microsoft Word soft copy file format (to be submitted with the hard copies) ..."

Question #: 152**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements**Question:**

Will the Government please allow the use of 11" x 17" size paper for the submission of maps and required Section J spreadsheets?

Answer:

Section L, Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors or Respondents, will be updated so that Offerors may submit maps, tables, and spreadsheets as an 11" x 17" foldout.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions, third paragraph, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to read, "Font Size 12, single-spaced, 8.5" x 11" (with the exception of the submission of maps and required Section J spreadsheets pertaining to network statistics, which may use 11" x 17" size paper) ..."

Question #: 153**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements**Question:**

Will the Government please allow the use of 11” x 17” size paper for large graphics and tables?

Answer:

Section L, Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors or Respondents, will be amended pertaining to the Network Statistics submittal (Section L, Table 3, Network Statistics Required for Coverage and Capacity, and Table 5, Network Statistics Required for Coverage and Capacity). The Section L language will be updated so that Offerors may submit those tables as an 11” x 17” foldout. That amendment will affect those two tables only when being submitted within the hard copy of Volume II.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions, third paragraph, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to read, “Font Size 12, single-spaced, 8.5” x 11” (with the exception of the submission of maps and required Section J spreadsheets pertaining to network statistics, which may use 11” x 17” size paper) ...”

Question #: 154**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.2.5, Submission of Proposals**Question:**

Can the Government please define the soft copy files and file types required for each Volume (I-III)?

Answer:

Yes, Adobe PDF or Microsoft Word soft copy file format is acceptable, with the exception of Excel, map, and shape files. The RFP is hereby amended, as incorporated in Amendment No. 002, to reflect this change.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.5, Submission of Proposals, first paragraph, is hereby amended, as incorporated in this Amendment No. 002, to read, “... and on a flash drive in Adobe PDF or Microsoft Word soft copy file format, with the exception of any Excel, map, and shape files, to be submitted with the hard copies) ...”

Question #: 155**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions**Question:**

Will the Government please allow the use of 11” x 17” size paper for the submission of maps and required Section J spreadsheets?

Answer:

Section L, Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors or Respondents, will be amended so that Offerors may submit maps, tables, and spreadsheets as an 11” x 17” foldout.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions, third paragraph, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to read, “Font Size 12, single-spaced, 8.5” x 11” (with the exception of the submission of maps and required Section J spreadsheets pertaining to network statistics, which may use 11” x 17” size paper) ...”

Question #: 156**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions**Question:**

Will the Government please allow the use of 11” x 17” size paper for large graphics and tables?

Answer:

Section L, Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors or Respondents, will be amended so that Offerors may submit maps, tables, and spreadsheets as an 11” x 17” foldout.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions, third paragraph, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to read, “Font Size 12, single-spaced, 8.5” x 11” (with the exception of the submission of maps and required Section J spreadsheets pertaining to network statistics, which may use 11” x 17” size paper) ...”

Question #: 157**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions**Question:**

Can the Government please confirm that headers and footers are exempt from the font type and size requirement of Times New Roman size 12 font as long as it is legible?

Answer:

Yes, headers and footers within documents are exempt from the font type and size.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, first paragraph, is hereby amended, as incorporated in Amendment No. 002, to read, "... Tables, charts, figures, and headers and footers may use a font size other than point 12 as long as it is legible..." and Section L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions, third paragraph, is being revised to read, "... Tables, charts, figures, and headers and footers may use a font size other than point 12 as long as it is legible ..."

Question #: 158**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions, 3rd paragraph**Question:**

Can the Government please confirm that Attachments provided by the Government that are not in the required Times New Roman 12 pt font are excluded from the font requirement?

Answer:

Yes, any font contained in the templates are acceptable font submissions as long as it is legible.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 159**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management, 2nd paragraph**Question:**

Section L.3.1 provides conflicting guidance on the Volume I page limit. Can the Government please clarify if the page limit for Volume I is "100 pages" or a "50-page limit"?

Answer:

Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management, is being revised, in this Amendment 002, to increase to 200 pages (100 sheets of paper, double-sided print)

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management, second paragraph, is hereby amended, as incorporated in Amendment No. 002, to read, “The business management proposal shall not exceed 200 pages in length (100 sheets of paper, double-sided print).”

Question #: 160

RFP Section Reference: Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management

Question:

Given the significant amount of data requested for Volume I, would the Government consider increasing the page limit to 300 pages?

Answer:

Yes, Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management, is being revised, in this Amendment 002, to increase to 200 pages.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management, second paragraph, is hereby amended, as incorporated in Amendment No. 002, to read, “The business management proposal shall not exceed 200 pages in length (100 sheets of paper, double-sided print).”

Question #: 162

RFP Section Reference: L.3.1.1, Section One – General, Paragraph 4 (“As part of Volume I...”)

Question:

Section L.3.1.1 requires the submission of a “Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and Performance Work Statement (PWS)”. Can the Government please confirm that the WBS and PWS are excluded from the Volume I page limit?

Answer:

No, the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and the Performance Work Statement (PWS) are not excluded from the page limitation stated in Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 163**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.1.1, Section One – General, 4th Paragraph**Question:**

Section L.3.1.1 requires the submission of a “Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and Performance Work Statement (PWS)”. Can the Government please confirm that the WBS and PWS should be submitted in an offeror’s Volume I proposal under “Section Two – Leadership and Program Management”?

Answer:

No, the WBS and the PWS are to be included in Section One – General of the Business Management volume as stated in Section L.3.1.1, Section One – General.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 164**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.1.1, Section One – General, 4th Paragraph**Question:**

Can the Government please define the level of detail desired for the WBS?

Answer:

The Offeror shall propose an approach at the task and subtask level.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3.1.1, Section One – General, fourth paragraph, is hereby amended, as incorporated in Amendment No. 002, to read, “... such that the objectives (specified in Section C, Statement of Objectives [SOO], and the associated attachments in Section J) are met at the task and subtask level.”

Question #: 165**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.1.1, Section One – General, 4th Paragraph**Question:**

Section L.3.1.1 requires the submission of a “separate tabs noting the solution for each Day 1 task order identified in Section B”. Can the Government please define the scope of the Day 1 Task Order Solution requirement, and whether or not it is included in the Volume I page limit?

Answer:

The Offeror’s overall proposed solution shall be addressed within their proposal. However, in order to ensure the Day 1 task orders identify the Offeror’s solution, at award, the Government requests the solution for the individual task orders contain details applicable to the individual tabs/task order. Refer to Section B.2.1, Day 1 Task Orders; Section J, Attachment J-8, IOC/FOC Target Timeline; and Section J, Attachment J-13, Pricing Template. Additionally, Amendment No. 001 provided information with regard to page count for the Day 1 task order tabs.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 166**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.1.1.4, Past Performance**Question:**

Can the Government please confirm that all content submitted in response to Section L.3.1.1.4 is excluded from the Volume I page limit?

Answer:

Yes, Amendment No. 001 provided additional clarification with regard to exclusions from the page count for Volume I – Business Management, which excluded Section L.3.1.1.4, Past Performance.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 168**RFP Section Reference:**

Section L.3.1.1.1, Solicitation Conformance Traceability Matrix

Section J, Attachment J-22, Solicitation Conformance Traceability Matrix

Question:

Can the Government please confirm that proposal data provided in the Attachment J-22 format to meet the L.3.1.1.1 requirement is exempt from the Volume I page limitation?

Answer:

Yes, Amendment No. 001 provided additional clarification with regard to exclusions from the page count for Volume I – Business Management, which excluded the Solicitation Conformance Traceability Matrix contained in Section J, Attachment J-22.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 169**RFP Section Reference:**

Section L.3.1.3, Section Three – Public Safety Customer Appreciation

Section J, Attachment J-23, End User Pricing Tables

Question:

Can the Government please confirm that proposal data provided in the Attachment J-23 format to meet the L.3.1.3 requirement is exempt from the Volume I page limitation?

Answer:

Yes, Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management, is being revised in this Amendment 002, to exclude the template contained in Section J, Attachment J-23, End-User Pricing Tables.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management, is hereby amended, as incorporated in Amendment No. 002, to read, “... the Public Safety Device Connections Template and Section J, Attachment J-23, End User Pricing Tables, referenced in L.3.1.3, Section Three – Public Safety Customer Acquisition; ...”

Question #: 170**RFP Section Reference:**

Section L.3.1.3, Section Three – Public Safety Customer Appreciation

Section J, Attachment J-24, Public Safety Device Connections Template

Question:

Can the Government please confirm that proposal data provided in the Attachment J-24 format to meet the L.3.1.3 requirement is exempt from the Volume I page limitation?

Answer:

Yes, Amendment No. 001 provided additional clarification with regard to exclusions from the page count for Volume I – Business Management, which excluded the Public Safety Device Connections Template contained in Section J, Attachment J-24.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 171**RFP Section Reference:**

Section L.3.1.8, Section Eight – Deliverables Table

Section J, Attachment J-16, Deliverables Table

Question:

Can the Government please confirm that proposal data provided in the Attachment J-16 format to meet the L.3.1.8 requirement is exempt from the Volume I page limitation?

Answer:

No, Section J, Attachment J-16, Deliverables Table, is not excluded from the page limitation identified in Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3.1, Volume I – Business Management, is hereby amended, as incorporated in Amendment No. 002, to delete the sentence, “The attachments that are required to be completed are not part of the 50-page limit.”

Question #: 172**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.1.4, Section Four – Customer Care and Life-Cycle Sustainment**Question:**

Are bill formats separate for each public safety entity? Are printed bills required, or are online bills sufficient?

Answer:

As described in Section C, Statement of Objectives, Section C.5, Objectives, among other sections of the RFP, the Contractor is responsible for customer care and marketing. FirstNet will not place requirements on the Contractor on the methods and strategies used to achieve the stated objectives.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 173**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.1.5.1, Financial Resources**Question:**

Can the Government please confirm that all content submitted in response to Section L.3.1.5.1 is excluded from the Volume I page limit?

Answer:

Yes, Amendment No. 001 excluded all of the content stated in Section L.3.1.5, Section Five – Financial Standing.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 174**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.1.5.2, Sources of Funding and Financing**Question:**

Can the Government please confirm that all content submitted in response to Section L.3.1.5.2 is excluded from the Volume I page limit?

Answer:

Yes, Amendment No. 001 excluded all of the content stated in Section L.3.1.5, Section Five – Financial Standing.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 175

RFP Section Reference: Section L.3.1.5.3, Parent Company Guarantees

Question:

Can the Government please confirm that all content submitted in response to Section L.3.1.5.3 is excluded from the Volume I page limit?

Answer:

Yes, Amendment No. 001 excluded all of the content stated in Section L.3.1.5, Section Five – Financial Standing.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 176

RFP Section Reference: Section L.3.2.1.2.3, NPSBN Deployment

Question:

Will hardening requirements of LTE end site be made available by FirstNet during the solicitation period?

Answer:

No, Offerors' proposed solutions shall demonstrate their strategies and processes for hardening that achieve the stated objective in Section C, Statement of Objectives, Section C.5, Objectives, Objective #7, User Service Availability. Also, refer to Section L.3.2.2.4.4, Public Safety Grade.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 178**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.2.2.2.1.3, Hosting and Cloud Services**Question:**

Are there any restrictions around the use of "public cloud" platforms for all or portions of the Application Ecosystem?

Answer:

A proposed solution of “public cloud” for all or portions of the application ecosystem will have to meet the objectives and comply with FirstNet security and standards. Please refer to Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, with regard to cloud security.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 179**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.2.2.2.1.4, FirstNet Application Store**Question:**

Does the FirstNet Applications Store need to physically store and distribute all application files, or is it also acceptable for the Store to index and reference existing application stores?

Answer:

Section C, Statement of Objectives, outlines a goal of providing Offerors increased flexibility in responding to the RFP. As neither Section L.3.2.2.2.1.4, FirstNet Applications Store, nor section M.4.3.2.1.4, FirstNet Applications Store, specifies a specific physical model for the store, the Offeror may propose a solution that meets the objectives of the RFP.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 180**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.2.2.5, Operations**Question:**

Are there any restrictions on off-shoring (e.g. NOC, network monitoring, etc.)?

Answer:

Yes, all critical operational equipment and functions, which are those that do not inhibit the secure and effective operations of the NPSBN, shall be located within the sole jurisdiction of the United States.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section J, Attachment J-10, Cybersecurity, Section 2.1, Public Safety Needs, is being revised in this Amendment 002, to read, "... public safety users can readily access the network. All critical operational equipment and functions, which could affect the secure and effective operations of the NPSBN, shall be located within the sole jurisdiction of the United States. To that end, ..."

Question #: 181

RFP Section Reference: Section L.3.2.2.5.2, Business and Operational Support Systems

Question:

Are the BSS deployments required to be separated in the different states? Is it required to have geo-redundancy for BSS?

Answer:

There is not a requirement for separate deployments in each state and territory, but local agencies, regions, and states/territories will need to have visibility into their relevant business information (e.g., billing). It is up to the Offeror to determine if geo-redundancy is needed for the Business Support Systems (BSS) solution to best meet the objective identified in Section C, Statement of Objectives, Section C.5, Objective #7, User Service Availability.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 182

RFP Section Reference: Section L.3.2.2.5.2, Business and Operational Support Systems

Question:

Will there be any prepaid subscription scenario? If yes, please provide some information about prepaid subscription scenarios that we need to consider.

Answer:

All methods of billing are available to the Offeror at its discretion, including prepaid, postpaid, and any other billing scenarios.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 185**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.2.2.5.2, Business and Operational Support Systems**Question:**

Must usage of shared devices be tracked separately for each user for charging/billing purposes?

Answer:

No. FirstNet expects that the Offeror will provide innovative, mutually beneficial billing solutions, as appropriate to the Offeror's business model, that drives adoption and use of the NPSBN. The Offeror may propose any billing solution in accordance with the terms and conditions of the RFP.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 187**RFP Section Reference:** Section C.5, Objectives, 7th Bullet, User Service Availability**Question:**

Is the two-hour window for "Service Restoration Activities" for all incidents or for mission critical performance-related incidents? Can a tiered approach be proposed to manage various incident severities, minimize costs, without impact performance and quality?

Answer:

Offerors' solutions shall propose their strategy of how this objective will be met while taking into account that users of the NPSBN will not be without services longer than a two-hour duration. This would include an approach for managing various incident severities and minimizing costs without impact performance and quality. Additionally, as stated in Section C, Statement of Objectives, Section C.5, Objective #7, User Service Availability, "Service restoration activities shall ... not exceed two hours for any impaired service."

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 188**RFP Section Reference:**

Section L.3.3.3, Payments to FirstNet

Section B.4.4, FirstNet Operational Sustainability

47 USC 1421 (Act) Section 6201

Question:

As referenced above, the term of the agreement between FirstNet and the successful offeror is “assumed” to be 25 years from the award of the IDIQ. In as much as the monetization of the excess capacity is an underlying strategy for funding some of the cost of the Network, AND that the offeror is depending upon a 25 year grant of use of the excess capacity as set forth in the Terms and Conditions in Appendix J-20 of the RFP, how will FirstNet be able to provide contractual assurances of the access to the excess capacity (bandwidth) when the Initial License period granted under the Act is limited to 10 years?

Answer:

The Government has interpreted “as referenced above” in the Offeror’s question as referring to the RFP sections and has answered accordingly. Section 1421 of the Act describes the terms of and process for renewal of the spectrum license granted to FirstNet. Although license renewal is anticipated, FirstNet cannot make any contractual assurances related to the renewal of its license outside the process that is specifically described in the Act.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 190**RFP Section Reference:**

Section J, Attachment J-8, IOC/FOC Target Timeline, Table 1

Section B.2.2, State and Territory Task Order(s) – Initial FirstNet-Deployed RAN States

Question:

The IOC/FOC milestone dates in Table 1 are listed as “from award”. Can the customer please clarify if the “award” referenced is the award of the IDIQ, or for the award of State and Territory Task Order(s) as referenced in B.2.2?

Answer:

The “from award” date applies to the award of the IDIQ and all Day 1 task orders.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 192**RFP Section Reference:** Section B.4.4, FirstNet Operational Sustainability**Question:**

B.4.4. states “Payments to FirstNet will begin when FirstNet awards the state and territory Delayed FirstNet-Deployed RANs subsequent task order(s)”. We understand this to be 900 days after Award of the Contract and Day 1 Task Orders. The period of the Minimum Payments is given as 25 years. Are the 25 years commencing upon the commencement of Minimum Payments?

Answer:

No. Payments to FirstNet are triggered by State and Territory Task Order award(s). The 25 years refers to the life of the IDIQ contract period of performance.

Payments associated with Delayed FirstNet-Deployed RANs task orders would correspond to the payments originally proposed by the Offeror, commencing with year 1 and continuing throughout the life of the IDIQ contract, which may not result in 25 annual payments for the given task order. Payments proposed by the Offeror beyond the IDIQ contract period of performance would not be required.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3.3.4, Delayed Payments to FirstNet, third paragraph, fourth bullet is being added in this Amendment 002 to read, “First payment to FirstNet will be due two weeks after the state and territory task order award date (Section G.6.3, Delayed Payments to FirstNet). First payment amount will be the proposed year 1 payment in the Delayed Payments to FirstNet worksheet of the Pricing Template (Section J, Attachment J-13).” The fifth bullet is being added in this Amendment 002 to read, “Each subsequent payment will be due two weeks prior to the start of the subsequent Government fiscal year (Section G.6.3, Delayed Payments to FirstNet), and will continue until the end of the 25-year period of performance of the IDIQ contract.”

Section G.6.3, Delayed Payments to FirstNet, first paragraph, first bullet is being added in this Amendment 002 to read, “The first payment to FirstNet will be due two weeks after the state and territory task order award date. The first payment amount will be the proposed year 1 payment in the Delayed Payments to FirstNet worksheet of the Pricing Template (Section J, Attachment J-13).” The second bullet is being added in this Amendment 002 to read, “Each subsequent year’s payment will be due two weeks prior to the start of the subsequent Government fiscal year, and will continue until the end of the 25-year period of performance of the IDIQ contract.”

Question #: 200**RFP Section Reference:**

Section L.3.2.1.1, Coverage and Capacity Maps and Statistics

Section L.3.2.1.3.1, IOC Coverage Maps and Network Statistics

Question:

If the Coverage Maps requested in Section L Tables 2 and 4 are to be included within the hard copy portion of Volume II, should offerors submit a separate map in the hard copy for each technology requested for Non-Band 14 (LTE, 3G, 2G, and roaming) and each LTE Analysis Layer requested for Band 14 (RSRP, Best Server, SINR, Uplink SINR, MCS, Downlink Average Data Rate, Uplink Average Data Rate, and Composite Coverage Map) for all FOC (Table 2) and IOC (Table 4) milestones, for a total of 72 maps?

Answer:

Per Section L.3.2.1, Coverage and Capacity, depending upon the Offeror's proposal, up to 72 maps may be submitted by the Offeror in hard copy. These maps should be based on a bin size no greater than 30 x 30 meters, include Esri shapefiles and MapInfo files (in electronic format), and reference the information contained in Section J, Attachment J-1, Coverage and Capacity Definitions. The format and submittal method are stated in Section L.3.2.1.1, Coverage and Capacity Maps and Statistics.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 201**RFP Section Reference:**

Section L.3.2.1.1, Coverage and Capacity Maps and Statistics

Section L.3.2.1.3.1, IOC Coverage Maps and Network Statistics

Question:

Can the Government please confirm that the Network statistics requested in Section L Tables 3 and 5 are to be submitted separately in the Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template (.xlsx), and do not need to be included within the hard copy portion of Volume II?

Answer:

Yes, Section J, Attachment J-17, Coverage and Capacity Template, is to be submitted as part of the proposal submission in hard copy per the instructions contained within this Amendment 002.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 202**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.3.2.1.1, Coverage and Capacity Maps and Statistics

Section L.3.2.1.3.1, IOC Coverage Maps and Network Statistics

Question:

If the Network Statistics requested in Section L Tables 3 and 5 are to be included within the hard copy portion of Volume II, can offerors provide the spreadsheets on 11” x 17” foldout?

Answer:

Section L, Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors or Respondents, will be amended pertaining to the Network Statistics submittal (Section L, Table 3, Network Statistics Required for Coverage and Capacity, and Table 5, Network Statistics Required for Coverage and Capacity). The Section L language is being amended so that Offerors may submit those tables as an 11” x 17” foldout. This amendment will affect those two tables only when being submitted within the hard copy of Volume II.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions, third paragraph, is being revised in this Amendment 002 to read, “Font Size 12, single-spaced, 8.5” x 11” (with the exception of the submission of maps and required Section J spreadsheets pertaining to network statistics, which may use 11” x 17” size paper) ...”

Question #: 210**RFP Section Reference:** Section J, Attachment J-2, Nationwide and Rural Coverage Compliance Checklist

Section L.3.2.1, Coverage and Capacity

Section M.2.3.2, Rural Partners and Subcontractors

Question:

Can the Government please clarify what types of rural telecommunications provider partnerships qualify toward the 15 percent coverage factor (i.e. transport, lease, etc.)?

Answer:

FirstNet interprets a “rural provider” or “rural telecommunications provider” to mean an entity that provides either exclusively or the vast majority of its telecommunications or broadband services in a geographic area that falls within the definition of the term “rural” as defined in the Act as interpreted by FirstNet. See First Responder Network Authority, Final Interpretations of Parts of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012, 80 Fed. Reg. 63523, 29 (October 20, 2015), <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-10-20/pdf/2015-26621.pdf>.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 212

RFP Section Reference: Section J, Attachment J-20, Terms and Conditions for the Use of FirstNet Network Capacity, Section 1.2, Terms and Conditions, 3rd Bullet, Operations of the NPSBN, 1st Sub-Bullet (3.1), 3rd Sub-Sub-Bullet (iii)

Question:

J.20.3.1(iii) contains the provision that “the Contractor agrees and acknowledges that FirstNet shall have unfettered use of and access to all NPSBN facilities and equipment”.

Can the Government please confirm that this use and access shall be limited to the extent necessary for FirstNet to fulfill its obligations under the 2012 Act?

Answer:

FirstNet is prohibited from relinquishing its rights under the license issued to it by the FCC. Although FirstNet does not intend to own NPSBN assets, as an FCC licensee it will retain the right to use and access equipment and facilities used to provide services over the NPSBN. See Intermountain Microwave, 12 FCC.2d 559, 24 RR 983 (1963). In the context of this right, FirstNet will work with the Contractor to ensure that the security and integrity of all operations are maintained, including appropriate demarcation between NPSBN and other networks.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 242

RFP Section Reference: Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, Paragraph 1

Question:

The Offeror respectfully requests clarification to Section L.2.4 and the instructions related to page count and “exclusion”. Currently, Section L.2.4 states, “The 50-page limit excludes the papers identified below.” Please clarify specifically the “papers” excluded from page count.

Answer:

The sentence, “The 50-page limit excludes the papers identified below” has been deleted in this Amendment 002.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, first paragraph, is hereby amended, as incorporated in Amendment No. 002, to delete the sentence, “The 50-page limit excludes the papers identified below.”

Question #: 243

RFP Section Reference: Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, Paragraph 1, and L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions, Paragraphs 1 and 2

Question:

The FirstNet RFP allows “... use of a font size other than point 12 as long as it is legible” for tables, charts, and figures. May the Offeror use a different font style, e.g. Arial, for tables, charts, and figures?

Answer:

Yes, tables, charts, and figures are exempt from the font type and size.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

Yes

RFP Change Description:

Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements, first paragraph, is hereby amended, as incorporated in Amendment No. 002, to read, “... Tables, charts, figures, and headers and footers may use a font size other than point 12 as long as it is legible ...” and Section L.3, Proposal Format and Submission Instructions, third paragraph, is being revised in this Amendment 002, to read, “... Tables, charts, figures, and headers and footers may use a font size other than point 12 as long as it is legible ...”

Question #: 260**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements**Question:**

During the FirstNet RFP webinar following the release of the RFP, it was indicated that a company can submit a proposal even if it does not provide a capability statement. Can FirstNet clarify whether a capability statement is a mandatory step in order to bid?

Answer:

No, in accordance with FAR 15.202(b), submission of a capability statement is not a requirement in order to participate in this acquisition and submission of a proposal. However, Section M.2.1, Phase I – Capability Statements, affords the Government the opportunity to provide feedback to the potential Offeror regarding evaluation of the capability statement prior to submission of formal proposals to the solicitation. Such feedback may be helpful to the potential Offeror in formulating its solicitation response.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A

Question #: 320**RFP Section Reference:** Section L.2.4, Submission of Capability Statements**Question:**

Will a list of Contractors that are positively evaluated for the capabilities be published? If so, where?

Answer:

In accordance with FAR 15.202(b), submission of a capability statement is not a requirement in order to participate in this acquisition and submission of a proposal. Also, 41 U.S.C. § 2102, “Prohibitions on Disclosing and Obtaining Procurement Information,” prohibits publicly disclosing any source selection information. Therefore, only the source selection evaluation team will be privy to the capability statement submissions, and they will not be made public.

RFP Change (Yes/No):

No

RFP Change Description:

N/A