### 695-2012 ADDENDUM 3

# PROVISION OF TELEPHONE SYSTEM INFRASTRUCTURE, RELATED EQUIPMENT AND SYSTEMS AND CELLULAR WIRELESS SERVICES

## **URGENT**

PLEASE FORWARD THIS DOCUMENT TO WHOEVER IS IN POSSESSION OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

ISSUED: January 7, 2013 BY: Ed Richardson TELEPHONE NO. (204) 986-6002

THIS ADDENDUM SHALL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL AND SHALL FORM A PART OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS

Please note the following and attached changes, corrections, additions, deletions, information and/or instructions in connection with the Request for Proposal, and be governed accordingly. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in Paragraph 9 of Form A: Proposal may render your Proposal non-responsive.

## PART E - SPECIFICATIONS

Revise: E5.53 to read:

E5.53 Item No. **109** is an increment of bandwidth to Item 108 above. As the number of devices increase on the custom APN, it is essential that the City must increase the bandwidth of this connection. The Bidder shall price the cost to increment this service in increments of 10 MB/s.

### **Questions and Answers**

- Q1 Referencing D2.3, E6.18, E7.12, E7.37, Can the Bidder define criteria around the maximum number of IMAC's allowed to limit variable costs?
  - A1 The costs for all basic IMAC's is to be included in the base pricing. A basic IMAC is considered a routine day to day addition, removal or change. Basic IMAC's do not include brand new facilities or large scale renovations that may necessitate work on more than 15 devices in a single facility.
- Q2 Does the City expect their existing LAN traffic to traverse the Bidders switch? If so, how does the city envision the City's and Bidder's LAN switches to be connected?
  - A2 There is one network drop per workstation area, which implies the sharing of PC and VoIP phone network line. The City expects the Bidder to provide their solution within the response, including options to address the situation of the City's requirement to manage equipment provided by the Bidder, and/or viceversa.
- Q3 Clarity required B21.9.2 "Notwithstanding B22.3" clause was modified to change "section" to "solution". Solution is not consistent with the use of section throughout the RFP no definition for solution has been provided. Can the City provide clarity as to the intent of using "solution" instead of "section".
  - A3 The original wording of "...shall have the right to choose the section which is in its best interest." did not correctly reflect the City's intention. The City will not choose a section (four sections in this RFP). Solution as used in this clause refers to the awarding of a contract in two or more sections to a single Bidder if there is significant financial and technological advantages for the City to do so. As per the revised clause "B21.9.2 Notwithstanding B22.3, the City shall not be obligated to award any Section to the responsible

Bidder submitting the most advantageous offer for that Section and shall have the right to choose the solution which is in its best interests.

- Q4 Can the City confirm that notwithstanding any term or condition found in this RFP or the City's general terms and conditions (part C), that the RFP shall be awarded by section in its entirety, or not awarded at all?
  - A4 Each section will be evaluated on its own merits. Each section will be awarded as a whole. See B21.9.2
- Referencing D2.5.2 & E4.7 Clarity required with respect to quantities Assuming the Bidder has met all terms and conditions of the contract, and assuming the City has not given notice to cancel the Bidder's contract, does the City have the option of procuring a section or portions of there in, from another supplier?
  - A5 If the Contractor cannot supply a cellular voice, voice and data or data only service that meets the needs of the City because of a limitation in hardware, software or geographic coverage areas, the City may procure only such services from another supplier. Every effort will be made to utilize hardware and software from the Contractor but future work yet unconsidered, may make this impossible.
- Q6 Referencing B13.22. Who uses the same financial feeder system as the City of Winnipeg, that we could use as reference?
  - We are not so much interested in references that have the same financial feeder system as the City of Winnipeg as we are in seeing the range of experience the Bidder has had with billing and financial systems integrations. A Bidder's experience shall be evaluated in accordance with B21.
- In some sections of the Request for Proposal we're finding the quote, "references required" doesn't really pertain to that particular item in the Proposal.
  - We have asked for references in these operational areas as we need to assess the experiences of other customers. For each operational aspect we ask about, whether it is seasonal deactivation processes, service level agreements, repair abilities, etc. we will assess your performance and score you accordingly. We place a lot of emphasis on the experience of other customers to assess the level of completeness and maturity of these types of processes as we are not interested in making it up as we go.

We would prefer three references for each area we have indicated "references are required" but in the event you compile a list that consolidates many reference points into groups please note that any consolidated response that is unclear (with the above clarifications on referencing in general considered) will be scored accordingly. Again, the spirit of the reference exercise is to enable you to show us how "deep" you are in these areas.