



Q+A – RFP 894894

Question 1: On Page 9, Section 3.d.i of the RFP document, you list “East Lansing Locations – 400 call paths (total between both sites)”. Are you able to clarify this? Are you looking for 200 call paths per site? Or are you hoping that at any given time, either site could have 400 call paths?

Answer: 200 Call paths per each connected location into the Main MSU Campus. These provide for redundancy and risk mitigation. Each East Lansing location (2 of the 3) should be able to handle 400 concurrently connected calls, or 200 each if your service meters connected calls.

Question 2: Are you looking for a specific contract term?

Answer: We are looking for a 3 or 5 year contract term.

Question 3: Do you have toll free? Are you looking to have your toll free be a part of this SIP solution?

Answer: Yes we have current providers under contract for Toll Free service that we utilize. Toll free service is not a part of this RFP.

Question 4: In Section 1 Background of the RFP document, you state “Michigan State University has campuses at the following locations that are currently provided local hand-off service.” Can you further explain/clarify what you mean by “local hand-off service”?

Answer: MSU’s extended sites include Flint, Detroit and Grand Rapids.

The expectation is that primary service is provided to MSU’s East Lansing campus for all numbers associated with the account. Should those locations become orphaned due to network connectivity issues where they are no longer able to connect with the main site, calls should be able to be placed at those locations without dependency on the East Lansing site. Put another way, all sites should be able to place and receive calls on their own should they need to.

Question 5: We would like to ask if an extension to this RFP is possible past the current due date of 10/3/25. We want to ensure that we can provide the best possible solution along with the best possible pricing.

Answer: Based on the timeline for this project, we can extend the proposal due date to October 8, 2025 at 3:00pm Eastern.

Question 6: Question 1 on RFP #894894 PSTN Connectivity Phone Services from Pages 8-9. Of the 19,000 active DID’s, how many require E911 services?

Answer: MSU is expecting that all approximately 19,000 active DID’s have e911 records. These records would be static locations, but need to be updated on a regular basis as those users move between and within facilities on our campuses. Unused DID’s within the DID block will need to be able to add static 911 records as they are activated.

Question 7: In “RFP-894894-MSA,” Page 1, Section 2 This section states that the term is for 1 year. However, the pricing term isn’t stated in the RFP itself. May MSU clarify the pricing term please?

Answer: MSU is asking for 3 year pricing for this contract.



Question 8: Additionally, would MSU be amenable to reviewing our specific terms and conditions of service, not as a replacement of this MSA, but as an addendum to it?

Answer: You may propose your specific terms and conditions and we will evaluate them during the review process.

Question 9: In “RFP-894894” page 11, MSU asks for international calling in their pricing sheet. May MSU please provide us a list of countries included in your international call data?

Answer: Please see separate PDF list of the countries included in MSU’s international call data.

Question 10: In “RFP-894894” page 11, may MSU please clarify if you want the per unit pricing in a separate table from the original pricing sheet?

Answer: Please provide the Total Cost of Ownership in the table on page 11 and complete the pricing table on page 12.

Question 11: In “RFP-894894” page 11, you list a separate column for “SIP Trunking” and “Call Paths.” May MSU please clarify what they are looking for in the “SIP Trunking” column? Would vendors be able to modify the pricing sheet to reflect pricing that would combine those two columns? For example, Granite prices out call paths as SIP Call Paths and thus making one of the columns redundant.

Answer: Yes.

Question 12: On page 12 of “RFP-894894,” when filling out the total cost of ownership pricing table, may MSU please clarify within locations A, B and C, vendors only need to provide pricing for two of those locations? Or all three?

Answer: MSU is expecting service to be provided to 2 of the 3 possible East Lansing locations. MSU is expecting to also provide service to the locations in Detroit, Flint and Grand Rapids as well.

Question 13: On the bottom of every page in “RFP-894894” it states, “Release date: 08/23/24.” Was this RFP previously released last August?

Answer: The date at the bottom is the release date of the current version of the RFP template document.

Question 14: On page 10 of “RFP-894894,” you ask, “Does your solution support API access for automation and 3rd party application integration?” May MSU please elaborate/clarify this question please?

Answer: Some vendors offer the possibility to make changes to their account via API calls (REST calls), such as by activating services, changing static 911 records, enabling features such as call forwarding, etc. If this an option, please elaborate on the solution.

Question 15: On page 2 of “RFP-894894,” you list that the “Estimated Contract Award” will be issued sometime in October/November of 2025. What are MSU’s expectations regarding project rollout? When do you need the project completed by

Answer: During the award phase, MSU expects to work on the final deployment schedule. It is understood that some vendors will require some time to complete a fiber deployment and port DIDs, and that schedule will determine the project schedule. It is expected that both parties will work to deploy the solution in a reasonable, but persistent timeline.



Question 16: Regarding pages 8 & 11 of “RFP-894894,” May MSU please provide us a list of how many DIDs are at each location to properly price an accurate number of DIDs at each location in the pricing sheet?

Answer: MSU does not currently pin DIDs to a particular location, but total DIDs include:

Location	NXX	DIDs
Lansing	517-432-XXXX	9999
Lansing	517-353-XXXX	9999
Lansing	517-884-XXXX	9999
Lansing	517-355-XXXX	9999
Lansing	517-364-XXXX	12
Grand Rapids	616-234-26XX	100
Grand Rapids	616-234-27XX	100
Grand Rapids	616-234-28XX	50
Detroit	313-578-96XX	100
Detroit	313-578-97XX	100

Question 17: On page 6 of “RFP-894894” regarding references, may you please clarify the question “What role did your company play?” Does MSU mean the reference’s company’s role or the vendor’s role?

Answer: Please provide the role you as the vendor played in the project.

Question 18: Page 8 - Michigan State University has campuses at the following locations that are currently provided local hand-off service: 15 Michigan St Grand Rapids, MI 49503 (Secchia Center) 200 E. First St Flint, MI 48502 (Flint Medical Center) 4707 St Antoine St Detroit, MI 48201 (MSU Detroit Medical Center)

Please explain what is meant by local hand-off service to the off-campus locations listed above. Are these connections currently through the local telephone company whereas the connections to the East Lansing locations are provided by a carrier?

Answer:

Those facilities are currently served by fiber services to provide SIP service. Current services are based on a fiber node and local SBC. How the respondent provides this service should be detailed and does not necessarily need to match the current service except that a network connection to consume the SIP service is required.



Question 19: Page 9 - The Service Provider will need to deliver a facilities-based service via fiber or copper to each of the following off-campus locations to facilitate service delivery should the existing WAN connections between the East Lansing facility and these locations fail. They should be able to allow regular inbound and outbound calling as well as access to 911 services. a. 15 Michigan St Grand Rapids, MI 49503 (Secchia Medical Center) b. 200 E. First St Flint, MI 48502 (Flint Medical Center) c. 4707 St Antoine St Detroit, MI 48201 (MSU Detroit Medical Center)

Would Sip Trunk Groups over the public internet to the three off-campus locations serving as a failover/backup solution be an acceptable alternative to three facility-based connections?

Answer:

These remote sites have their regular internet connection served by the main campus in East Lansing, MI. The more likely situation is that the network connection between these sites is severed, so it is unlikely that a backup circuit over the public internet would suffice for this scenario.