

**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 2
AMENDMENT DATE:	December 18, 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 in writing from interested Bidders prior to the December 12, 2012 due date for submission written questions. The period for submission of written questions has ended. 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 is a revised list of the states that have indicated, in writing, an intent to participate in the Multi-State Learning Technology Initiative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hawaii • Maine • Massachusetts • Montana • New Jersey • Oklahoma • South Carolina • Vermont <p>Note: This list may be amended to add additional states as necessary.</p>
2	Is this Initiative open to Wireless Providers who are able to supply Tablets?	Yes.
3	Is this strictly a laptop program?	<p>No. Laptops are not specifically requested. The specifications for the requested devices are defined within the RFP. The use of the term “laptop case” in Appendix G – Additional Forms – Portable Computing Device Specifications Summary, page 123 was an administrative oversight. Replace the phrase “laptop case” with “device case”. Instances of the term “laptop” and “tablet” in sections describing Hawaii’s “Digital Materials Using Tablets and Laptops” should be replaced with “portable computing device(s)”. The State of Hawaii seeks the device strategy most appropriate for their context and efforts to implement systemic reforms. These references should not be considered a commitment to purchase a specific type of device, as the decision will be base on the final submission of proposals from vendor.</p>
4	For the Wireless Connectivity, are you looking for something that is hardwired or could it be a Hotspot device? A Hotspot allows for up to 5 people to be connected at once.	<p>The specifications and requirements for Wireless Connectivity are best described in Part II, Section 7, Network Connectivity and Infrastructure. Additionally, please see RFP #210210412 Amendment 1,</p>

		Question and Answer #12.
5	<p>On the recent Multi-state RFP, it wasn't clear to us if this was just for the infrastructure and devices or if you were actually including software that would be used on/by the devices. For example, the wording of the following sections hint at inclusion but it was sufficiently vague that we were hoping for clarification:</p> <p>4.4. Content, Assessment, and Integration</p> <p>4.5. Primary Research Databases</p> <p>Can you clarify that for us?</p>	Please see Part II, Sections 6.6 and 6.7.
6	Can we obtain a list of those that attended the recent Bidders Conference?	Please see RFP 201210412 Amendment 1, Question and Answer #20.
7	Regarding the Software sections of the RFP, are providers allowed to submit proposals that focus solely on the software sections of the RFP?	Please see Part I, Section C – Eligibility to Submit Proposals and Alternate Proposals. Additionally, please see RFP 201210412 Amendment 1, Question and Answer #11.
8	We are a regional company. Can we address the scope of work items for the state or states we fit the best? In other words, can a response be limited to certain states?	Yes, but proposals should address all functional elements of the RFP for the states or region covered.
9	Would you like each copy of the proposal presented in a tabbed binder, stapled packet, spiral-bound booklet, or other?	No specific booklet or binder requirements have been given in the RFP, and therefore, any of the examples in the question (or any other bound, clearly organized method) would be acceptable. For other proposal submission requirements please see PART IV PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS.
10	Would you like the forms in the Appendices (excluding Appendix A: Cover Page) to be included at the end of the proposal, or in the complementary Section?	<i>Appendix A – Proposal Cover Sheet</i> should be the first page of the proposal. <i>Appendix B – Cost Proposal Form</i> should be included in Section III Cost Proposal of the proposal. <i>Appendix G – Additional Forms</i> should be included at the conclusion of Section II Specifications of Work to be Performed.

11	We are a Google Apps/ Postini/ Vault reseller, and are also an authorized Chromebook reseller to schools. Would this RFP cover Google and Chrome products?	It is the responsibility of the Bidder to clearly describe how its solution meets the requirements and specifications of this RFP as set forth in the RFP.
12	Section 6.5.1 – Assessments - Will failure to meet the current technical requirements of either existing assessments or potential future assessments disqualify a device from consideration?	A solution’s compliance with and capacity to administer the SBAC or PARCC assessments is extremely important. Failure to meet this requirement will be considered during the scoring and evaluation of the proposal.
13	Part V, Section B(3) - Scoring and Evaluation - If a vendor only bids on one or two of the tiers, would their bid be considered non-compliant?	No, a proposal may be considered compliant even if it does not respond to all tiers.
14	Part I, Section D (page 12) - Number of Awards and Contract Structure - If a vendor submits both a Primary proposal and an Alternate proposal, is each proposal scored and awarded separately?	Yes. All proposals submitted are scored and evaluated independently against the requirements as set forth in the RFP.
15	Will participating states and school districts have the option to purchase either the Primary proposal or the Alternate proposal if both proposals are accepted?	Once awarded, a proposal will be considered simply an “awarded” proposal and not “Primary” or “Alternate”. States will have the option to select one or more awarded proposals to negotiate one or more Participating Addenda based its own procurement rules and practices. Districts within individual states may have the option to purchase against an awarded proposal based on the procurement rules and practices of each individual state.
16	Part I, Section D - Number of Awards and Contract Structure - Per previous question (question #15) - If acceptable, should the price per seat for each be separated (i.e. State price District price) in Table 1 of the Cost Proposal Form?	No. Appendix B, Cost Proposal Form, should be completed as provided in the RFP. Appendix B should not be changed. As per Appendix C, Participant Tier Structure, Tier 1 and Tier 2 states will act as a purchasing aggregator.
17	Part I, Section C - Eligibility to Submit Proposals and Alternate Proposals - Within a vendor's primary or alternate solution, is it acceptable to offer 2 different solutions for middle schools	A Bidder may submit 2 different solutions for middle schools and high schools. Please see Part I, Section C Eligibility to Submit Proposals and Alternate Proposals . In particularly, Bidders should note:

	<p>(teachers and students) and high schools (teachers and students whose district opts-in), as long as both solutions are educationally strong and the professional development appropriately aligned?</p>	<p>“The Sourcing Team is only interested in alternate proposals if the alternate is materially different (such as the use of a completely different personal computing device) than the main proposal.”</p>
<p>18</p>	<p>Appendix D, NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions - Please provide the special terms and conditions that are referenced in the Conflict of Terms provision, page 67.</p>	<p>Appendix D – NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions, is made up of the terms and conditions of the Master Price Agreements that awarded Bidders will be expected to sign as a result of this RFP. This is noted in Part IV, Section 1 (page 58) of the RFP. States that seek to participate under this program will then sign a Participating Addendum, choosing from only those awarded Bidders who have signed Master Price Agreements.</p> <p>Individual states may have state-specific terms that need to be negotiated at the point of signing a Participating Addendum. Any reference in the RFP to “special terms and conditions” should be interpreted as the participating states’ terms and conditions under the subsequent Participating Addenda, unless otherwise noted.</p> <p>The State of Maine intends to use its <i>Agreement to Purchase Services (BP54-IT)</i> as the basis of its Participating Addendum. Please see Appendix E – State Profiles – Maine, Section 1.2 Contract / Participating Addendum for information about Maine’s standard terms and conditions for this program and a link to the BP54-IT document.</p> <p>The State of Hawaii’s General Conditions for Contracts are documented in HRS Chapter 103D The Hawaii Public Procurement Code, and it may be downloaded from http://hawaii.gov/spo/general/gen-cond/general-conditions-for-contracts.</p> <p>The State of Vermont’s standard terms and</p>

		conditions are <i>Standard State Provisions for Contracts and Grants and Commodity Purchases Terms and Conditions</i> , and they may be downloaded from http://bgs.vermont.gov/purchasing/forms .
19	Appendix D, NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions - Please provide the special terms and conditions that are referenced in the Termination provision, page 67, second sentence.	Please see Question and Answer #18 of this Amendment.
20	Appendix D, NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions - Please provide the special terms and conditions that are referenced in the Delivery provision, page 68, fourth sentence.	The “special terms and conditions” referenced in the DELIVERY provision (page 68, fourth sentence) are to be determined based on the Bidders’ proposal and acceptance of agreed upon terms and conditions as set forth in an individual state’s Participating Addendum.
21	Appendix D, NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions - Please provide the special terms and conditions that are referenced in the Nondiscrimination provision, page 69, third sentence.	Please see Question and Answer #18 of this Amendment.
22	Appendix D, NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions - Please provide the special terms and conditions that are referenced in the Firm Price provision, page 70, first sentence.	Please see Question and Answer #18 of this Amendment, however, please also note that the bid validity period for this RFP is 180 days. Pricing should be submitted in accordance with Appendix B – Cost Proposal Form and Appendix C – Participant Tier Structure .
23	Appendix D, NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions - Please provide Attachment A that is referenced on the State Participation/Unique Terms and Conditions provision on page 71, second sentence.	Please see Question and Answer #18 of this Amendment. There is no Attachment A , please disregard that reference.
24	Please confirm that the <i>State of Maine Agreement to Purchase Services (BP54-IT)</i> included with this RFP is actually for both products & services.	Yes, the <i>State of Maine Agreement to Purchase Services (BP54-IT)</i> is for both products and services.

25	Please clarify if the bid validity period is 180 or 90 days. 180 days is specified in Part I, Section B3 (page 11, last sentence), and in Appendix A, Proposal Coverage Page (page 60, first bullet), and 90 days is referenced in Appendix D, NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions (page 70, first sentence of Firm Price provision).	The validity period for pricing provided in a proposal is 180 days as specified in Part I, Section B3 (page 11) and Appendix A, Proposal Cover Page (page 60).
26	<p>Part I, Section D - Number of Awards and Contract Structure, page 12, states, “After the pre-qualified list has been established, each individual state that chooses to participate in this program will be able to select the vendor (or vendors) whose proposed solution would be in the best interests of the participating state’s sole discretion.”</p> <p>Will pre-qualified vendors be similarly empowered to choose whether or not to enter into a participating addendum with a particular state?</p>	<p>Please see Appendix D, NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions, page 71 STATE PARTICIPATION/UNIQUE TERMS AND CONDITIONS, paragraph 2:</p> <p>“After the solicitation has closed and an award has been made, additional NASPO members may be added with the consent of the contractor through the execution of a Participating Addendum.”</p>
27	A clarification regarding Tier One; are the “factors” for the vendor’s guidance only or are they intended to be similar to requirements in which the vendor needs to meet all six factors?	The “factors” included in Appendix C, Participant Tier Structure , are intended to be met by participating states, or be reasonably close for negotiation purposes, in order to qualify for pricing at the tier in question.
28	<p>Are the requirements provided in Part II:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 10, Professional Development, Curriculum Integration, and Consultation • Section 11, Support and Maintenance • Section 12, Project Management and Implementation <p>all intended to be included in the total cost in Appendix B – COST</p>	Yes.

	PROPOSAL , Table 1?	
29	Appendix B – COST PROPOSAL , Table 4 is intended to be “optional”; presented in addition to 1, 2 and 3. Can a vendor respond to Table 4 only?	No. A cost proposal that only responds to Table 4 would not be considered responsive to the RFP.
30	I represent a language and literacy software company serving K-8 students and we are wondering if we will be considered since the RFP focuses mainly on technologies other than software. The RFP states, “the Provider is not required to provide educational content” (page 27); however, will a vendor still be considered if they only provide educational content (software) and not hardware or other learning technology?	Please see Part I, Section C – Eligibility to Submit Proposals and Alternate Proposals . Additionally, please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , Question and Answer #11.
31	Is inclusion in a RFP response by a primary bidder the only way for a content provider to be considered and included as an optional content service? Are there any alternatives for submitting as one of these optional services by vendors that cannot bid on the full solution?	Please see Part I, Section C – Eligibility to Submit Proposals and Alternate Proposals . Additionally, please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , Question and Answer #11.
32	I saw the RFP posted for the Multi-State Learning Technology Initiative. It looks like the purpose of this RFP is to add additional portable computing devices to the networks within your school districts. My company provides an Internet optimization appliance that allows school districts to eliminate Internet outages while adding additional low cost bandwidth to assist the added need of the mobile devices in the schools. We have acquired a state contract with Arkansas and have seen immense success in providing this	Please see Part I, Section C – Eligibility to Submit Proposals and Alternate Proposals . Additionally, please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , Question and Answer #11.

	<p>technology to their school districts and we are hoping to expand that success. This technology has been made affordable to them with this state contract due to our generous discount we provide to State Contracts.</p> <p>I need to know if it is worth my time to submit a response to this RFP. Will our technology solution still fit within the scope of this RFP?</p>	
<p>33</p>	<p>Part II, Section 3.2 Hawaii Scope of Procurement reads, “The purchase of a digital curricular package will include professional development and technical assistance from the publisher.” Is this professional development related to the digital curricular package only, and thus, is Hawaii seeking other professional development relevant to the hardware solution?</p>	<p>Part II, Section 3.2 Hawaii Scope of Procurement details the total scope of its procurement plans. Some of the goods and services details in this section are beyond the scope of this RFP (“...the state will separately purchase curricular materials...”). The State of Hawaii is seeking all goods and services as described in this RFP (while not anticipating requiring assistance with the wireless network components, Hawaii reserves the right to request assistance).</p> <p>Please see Part II, Section 10 Professional Development, Curriculum Integration, and Consultation for more information about the RFP’s requirements for professional development.</p> <p>For more information about Hawaii’s plans for wireless network connectivity, please see Part II, Section 7.1.2 Hawaii – Existing Wireless Networks.</p>
<p>34</p>	<p>Part II, Section 6.3 Students – Please provide a table clarifying the number of students/faculty in MT and SC through 2024? This was done for ME, VT and HI on pages 21-23, but no estimates were given for MT and SC, (which recently signed on as a participating state).</p>	<p>No estimates are currently available for Montana and South Carolina.</p>

35	<p>Part II, Section 6.2.1.1 Maine Teachers and Staff – “In 2009, the Department’s initial count for total eligible staff for grades 7-12 was 11,869.” Can you please provide an estimated breakdown of quantities of the various types of staff within this number?</p>	<p>The State of Maine established an eligibility guideline for teachers and staff. These guidelines may be viewed on page 21 of the MLTI Manual found here:</p> <p>http://www.mlti.org/manual</p> <p>Schools used these guidelines to report to the State the total eligible teachers and staff at each school site. As such, the State of Maine does not have a breakdown of the various types of staff. Additionally, while the State of Maine does include many different staff roles in its description of eligibility, it does not differentiate the device or tools on the device for various roles. For specific role-based needs in a school beyond what is described in this RFP, it is presumed that the local school will separately procure and augment the solution for those needs.</p>
36	<p>Part II, Section 6.8.2 Maine Pre-service Teachers and Higher Education – “Bidders must describe its plan to allow higher education institution teacher preparation programs in Maine to participate in the MLTI and provide devices and necessary services to the institution and pre-service teachers” Please share what types of services or programs are already in place or have been offered or provided as part of this initiative in the past? What level of exposure already exists for Pre-service Teachers and Higher Education?</p>	<p>Currently, the Maine Learning Technology Initiative (MLTI) has very limited formal programs in place with higher education institutions. MLTI just began an information exchange/collaborative between the Pre-Service programs at Maine’s largest public Universities (University of Maine Orono, University of Maine Farmington, and University of Southern Maine). The extent of this collaborative is limited to facilitated exchanges of information about practices, needs, and strategies for supporting pre-service teachers in a modern 1:1 K-12 classroom environment. Additionally, student teachers from any higher education institution placed in a participating MLTI school is provided an MLTI device as if they were a regular member of the teaching faculty at that school for the duration of their student teaching.</p>
37	<p>Part II, Section 6.8.2 Maine Pre-service Teachers and Higher Education – Can the State provide</p>	<p>The State of Maine does not have data related to the anticipated demand. Part II, Part II, Section 6.8.2 Maine Pre-service</p>

	the details of the anticipated demand for leasing agreements - term and type?	<p>Teachers and Higher Education does not specify leases as the financial arrangement. Note that it reads:</p> <p>In addition, Bidders <i>must propose how it intends to structure any financial arrangements</i> including <i>potential</i> leases, invoicing, etc.</p> <p><i>[Italics added for emphasis]</i></p>
38	<p>Part II, Section 7, Network Connectivity and Infrastructure – First paragraph of that section states that Power-over-Ethernet (PoE) is preferred.</p> <p>a. What are we powering with each switch?</p> <p>i. Access Points (AP)?</p> <p>ii. VOIP Phones?</p> <p>iii. IP Cameras?</p> <p>b. How many of what devices for each switch?</p>	<p>Please see Part II, Section 7.2 Local Network and Access, fourth sentence:</p> <p>“A Provider will be responsible for the <i>design, installation, configuration,</i> and on-going maintenance and support of the wireless network infrastructure for the term of the Agreement.”</p> <p><i>[Italics added for emphasis]</i></p>
39	In <i>general</i> , if we are using an existing network to build out the wireless solution, will the schools be responsible for SmartNet on existing equipment? If yes, what is the warranty term?	<p>Please see Part II, Section 7.1.1 Maine – Existing MLTI Wireless Networks:</p> <p>“If a Providers solution includes existing MLTI network devices or infrastructure, the Provider must agree to provide full warranty/performance coverage as it would with newly installed devices or infrastructure.”</p>
40	<p>Part II, Section 7 Network Connectivity and Infrastructure – Is the current infrastructure being ripped and replaced?</p> <p>a. If so, are schools interested trading in the current equipment?</p> <p>b. If there IS a trade in, will the State</p>	<p>Bidders should not assume the existence of a wireless network infrastructure. Bidders should propose its solution for providing a new wireless network infrastructure as described in Section 7 Network Connectivity and Infrastructure.</p> <p>In Maine, Bidders may optionally utilize the existing equipment as part of its</p>

	be able to provide a trade in estimate?	solution as per Part II, Section 7.1.1 Maine – Existing MLTI Wireless Networks . As per RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , question 9, the State of Maine will own the network equipment as detailed in Appendix E, State Profiles – Maine at the conclusion of the current agreement (June 30, 2013). If a Bidder’s solution does not utilize this equipment, the State will redeploy the equipment to serve schools not participating in the 1:1 program. That redeployment is outside the scope of this RFP.
41	<p>Part II, Section 7.1.1 Maine – Existing MLTI Wireless Networks - “If a Providers solution includes existing MLTI network devices or infrastructure, the Provider must agree to provide full warranty/performance coverage as it would with newly installed devices or infrastructure.”</p> <p>In order to comply with the above, we would like more information about the current network, age and condition of the legacy equipment, as well as information about the balance of manufacturer warranty so that we can factor into our costs and solution. What additional information can the State provide on this topic?</p>	Please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , Question and Answer #28 and RFP #201210412 Amendment 2 , Question and Answer #39 and #40.
42	Part II, Section 7.2 Local Network and Access – Are Redundant Power Supplies required for switches if those switches support them (ie. 3560X Series switches)?	Please see Part II, Section 8.6 UPS .
43	Part II, Section 7.2 Local Network and Access – What routing requirement are there for each switch? LAN Base, IP Base or IP Services (Layer 2, Layer 2+, Layer	Please see Part II, Section 7.2 Local Network and Access , fourth sentence: “A Provider will be responsible for the <i>design, installation, configuration, and on-</i>

	<p>3)?</p> <p>a. Will different IOS’s be required for different closets?</p> <p>b. If so, that will be required info for the port count per closet.</p>	<p>going maintenance and support of the wireless network infrastructure for the term of the Agreement.”</p> <p><i>[Italics added for emphasis]</i></p>
<p>44</p>	<p>Part II, Section 7.2.2 Wireless Access – Do the existing access point counts per location sufficiently cover the location or do they require any additional access points?</p>	<p>Bidders should not assume the existence of a wireless network infrastructure. Bidders should propose its solution for providing a new wireless network infrastructure as described in Section 7 Network Connectivity and Infrastructure.</p> <p>In Maine, Bidders may optionally utilize the existing equipment as part of its solution as per Part II, Section 7.1.1 Maine – Existing MLTI Wireless Networks. As per RFP #201210412 Amendment 1, Question and Answer #9, the State of Maine will own the network equipment as detailed in Appendix E, State Profiles – Maine at the conclusion of the current agreement (June 30, 2013). If a Bidder’s solution does not utilize this equipment, the State will redeploy the equipment to serve schools not participating in the 1:1 program. That redeployment is outside the scope of this RFP.</p> <p>Maine’s current provider’s solution satisfies the network coverage requirements of the current contract.</p>
<p>45</p>	<p>Do the existing access point counts provide 1:1 AP: Classroom coverage for any 1:1 Wireless programs coming forth?</p> <p>i. Is a 1:1 program expected at all locations?</p> <p>ii. How many additional access points per site would be needed to</p>	<p>i. Please see Part II, Section 7.2.1 Wireless Coverage.</p> <p>ii. Please see Part II, Section 7.2 Local Network and Access, fourth sentence:</p> <p>“A Provider will be responsible for the <i>design, installation, configuration, and on-going maintenance and support of the wireless network infrastructure for the term</i></p>

	<p>achieve this?</p>	<p>of the Agreement.”</p> <p><i>[Italics added for emphasis]</i></p>
<p>46</p>	<p>Part II, Section 7.3.1 Portability – What are the port counts required for all the switches?</p> <p>a. Are they going to standardize on a 48pt Full PoE Switch to replace each? That would be easiest so that there are not multiple configurations for different closets and schools.</p> <p>b. Can they supply this port count by closet so we know what switches connect to what?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. If multiple switches in a closet do they prefer stacking to uplinks or vice versa?</p> <p>c. At current there are no Fiber connectivity statistics. We need both copper and fiber port count requirements as well as if the fiber connections are Multimode or Singlemode to formulate a valid BoM.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i. Are uplinks between closets 1G or 10G?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ii. If Multimode, 50 or 62.5 micron fiber and what is the distance?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">iii. If Singlemode, what is the distance?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">iv. What connections are at their fiber patch panels? What length jumper cables would be needed to connect the switches?</p>	<p>Please see Part II, Section 7.2 Local Network and Access, fourth sentence:</p> <p>“A Provider will be responsible for the <i>design, installation, configuration</i>, and on-going maintenance and support of the wireless network infrastructure for the term of the Agreement.”</p> <p><i>[Italics added for emphasis]</i></p>
<p>47</p>	<p>Is there any Core Networking infrastructure required here at any of these sites or a centralized site?</p>	<p>Please see Part II, Section 7.2 Local Network and Access, fourth sentence:</p> <p>“A Provider will be responsible for the <i>design, installation, configuration</i>, and on-going maintenance and support of the wireless network infrastructure for the term of the Agreement.”</p>

		<i>[Italics added for emphasis]</i>
48	<p>On sites where there are multiple WLAN controllers do we need to stay with that configuration or would 1 controller per site be effective?</p> <p>a. If multiple controllers are required, how many licenses are needed for each controller?</p>	<p>Please see Part II, Section 7.2 Local Network and Access, fourth sentence:</p> <p>“A Provider will be responsible for the <i>design, installation, configuration</i>, and on-going maintenance and support of the wireless network infrastructure for the term of the Agreement.”</p> <p><i>[Italics added for emphasis]</i></p>
49	<p>We intend to provide the State of Maine and NASPO with a comprehensive contract that accounts for schools on the very beginning of the 1:1 planning as well as large districts with investments already made with respect to wireless connectivity. With that goal in mind, we find that the per seat pricing including wireless access points may be inequitable comparing larger districts to the smaller schools and administration offices in the rural areas. We suggest the wireless solutions should be broken out on a “per unit” basis, rather than per seat to allow for adequate coverage without unnecessary inflation of the per seat price. If not acceptable for Maine, could the NASPO portion of the Agreement be structured this way to have adequate flexibility?</p>	<p>No. Interested Bidders should respond using the Cost Proposal Form provided as Appendix B of the RFP.</p>
50	<p>Part II, Section 9.5.1 Warranty – Warranties typically run from date of delivery. For clarity, is the intent of this provision to have a warranty through the initial term of the agreement (4 years, so at minimum through June 30, 2017) and not through the entire potential of the agreement (June 30, 2023)?</p>	<p>Please see Part II, Section 9.5.1 Warranty, third sentence:</p> <p>“Consistent with the requirements of this Section of the RFP, the Provider shall warranty against normal wear and tear and ensure the delivery of all services for the term of the agreement.”</p>

51	Assuming renewals are not included, what then is the minimum desired warranty for a unit sold in 2018?	Please see Part II, Section 9.5.1 Warranty , third sentence: “Consistent with the requirements of this Section of the RFP, the Provider shall warranty against normal wear and tear and ensure the delivery of all services for the term of the agreement.”
52	Part II, Section 9.5.1 Warranty – Similar to repair, are replacement units required through June 30, 2017 or including any renewals? Assuming renewals are not included, what then is the minimum replacement coverage for a unit sold in 2018?	Please see Part II, Section 9.5.1 Warranty , last sentence: “Notwithstanding the cause of any loss, the Provider must provide replacement units in a timely manner and at a reasonable cost for the term of the Agreement.”
53	Part II, Section 9.5.4.1 Maine Theft/Loss – Is similar data available for any other opt-in state? If so, please provide.	No other state has an existing statewide 1:1 program, therefore no other data is currently available.
54	Part II, Section 10 Professional Development, Curriculum Integration, and Consultation – Since it is well recognized that the implementations will vary state-to-state, is there a set of base requirements for “appropriate amount” of the various types of professional development that should be included in the base price per seat? Please provide “appropriate amounts” used for MLTI as a basis for comparison or levels used and estimated adjustments recommended from the experience.	The “appropriate amounts” in this context should be proposed by the Bidder based upon the Bidder’s experience implementing and understanding of its own proposed solution.
55	Part II, Section 10.2.1 Educator Professional Development – The list of challenges is very helpful. Can you also offer some insights into what the Maine DOE considers the more successful aspects of the professional development program	Please see Part II, Section 10 Professional Development Curriculum Integration, and Consultation . Additionally, for more information about Maine’s current program, please see http://www.maine.gov/mlti/ .

	to-date?	
56	Part II, Section 12.1.8 Project Staffing – Please provide a minimum expectation for meeting the “in-state” requirement? Is the project defined separately from the Agreement? Is this expectation consistent for all opt-in states?	“In-State” means that the project team provided by the Provider be located in the participating state. It is anticipated that each participating state would require its own project team to support the program.
57	Part II, Section 12.1.8 Project Staffing – Please provide clarification as to how you are differentiating the role of an “Education Specialist” versus a “Professional Development Specialist?”	An Education Specialist is an individual that has expertise in teaching and learning. A Professional Development Specialist is an individual with expertise in staff development and would be directly involved with the delivery of professional development.
58	Appendix B Cost Proposal Form – Please clarify that for Table 2, the Volume Discount Factor Percentage discount for every 500,000 seats of “increased participation”, is for each instance of a 500,000 unit milestone? Also, when is participation measured to effect this additional discount (e.g. for commitments at contract launch vs. throughout period)? Do latent participants intended to benefit from an increased discount that early adopters did not receive?	The percentage discount is for each instance of 500,000 seats, collectively across all participating states with a Participating Addendum with the same solution. When a milestone is reached, all participating states should benefit from the discount.
59	As the State has mentioned different Specifications for several types of device - Student/ Teacher/ Grad Student etc., we would like to be able to offer corresponding “per seat” pricing for each type to maximize savings. This way no State will carry an undue burden of cost to the inherent “averaging” required to arrive at a per seat price.	Part II, Section 6.2.1 Teachers and Staff , second sentence reads: “The teacher’s device may be the same as the student’s device or may be a more fully capable device.” Otherwise, Part II, Section 6.5 Device Functional Requirements and Part II, Section 6.6 Software and Function do not mention different specifications for several types of device for different users.
60	Will the State alter the Cost Proposal to be more flexible in presenting	No. Interested Bidders should respond using the Cost Proposal Form provided as

	pricing and thus more competitive for each user community (students, teachers, administration) to provide prices on a per seat basis by user type?	Appendix B of the RFP.
61	Appendix E – State Profiles – Maine, Section 1.6, Wireless Network Infrastructure – On sites where access points are listed without a WLAN controller, where are those access points managed? (ie. SAU ID 1213 Caribou regional Applied Tech Center).	Three pairs of schools share physical buildings and internal network infrastructure. Therefore, from a network design perspective, each pair may be treated as a single network infrastructure location. Those pairs are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1213 Caribou Regional Applied Tech Ctr and 1212 Caribou High School • 1149 Cony High School and 1153 Capital Area Technical Center • 1534 Hall-Dale High School and 1535 Hall-Dale Middle School
62	Appendix G – Additional Forms – Staff Experience with Similar Projects , page 121 – Given that the State contemplates a potential ten year term of the agreement, please confirm expectations that these technical role profiles are representative of the caliber of present and continuing resources associated with the Provider, and not specific named resources for the duration of the potential award.	The Sourcing Team acknowledges that staffing may change over the term of the Agreement and that the number of participating states is unknown. Therefore responses may be representative examples. However, to the degree that a Bidder can identify actual individuals who would serve on the initial project teams for each of the Sourcing Team states (ME, HI, VT), the Sourcing Team would appreciate named resources.
63	Does Maine anticipate awarded vendor(s) to maintain pricing for 1:1 devices across all states that have/will participate in this contract?	Please see Appendix B – Cost Proposal Form and Appendix C – Participant Tier Structure . Pricing is expected to remain consistent across Tiers for all participating states. Additionally, please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , Question and Answer #22 and #23.
64	Is the expectation to have consistent/set prices for all services across all states that participate? Will awarded vendor have the ability to negotiate different rates for individual states based on each	Please see Appendix B – Cost Proposal Form and Appendix C – Participant Tier Structure . Pricing is expected to remain consistent across Tiers for all participating states. Additionally, please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , Question and

	state's unique economic conditions?	Answer #22 and #23.
65	Is the expectation to have consistent/set prices for all hardware devices (including networking, servers, storage, laptops, tablets, desktops, etc) across all states that participate? Will awarded vendor have the ability to negotiate different rates for individual states based on each state's unique economic conditions?	Please see Appendix B – Cost Proposal Form and Appendix C – Participant Tier Structure . Pricing is expected to remain consistent across Tiers for all participating states. Additionally, please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , Question and Answer #22 and #23.
66	Will Maine provide a full list of each state that has currently expressed interest in participating and also have their expected 1:1 device counts shared per state? Number of school districts with enrollment numbers would be very beneficial.	Please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , Question and Answer #1 and RFP #201210412 Amendment 2 , Question and Answer #1. Additionally, please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 2 , Question and Answer #34.
67	Will Maine accept multiple devices for their 1:1 initiative in order to offer freedom of choice per school and per use demands?	Please see Part I, Section C Eligibility to Submit Proposals and Alternate Proposals and Part I, Section D Number of Awards and Contract Structure .
68	There is information on the Student Information System used in Maine – do all districts use the same Infinite Campus and Power School systems?	The State of Maine has one standard version of Infinite Campus deployed across the state. Any upgrades are done all at once statewide. We are currently at E.1242. PowerSchool installations are procured and managed locally. No version data for PowerSchool is available.
69	For other states – What are the Student Information Systems currently used in the States/Districts? Can you provide a list by district?	This information is currently not available.
70	What are the Learning Management Systems (LMS) currently used in the States/Districts? Can you provide a list by district? Only Hawaii is listed as, “Many Hawaii schools use the Global Scholar Pinnacle Instruction	While no one LMS is used consistently across either the State of Maine or Vermont, Bidders may consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vermont Virtual Learning Cooperative (http://www.vtvlc.org) uses

	Learning Management System”.	<p>Moodle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine’s AP4ALL (http://www.ap4all.org) uses Moodle. • Maine’s current 1:1 solution includes a Studywiz environment. It is not used heavily.
71	Due to the complexity of this RFP along with the upcoming holiday break, would Maine consider giving all vendors responding to this RFP an extension to Friday February 1?	Please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , Question and Answer #15.
72	Part II, Section 3.2 Hawaii Scope of Procurement – In this section the content states “(Hawaii) is currently planning to purchase tablets for elementary and middle grades” and further, “contract to purchase tablets will also include corresponding technical assistance to complement the curricular package”. Please clarify or expand upon requirements for “corresponding technical assistance” for tablets.	Please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 2 , Question and Answer #33.
73	Part II, Section 3.2 Hawaii Scope of Procurement – Is there a requirement for an optical drive and how it might be used in the system?	No, there is no requirement for an optical drive in the system.
74	Part II, Section 5.2.2 Hawaii Opt-in and Part II, Section 5.2.3 Vermont Opt-in – What is the anticipated formal opt-in timeframe in Hawaii and Vermont?	<p>Hawaii expects opt-in to occur in late May or June of 2013. However, the first year of deployment may see a one-time shift in the opt-in period, as budget distributions in Hawaii normally occur in early July.</p> <p>Vermont has declined to respond.</p>
75	Part II, Section 6.1.2 Hawaii Participating Users and Part II, Section 6.1.3 Vermont Participating Users – What is the opt-in timeframe for local schools in Hawaii and Vermont, and when will they be able to confirm funding support?	<p>Hawaii expects opt-in to occur in late May or June of 2013. Confirmation of state level budgets normally occurs in late June.</p> <p>Vermont has declined to respond.</p>

76	Part II, Section 6.5 Device Functional Requirements – Is there a docking station requirement?	No, there is no docking station requirement.
77	Part II, Section 6.5 Device Functional Requirements – Does the state require support for 802.11a WiFi standard or is 802.11b/g/n acceptable?	The Bidder’s proposed device must include WiFi standards support to allow it to meet any and all functional requirements as set forth in the RFP and at the minimum leverage the WiFi solution included in the solution Part II, Section 7 Network Connectivity and Infrastructure . Ideally, the device would include support for multiple standards to provide increased flexibility of use in non-school environments.
78	Part II, Section 6.5 Device Functional Requirements – Is there a minimum processor requirement? Is there a set of minimum specifications for the tablets?	There is no minimum processor requirement. Bidder’s should keep in mind the processor’s capacity in its solution to meet and/or exceed the functional use of the solution as described in the RFP.
79	Part II, Section 6.5.2 Device Connectivity – Does the State require single or dual band Wi-Fi connections or is this something that may have to change for specific locations? If so does the State know which locations require single band and which require dual band?	Bidder’s should keep in mind the device’s connectivity capacity in its solution to meet and/or exceed the functional use of the solution as described in the RFP. In addition, please see Part II, Section 7.2 Local Network and Access , fourth sentence: “A Provider will be responsible for the <i>design, installation, configuration, and on-going maintenance and support</i> of the wireless network infrastructure for the term of the Agreement.” <i>[Italics added for emphasis]</i>
80	Part II, Section 6.5.13 Boot Time/Wake Time – How critical are boot time and wake times? Would you consider SSD’s as an option to improve boot time even though they will increase the cost?	The RFP best describes the Boot Time/Wake Time requirements.
81	Part II, Section 6.5.14 Upgrades – What type of upgrades is the State considering? Would the proposition for upgrades come from the schools or from the supplier?	Part II, Section 6.5.14 Upgrades reads: “Upgrades to the portable computing device, <i>if proposed</i> , during the term of the contract will be done within the per seat cost at a time that does not impact teaching

		and learning.” <i>[Italics added for emphasis]</i>
82	Part II, Section 6.6 Software and Function – Some of the described software can take advantage of more advanced hardware. Is the State willing to consider more advanced systems for specific use cases?	The RFP seeks a 1:1 computing solution. Bidders should design its solution to provide each student and teacher with the tools and functionality as described in the RFP.
83	Part II, Section 6.6.9 Software Updating – Are any schools currently using a management tool to track and enforce updates? If so, what and which locations?	Maine’s current solution includes the functionality to push updates to the portable computing device over the network for all sites. This solution is specific to the current solution. Bidders must specify how it plans to meet the requirements as described in Part II, Section 6.6.9 Software Updating .
84	Part II, Section 9.4 Backups – Clarity needed around the extent of backup required on the portable computing device. Is the student or the vendor responsible for backup and restoration of personal user files such as music and photos? Is vendor free to limit backup to specified education folders associated with classroom applications only?	Please note Part II, Section 9.4 Backups , final sentence: “The Bidder must describe the capacity and features of its backup solution, and which data would be recoverable by the user, by a school administrator, or by provider.”
85	Part II, Section 9.4 Backups Is there a networked backup solution in place in any of the schools already? If so, what and which locations?	Maine’s current solution includes a networked backup solution for all sites specific to the current solution. Bidders must specify how it plans to meet the requirements as described in Part II, Section 9.4 Backups .
86	Part III, Section A Timeline of Key RFP Events – At this time, the Due Date for Receipt of Proposals is “January 11, 2013 at 2:00pm, local time”. We respectfully request an extension due to the timing of holidays and end of year vacation schedules that would only provide more competitive responses benefiting NASPO, participants and procuring entities.	Please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , Question and Answer #15.

87	<p>Part III, Section C(2) Summary of Questions and Answers – At this time, the deadline for answers to be provided in response to bidder questions and the date the bid is due is “no later than seven (7) calendar days before the due date”. Would the State be willing to consider a 14 day period after final answers are provided to allow for more complete incorporation of information provided in final answers into the bidder’s response?</p>	<p>Maine procurement rules define that responses to Bidder questions be published no later than seven (7) calendar days prior to the proposal due date. However, all attempts will be made to provide responses as quickly as possible in order to allow Bidders more time to incorporate the information provided in their responses.</p>
88	<p>Appendix B – Cost Proposal Form – Can a bidder expand the Cost Proposal Form to address each Financial Option (ref: App. D, Comprehensive Financial Options) it elects to bid?</p>	<p>Please consider the clause entitled “Comprehensive Financial Options that Should be Included” of Appendix D to be deleted in its entirety. Bidders should determine and propose the most cost effective financial option for that Bidder’s proposed solution, and relay that proposal through the Cost Proposal Form that is provided as Appendix B to the RFP.</p>
89	<p>Appendix B – Cost Proposal Form – Re: Section 3.2 “Hawaii Scope of Procurement” content and plan to purchase tablets. May bidders expand Pricing Table 1 (further defined in Amendment 1 to be an Annual “Cost proposed per-seat” by Tier) to allow for separate pricing for Tier 1, 2 and 3 pricing for laptops, and Tier 1, 2 and 3 pricing for tablets</p>	<p>No. Please see Part I, Section C Eligibility to Submit Proposals and Alternate Proposals, second paragraph.</p>
90	<p>Appendix C – Participant Tier Structure – To assist vendors with interpretation of “Factors” given and with responding with appropriate Tier 1, 2 and 3 pricing, would the State please provide the NASPO interpretation or determination of Tier for each of the 5 currently identified participating states.</p>	<p>No. Each state’s “Tier” is subject to change during this RFP process and throughout the life of this program. Tier determinations will be made prior to setting up a Participating Addendum for each individual state.</p>
91	<p>Appendix D – NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions, Comprehensive Financial Options, page 72 – A purchase price financial option is requested. In this option</p>	<p>Please consider the clause entitled “Comprehensive Financial Options that Should be Included” of Appendix D to be deleted in its entirety. Bidders should determine and propose the most cost</p>

	<p>are we to assume a purchasing entity will issue an order to purchase the device and related recurring services for a specified period, and advise period length: 1, 2, or 3 years? In this option is the cost per seat to include the price of the device plus related services (excluding Wireless Network services)? Will the purchase order allow for the upfront purchase of the device plus related services for the entire term of related recurring services (assuming it exceeds one year)? If not, should separate line item pricing be provided for the device, and related recurring services (and for what specified term period)? Is it appropriate to assume the School Wireless Network Costs will be a separate line item on purchase orders, and treated as a one-time, non-recurring expense for the purchasing entity?</p>	<p>effective financial option for that Bidder's proposed solution, and relay that proposal through the Cost Proposal Form that is provided as Appendix B to the RFP.</p>
92	<p>Appendix D – NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions, State Participation/Unique Terms and Conditions, page 72 – Will the State provide the referenced Attachment A, or clarify what constitutes the cross-reference of an Attachment A in the Solicitation?</p>	<p>Please see the answer to Question and Answer #18 of this Amendment. There is no Attachment A, please disregard that reference.</p>
93	<p>Appendix E – State Profiles – Section 4 Additional NASPO Intent to Participate, Additional States – Montana: In reviewing the 2013 and 2014 State Education budget there does not appear to be a funded commitment to a 1:1 student education initiative, nor mention of a move in this direction. Can you point to Montana state legislation, budget or public information that supports commitment to a 1:1 managed program?</p>	<p>The State of Montana has submitted an <i>Intent to Participate</i> letter to NASPO consistent with standard NASPO cooperative purchasing practices.</p>

94	Montana: Will information for Montana such as: “Scope of Procurement”, “Student Count Estimates”, “Deployment”, and “Services Provided by Other Entities” be provided? (Sections 3 through 6.3. pages 15-23 and Appendix E, page 120)	No, this information is not currently available.
95	South Carolina has signed a letter of intent to participate. In reviewing the 2013 and 2014 State Education budget there does not appear to be a funded commitment to a 1:1 student education initiative, nor mention of a move in this direction. Can you point to South Carolina state legislation, budget or public information that supports commitment to a 1:1 managed program?	The State of South Carolina has submitted an <i>Intent to Participate</i> letter to NASPO consistent with standard NASPO cooperative purchasing practices.
96	South Carolina: Will information for South Carolina such as: “Scope of Procurement”, “Participation by Schools”, “Student Count Estimates”, “Deployment”, and “Services Provided by Other Entities” be provided? (Amendment 1, Question 1, page 2; Sections 3 through 6.3. pages 15-23 and Appendix E, page 120)	No, this information is not currently available.
97	Is it a requirement that new devices be compatible with the existing assets that Maine teachers and students have created with all current software, specifically iTunes? or iTunes U?	Please see Part II, Section 6.6.5 Distance and Online Learning and Part II, Section 10.1.1 Maine Transition Support .
98	<p>Question: In Part II, Section 4.5 Primary Research Databases – Reference is made to centralized, coordinated access to online and electronic content, databases, and other similar resources. What current content is being used in the participating states?</p> <p>Answer: The State of Maine’s virtual library, MARVEL can be found at http://www.maine.gov/marvel/. Complete listings of resources available in MARVEL can be found at that site.</p> <p>Hawaii uses the following electronic resources, among others: http://www.librarieshawaii.org/Serials/databases.html http://sls.k12.hi.us/learningresources/Learning_Resources/Welcome.html</p>	

	Vermont's Online Library can be found at http://www.vtonlinelib.org . Complete listings of resources available in the Vermont OnlineLibrary can be found at that site.	
99	Part II, Section 9.6. Asset Management – Requires a system to view details on all assets including the portable digital device, network switches, servers, wireless access point, etc.; however, the Cost Proposal Form isolates the cost per seat for the student/teacher learning technology solution and the school wireless costs separately. Where should the cost of the asset management solution be represented?	It is anticipated that not all participating states will require the network infrastructure described in Part II, Section 7 Network Connectivity and Infrastructure . As such, those states would not require asset management services related to network assets. Therefore the <i>Cost Proposal Form</i> separates the network costs from the per seat cost of the other equipment and services. Associated costs to include the asset management services for equipment included as part of the Bidder's solution as described in Part II, Section 7 Network Connectivity and Infrastructure should be reflected in Appendix B, Cost Proposal Form, Table 3 – School Wireless Network Costs .
100	Can a sample schedule of the previous year(s) dates/locations of education conferences be provided to help us understand fully the requirements of Section 12.1.3. Educational Conference?	Maine's schedule of professional development offerings and conferences hosted by MLTI can be found here: http://www.maine.gov/mlti/events/ MLTI also participates in many annual events in Maine hosted by other Maine educational organizations including: ACTEM (http://www.actem.org) MSMA (http://www.msmaweb.com) MAMLE (http://www.mamleonline.org) MCSS (http://mainecouncilsocialstudies.org) MPA (http://www.mpa.cc)
101	Is the Bidder obliged to provide products and services for any entity that expresses interest to participate in the program?	Please see Appendix D, NASPO Standard Terms and Conditions , page 71 STATE PARTICIPATION/UNIQUE TERMS AND CONDITIONS , paragraph 2: “After the solicitation has closed and an

		award has been made, additional NASPO members may be added with the consent of the contractor through the execution of a Participating Addendum.”
102	Just found out about the MLTI RFP and want to find out how we can get Inspiration® and Kidspiration® in on 6.6.1.7 concept mapping?	Please see Part I, Section C – Eligibility to Submit Proposals and Alternate Proposals . Additionally, please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 1 , Question and Answer #11.
103	Part I Introduction, Section A – Purpose and Background - What is the relationship between MLTI, WSCA and NASPO? Is there a long-term plan to merge the mission of WSCA and MLTI in the future?	<p>MLTI is a program of the State of Maine. Maine’s program will continue to operate within Maine. Maine will be using this RFP process as the competitive basis for the continuation of the program. A state may choose to create its own program at any time. Participating states will use this RFP process and resulting cooperative contracts as the basis for their programs, at their discretion.</p> <p>WSCA is the 15 state procurement directors from the Western Region of NASPO, plus Minnesota and South Dakota, who have been working together for 20 years to create cooperative contracts. It has never been a “legal entity”, just simply 15 state procurement directors working together. Because of the growth of WSCA’s cooperative contracts, effective January 1, 2013, support and management of the NASPO and WSCA cooperative contracting efforts will be shifted to the WSCA/NASPO Cooperative Purchasing Organization. Our contracts will be named WSCA/NASPO contracts (WSCA/NASPO Multi-State Learning Technology Initiative in this case).</p> <p>There are no plans to merge the missions of WSCA and MLTI.</p>
104	Part I Introduction, Section A – Purpose and Background - If a current NASPO member state chooses to participate in the Multi-State Learning Initiative Cooperative Purchasing and that member state	Cooperative contract participation by states is neither restrictive nor exclusive. States will decide what cooperative contracts to participate in based on their requirements and choices. The WSCA/NASPO PC Contracts are contracts to purchase

	currently has a WSCA participating addendum, which contract will control purchasing through this MLTI initiative – the current WSCA Participating Addendum or the new MLTI Participating Addendum? If all purchases for this initiative will go through the MLTI Participating Addendum, will the current WSCA Participating Addendum be terminated?	hardware. The WSCA/NASPO Multi-State Learning Technology Initiative contracts (resulting from this RFP) are set up on a “seat contract” basis that includes hardware, but also includes an array of services and support as defined in this RFP. The contracts are separate. They are NOT related, DO NOT overlap.
105	How does the new WSCA/NASPO Cooperative Purchasing Organization affect this procurement?	The creation of the new WSCA/NASPO Cooperative Purchasing Organization does not affect this procurement. The term organization name “National Association of State Procurement Officials” and the initialization “NASPO” in the RFP document should be considered equivalent to “WSCA/NASPO Cooperative Purchasing Organization”. For additional information about the WSCA/NAPSO Cooperative Purchasing Organization, please see RFP #201210412 Amendment 2 , Question and Answer # 103.
106	Is Appendix F, “Letter from Microsoft...” an indication that the proposed devices must contain Microsoft software?	No. There is no requirement to specifically propose Microsoft software. Part II, Section 6.6 Software and Function of the RFP provides information on the software requirements. Appendix F is provided only on an informational basis, regarding discounts that can be applied to any proposal that offers Microsoft software as part of the Bidder’s proposed solution.