

CHABS 2024 Request for Proposals – Vendor Questions and Responses (Updated 12/11/2023):

General RFP Question:

RFP 02 – Memorial Regional Health

Having a few conversion problems of the PDF RFP. Do you happen to have a Word version?

(CHABS Response in Red)

Unfortunately, we are unable to provide a word version of the posted RFP. This is to ensure the integrity of the RFP request is maintained. Additionally, in order to ensure that all vendors wishing to bid have access to the same documents, we decline to provide additional formats upon request.

RFP 25 – Summit Community Care/General RFP Contracting Question

Quick clarifying question.

“Since the form 461 has CHA as the customer of record and Rob as the contact, do you sign the contract under CHA with CHA contact as signer or is the HCP authorized to sign on behalf of CHA out of Greenwood Village?”

(CHABS Response in Red)

CHABS is the consortium leader and is the filer on record. There is no place on the Form 461 or accompanying RFP where CHABS is listed as the “customer of record.” We are clearly listed as the “consortium” and the participating sites are listed by HCP number and correspond to the Appendix A of the RFP document.

Additionally, if you look at the RFP document, CHABS role as consortium leader filing on behalf of eligible HCPs for HCF funded services is clearly outlined in the “background” section of this document as well as the contracting arrangement between the vendor and the HCP listed in the Appendix A of the document. It reads, “CHABS works collaboratively with eligible health care providers (HCPs) on funding a wide range of healthcare-related broadband use cases. USAC requires HCP’s to sign a Letter of Agency enabling CHABS to request bids on their behalf. Once the bids are received, HCPs will determine whether they intend to proceed to the contracting phase of the process.” (emphasis added).

Further in the document, under “9. Contracting Provisions” paragraph k states, “All contracts issued because of this RFP will be between the vendor and the HCPs.”

CHABS wants to make that explicitly clear as we have been having issues with vendors misunderstanding CHABS role relative to these RFPs and the services these RFPs potentially fund. Again, to be clear, there is no customer relationship between a vendor and CHABS. Any contract that results as an outcome of our RFP process is between the vendor and the HCP, who is the customer on record. There are no exceptions to this arrangement in either the RFP document or the Form 461.

RFP 39 – Diversus Health/General RFP Question:

Would you please send an email to Diversus and ask them to extend the deadline until next week?

(CHABS Response in Red)

Unfortunately, CHABS or the HCP cannot extend the deadline. It is a hard deadline set by USAC that corresponds to the allowable contract selection date (ACSD). To change that date, the current RFP would have to be withdrawn and a new RFP submitted. Doing so would push the HCP’s ability to contract for services once the ACSD has passed and accordingly shorten their timeline to work with service providers to get contracts for new services in place, if they choose to go that route, once the RFP closes. As such, we respectfully request all responding service providers meet the posted ACSD.

RFP 46 – Valley Wide/General RFP Question:

I heard back from a couple of vendors who said that when they try to click on the link in the RFP 1 column, nothing happens. So I clicked on the USAC posted services link and found our application:

HCF	RHC46100006684	17212	CHA Broadband Services	2024	CONSORTIUM
-----	----------------	-------	------------------------	------	------------

Then clicked on the RFP 1 link:

Link to FCC Form PDF	RFP Submitted	RFP 1	RFP 2	RFP 3
<a href="http://public...	1	<a href=...		
<a href="http://public...	1	<a href=...		
<a href="http://public...	1	<a href=...		
<a href="http://public...	1	<a href=...		

And nothing happened. I have tried the same process in 2 different browsers.

What should I do to have them submit an RFP?

(CHABS Response in Red)

It’s a known issue that USAC is “working to fix.” I apologize for the inconvenience.

For now, they can copy the link and paste it into their browser, and it will open a pdf of the RFP. That’s the best method right now.

Also please instruct vendors to speak with me directly and submit responses to me directly per the instructions in the RFP. Having conversations with prospective vendors could constitute a competitive bidding violation, and I want to avoid us having to forfeit any potential funds due to that kind of violation. Please direct them to get in touch with me directly with any questions or submissions.

RFP 65 – Boulder Community Health - Equipment:
(CHABS Responses in Red)

Questions

1. Section 5: CHABS Consortium Healthcare Provider Requests: *“For requests seeking support for services or equipment that include an ineligible component, vendor should provide pricing for a comparable service or piece of equipment that includes only eligible components.”* Wireless Access Points are considered internal networks and therefore ineligible with the Rural Healthcare Program. Please advise how the service provider should address the quoted statement. Should the service provider state that these components are ineligible?

CHABS respectfully disagrees with the contention that wireless access points are ineligible for support under the FCC’s Rural Healthcare Program. This question misunderstands how the FCC’s Rural Healthcare Program is configured. Please note, the Rural Healthcare Program (RHC) is composed of two parts: 1) Telecom Program and 2) Healthcare Connect Fund. While equipment is not eligible for support under the Telecom Program, it is in fact eligible in the Healthcare Connect Fund. CHABS does not participate in the Telecom Program. As such, wireless access points can be bid and requested for funding.

2. Regarding the complete solution: please confirm installation and managed services are required for the network components and locations listed in Appendix A.

Per Appendix A, which states, “please include any and all costs including installation, licensing, software and, warranty support to make equipment functional” CHABS can confirm that quotes for installation should be included in the bid. However, The HCP does not need managed services.

Please keep in mind however that all bids are a proposed solution, and the HCP has the discretion to select or reject a proposal in part or whole. Upon acceptance, the HCP has the discretion to choose which services in the bid it will accept. CHABS therefore recommends that any vendor wishing to bid, provide an itemized cost breakdown that would allow the HCP the ability to weigh the cost effectiveness of choosing to proceed with all or some combination of the services in the proposed solution.

3. For Managed Security Services; please provide the number of locations, number of devices, software applications, and hardware for each HCP location as defined in Appendix A.

Per the HCP’s clarification, the primary need is for hardware. The HCP does not wish to submit for any professional services or managed services.

RFP 52 – Jefferson Center for Mental Health:

- 4851 Independence Street Suite 100, Wheat Ridge, Colorado - What is the Z-location for the 100M EPL that is being requested? This service needs a z-location to have it quoted.
- 7495 West 29th Avenue, Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033 - We do not offer 75M for ENS circuits. Can we quote 80M?

(CHABS Response in Red)

- HCP not requesting an EPL. We are asking the location to have an ENS circuit like the rest of our locations.
- This location is closed. Bidding vendors can disregard quoting services for this location.