

**STATE OF MAINE /
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICIALS**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AMENDMENT

RFP NUMBER AND TITLE:	201210412, Multi-State Learning Technology Initiative
RFP AMENDMENT NUMBER:	Amendment 1
AMENDMENT DATE:	December 4, 2012
PROPOSAL DUE DATE:	January 11, 2012 at 2:00 pm local time
RFP ISSUED BY:	State of Maine, Department of Education and Division of Purchases, in combination with the National Association of State Procurement Officials (NASPO)
PROPOSALS DUE TO:	Division of Purchases Burton M. Cross Building, 4 th Floor 111 Sewall Street 9 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333-0009
DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES TO RFP: This document represents an amendment to RFP #201210412 and is therefore part of the RFP itself. This amendment contains the answers to the questions that were received from interested Bidders during or before the RFP's Bidders' Conference. Written questions can still be submitted to the RFP Coordinator until 5:00 pm local time on December 12, 2012. Unless specifically addressed below, all other provisions and clauses of the RFP remain unchanged.	

[Questions and answers provided on the subsequent pages of this RFP amendment.]

Question #	Question	Answer
1	Are there any additional states that have signed an Intent to Participate letter for this RFP?	<p>The following states have submitted a letter of Intent to Participate since the release of the RFP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Carolina <p>Note: This list may be amended to add additional states as they submit letters.</p>
2	Foxcroft Academy's Internet connection speed was not included in Appendix E – State Profiles – Maine. What is their Internet connection speed?	Foxcroft Academy's Internet connection speed is 100Mbps. Additionally, Mid-Coast School of Technology-Region 8's Internet connection speed should have been listed as 20Mbps (not 10Mbps).
3	In the RFP, how is software specified for Vermont and Hawaii? Are they expecting the same image set as Maine?	<p>All Sections and subsections of the RFP apply to all participating states except when labeled with a specific state name. For example, Section 6.6.3.1 Maine and its subsections are Maine-specific information and requirements. Bidders should not assume that State-specific information and requirements necessitate additional tools, equipment, or services. Bidders must describe how its solution meets or exceeds a state-specific requirement as applicable or how its solution will be altered or augmented to meet or exceed a state-specific requirement.</p>
4	Where can we find copies of the responses to the 2006 Maine Learning Technology Wireless Classroom Solution, RFP #1205143? What was the result of that RFP?	<p>There were two bid proposals submitted against RFP #1205143. Copies of these proposals may be downloaded here:</p> <p>Apple Proposal: [http://www.maine.gov/mlti/rfp/docs/1205143/1205143_apple_proposal.pdf]</p> <p>CDWG Proposal: [http://www.maine.gov/mlti/rfp/docs/1205143/1205143_cdwg_proposal.zip]</p> <p>RFP #1205143 was awarded to Apple, Inc. (see press release here: [http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=MLTINews&id=151539&v=Details])</p>

5	Will there be multiple awards for this RFP?	The Sourcing Team reserves the right to make multiple awards.
6	Assuming there are multiple awards, can a state elect to enter into a Participating Addendum with more than one awarded bidder?	Yes, but the decision to do so would be based on each individual state's procurement rules and need.
7	<i>Appendix B, Cost Proposal Form, page 62, Table 4 – Optional Features</i> does not specify "per seat" pricing. How should pricing be expressed for Table 4?	Bidders may choose units for pricing of <i>Optional Features</i> .
8	In some states, the technical services proposal portion of the bid is scored prior to the opening of the scoring proposal. Is this how Maine will score this RFP?	Maine procurement rules do not require that cost proposals remain sealed until after the technical services proposal scoring is complete. The State reserves the right to open and review scoring proposals at any time during the evaluation period.
9	The RFP asks for an annual per seat cost proposal for the <i>School Wireless Network Costs (Appendix B, Cost Proposal Form, page 62, Table 3)</i> . <i>Section 7.1.1 (page 34)</i> indicates that Maine owns its current wireless network infrastructure (cabling, switches, access points, etc.). Does Maine own the current wireless network infrastructure?	By the conclusion of the current contract (June 30, 2013), Maine will own the existing network infrastructure (see <i>Appendix E, State Profiles – Maine</i>).
10	The RFP asks for an annual per seat cost proposal for the <i>School Wireless Network Costs (Appendix B, Cost Proposal Form, page 62, Table 3)</i> . Is the per seat cost for the <i>School Wireless Network</i> for the service, the infrastructure, or both?	The per seat cost for the <i>School Wireless Network</i> includes service, infrastructure, and any other costs associated with the wireless network including installation.
11	The RFP asks for many different components including devices, wireless networks, software, and professional development. Can a Bidder respond to only certain parts of the RFP?	While the Sourcing Team will accept all responsive submissions for consideration, Bidders should note that all proposals submitted will be scored against the entire scope of services of the RFP, and evaluated in accordance with the evaluation procedures specified within the RFP.

12	Will the State accept creative proposals that may not match the specifics as detailed in the RFP?	<p>This is already addressed in the RFP:</p> <p><i>Part I, Section B. General Provisions #6:</i> The Sourcing Team, at its sole discretion, reserves the right to recognize and waive minor informalities and irregularities found in proposals received in response to this RFP.</p> <p><i>Part I, Section B. General Provisions #9:</i> If a Bidder cannot provide something as described in the Scope of Services section of this RFP, then that Bidder may propose something that is functionally equivalent, and provide an explanation of that equivalency. Functional equivalency will ultimately be determined by the Sourcing Team.</p>
13	<i>Appendix E, State Profiles – Maine, Section 1.9.2</i> seems to indicate that the State of Maine is seeking solutions for home connectivity. How should we respond to this apparent need?	<i>Appendix E, State Profiles – Maine, Section 1.9.2</i> provides additional information and augments <i>Part II, Section 4.3</i> . As noted in <i>Section 4.3</i> , “It is beyond the scope of this RFP to seek home Internet connectivity for individual users while away from the wireless infrastructure described in Section 7, Network Connectivity and Infrastructure. ”
14	Is the RFP asking for remote Internet access for students or teachers that do not have Internet connectivity at home?	No.
15	Are you willing to extend the RFP deadline to allow for more time to prepare a proposal?	The State reserves the right to extend the deadline for the submission of proposals. If the deadline is extended, Bidders will be notified via a posting to the RFP web site found at http://www.maine.gov/mlti/rfp/ . At this time, the State does not anticipate extending the deadline.
16	Five points of the scoring is awarded for economic impact. Can you define economic impact? We are a Maine-based services company. Would the inclusion of our company by a Prime Bidder be allowable as part of the response to this section?	Economic impact is defined in <i>Part IV, Proposal Submission Requirements, Section B, Subsection 1.1.4</i> on pages 54 and 55. Please note, this economic impact requirement in the RFP is not limited to the State of Maine only. This section should address any state that chooses to participate under this program.

17	Does the scoring of the proposal include preferences for military veteran organizations?	This RFP includes no such preference. While Maine's procurement rules generally do not include preferences, each state's selection criteria may vary when ultimately choosing an awarded Bidder (or Bidders) from among those holding a Master Price Agreement that results from this RFP.
18	Part I, Section F, Contract Term includes information about an anticipated 4 year agreement with up to 6 extension years totaling 10 years. Ten years is a long time in the technology world. Must Bidders provide the same pricing for all ten years?	Bidders' cost proposals should reflect pricing for implementation for the 2013-14 school year, but it is expected that this pricing will be honored for the entire term of the Agreement. If the costs decrease over this period, then the Sourcing Team (or individual states) reserves the right to amend the subsequent contracts and renegotiate more competitive pricing at any time.
19	Must the solution proposed remain static throughout the term of the Agreement or can it evolve over time as technology changes?	The Sourcing Team reserves the right to allow substitutions of equipment or services throughout the term of the Agreement provided these substitutions are functionally equivalent and do not increase the per seat cost, but this is subject to each participating state's procurement rules and practices.
20	Who attended the Bidders' Conference?	See attendee list below.

First	Last	Organization	Email
Shannon	Boelter	Dell	shannon_boelter@dell.com
Shannan	Beltz	Sprint	shannan.beltz@sprint.com
Jose	Burgos	Green Mountain Communications, Inc	jose.burgos@greenmtncomm.com
Maurice	Chagnon	Green Mountain Communications, Inc	m.chagnon@greenmtncomm.com
Jim	Cohen	Verrill Dana	jcohen@verrilldana.com
Bob	Collie	Education Networks of America	bcollie@ena.com
Jon	Davis	Hewlett-Packard Company	j.davis@hp.com
Chad	DeVogt	Systems Engineering	cdevogt@syseng.com
Tai	Dinh	Verizon Wireless	tai.dinh@verizonwireless.com
Adam	Dolan	Discovery Education	adam_dolan@discovery.com
Denise	Donahue	Tech Innovation	denised@techinnovation.com
Amy	Dupuis	Hewlett-Packard Company	amy.dupuis@hp.com
RJ	Fenolio	Verizon Wireless	rj.fenolio@verizonwireless.com
Michael	Trego	Sprint	michael.trego@sprint.com

Jim	Frenchak	K12	jfrenchak@k12.com
Kerry	Gallivan	MSAD 75	gallivan@link75.org
Kevin	Givens	Dell	kevin_givens@dell.com
James	Glusker	Capitol Computers	jglusker@capcomp.com
Laurence	Holt	Amplify	lholt@wgen.net
Lisa	Ivaszuk	Lenovo	livaszuk@lenovo.com
Steve	Johnson	Apple	johnson6@apple.com
Gary	Johnson	Pearson	gary.b.johnson@pearson.com
Tom	Johnson	Capitol Computers	tjohnson@capcomp.com
Bret	King	Apple	bking@apple.com
Dan	Leach	Tilson Technology Mgmt	dleach@tilsontech.com
Brian	Lenaghan	Intel Corporation	brian.lenaghan@intel.com
Tara	Maker	Apple	maker.t@apple.com
Rachel	McCoy	Pearson	rachel.mccoy@pearson.com
Victoria	McEachern	ePals	vmceachern@corp.epals.com
Ruth	Mockus	Hewlett-Packard Company	mockus@hp.com
Richard	Noonan	CDW	richard.noonan@cdw.com
Jamie	Northrup	Middlebury Interactive Languages	jnorthrup@middleburyinteractive.com
John	O'Connell	Amplify	joconnell@amplify.com
Will	Panek	Green Mountain Communications, Inc	will.panek@greenmtncomm.com
Gary	Pegoraro	eInstruction	gary.pegoraro@einstruction.com
Daniel	Pessin	Microsoft	dpessin@microsoft.com
Kimberly	Quinn Hutchinson	K12	kquinnhutchinson@k12.com
Chad	Schaedler	K12	cschaedler@k12.com
Rick	Scott	Red River Enterprise Group	rick.scott@redriver.com
Gray	Sigler	Sprint	gray.r.sigler@sprint.com
Douglas	Snow	Apple	dsnow@apple.com
Brian	Sullivan	Net Technologies	bsullivan@nettechnologiesinc.com
Dean	Velardocchia	Sprint	dean.velardocchia@sprint.com
Paul	Waller	Capitol Computers	pwaller@capcomp.com

21	Will solutions that include functionality above and beyond what is required in the RFP, like mobile access, be considered?	All proposed solutions will be considered, but please note that functionality included in a proposal that is beyond the scope of the RFP will not be included in the scoring of the proposals received. Only those elements described in the RFP will be scored during the evaluation of the proposals.
22	Can you clarify what is meant by <i>Part I, Section B #8</i> and the last paragraph of <i>Part I, Section E</i> ?	The RFP intends to establish a solution that could be implemented in any state, and to establish a cost for that solution. The RFP recognizes that details of implementation will

		likely vary due to specific state or regional issues including state experience and existing capacity. Therefore, the RFP's cost proposal template includes three pricing Tiers to accommodate some of those differences. In addition, the RFP recognizes that varying pre-existing capacity, infrastructure, experience and other state-specific rules, laws, or environments may require minor alterations to implementation of the solution as described in a Bidder's proposal. The Sourcing Team expects Bidders to work with participating states to implement their solution within the context of an individual state's environment.
23	Is it conceivable that as states negotiate Participating Addenda, that different pricing could be negotiated with a state based on its individual needs?	Yes, however the intent of this RFP is to coordinate a procurement process among interested states that anticipate implementing a program that is very similar from state to state, in accordance with the requirements detailed in the RFP. Further price negotiations beyond what is proposed will only be allowable in accordance with each individual state's procurement laws and rules. Also, please note that this specific RFP process to establish Master Price Agreements will not include a "Best and Final Offer" element, so interested Bidders are expected to provide their most competitive pricing with their submitted proposal.
24	Part II, Section 6, page 20 notes that "All devices will be deployed in the first year of the program" but isn't it possible that a state may elect to join this program in a year subsequent to the first year?	By "first year" the RFP means the initial year of an individual state's participation. Bidders should be prepared to deploy all devices in this initial year, but states may elect to do staged deployments at their discretion.
25	The RFP does not address E-Rate. How are E-Rate applications handled in this program?	Internet connectivity to the school building is beyond the scope of the RFP, therefore it is not anticipated that applicable E-Rate eligible entities will require documentation or information from Bidders for Priority 1 E-Rate applications. It is not a requirement of the RFP for the Bidder to provide E-Rate submission and management services, but for applicable E-

		<p>Rate eligible entities that elect to file for E-Rate funding support for Priority 2 funding support, Bidders are expected to provide necessary information and documentation as needed to the applicable E-Rate eligible entity.</p> <p>In Maine, it is anticipated that the State of Maine will be the purchaser of all equipment and services that result from this RFP. The State of Maine has not traditionally attempted to seek Priority 2 support from E-Rate. E-Rate application submissions will vary from state to state.</p> <p>In Hawaii, the State Department of Education (aka the SEA) is also the local school department (aka the LEA). Therefore, the Hawaii SEA/LEA does traditionally file for E-Rate funding support. Hawaii reserves the right to do so in regards to this procurement, whether in collaboration with a winning bidder, or independently.</p>
26	Where would we find state-specific National School Lunch data used to support E-Rate applications for schools?	<p>Each state maintains this data separately. For the Sourcing Team states, please see: Maine - https://portal.maine.gov/sfsr/sfsrdev.ed534.ed534_parameters Hawaii – http://arch.k12.hi.us/school/trends/trends.html# (On the left navigation pane, click the year, then the region requested to bring up all the available reports) Vermont – http://education.vermont.gov/documents/EDU-Child_Nutrition_2012_Eligibility_Report.pdf</p>
27	Can subcontractors included by a Prime Bidder be included in more than one bid proposal?	Yes.
28	How old is Maine's existing MLTI-installed wireless network equipment (as listed in <i>Appendix E, State Profiles – Maine</i>)?	The wireless network equipment listed in <i>Appendix E, State Profiles – Maine</i> was installed in the winter of 2009/2010.
29	Currently, the RFP lists four states that have expressed an interest to participate in this	Yes. See Question 1 (above) for additional interested states.

	program (<i>Part I, Section A Purpose and Background</i>). Can additional states be added to this program?	
30	What is the State of Maine's current per seat cost for devices?	Under the State of Maine's current contract, the cost for a device and all associated services is \$242 per seat, per year. Please note, this does not include the cost of wireless network installations or related equipment. The State of Maine's current wireless network pricing was not provided on a per seat basis, but was previously provided on a per school basis. That per school cost was \$7,817. The current RFP specifies that wireless network pricing must be provided on a per seat basis.
31	Is the "per seat" pricing on the Cost Proposal Form (page 62) meant to be cost per seat per year?	Yes.
32	Do Bidders have an opportunity to submit additional questions?	Yes. Written questions can still be submitted to the RFP Coordinator, Jeff Mao (jeff.mao@maine.gov), provided that they are in writing and submitted prior to December 12, 2012, by 5:00 pm.