



Questions & Answers (Q&A)

Architectural and Engineering (A/E) Professional Services for the Telecommunications Hardening, Resiliency, and Redundancy Program

Question # 1:

Reference:

Access Protocol

Question:

Will PRBP or OGP provide a pre-coordinated site visit schedule with the agencies (Police Bureau, Fire Department, etc.), or is it solely the Proponent's responsibility to coordinate access to each of the 343 locations?

Response:

While the PRBP will assisting in assuring that the proponent has access to facilities, it will be the proponents responsibility to duly coordinate each visit, in conjunction with the PRBP and each corresponding entity. "

Question # 2:

Reference:

Access Protocol

Question:

For the inventory of critical communications sites and towers, will agency escort personnel be required to access restricted or high-security areas?

Response:

Proponent should consider that agency personnel will need to be present for all visits."



Question # 3

Question:

The RFP specifies a minimum capacity of 18 kWh for lithium battery systems. Should the design consider future expansion of this capacity, or is this a fixed requirement for all site levels (CSI vs. Police Stations)?

Response:

The 18 kWh lithium-ion battery capacity is interpreted as the minimum baseline requirement. However, based on the RFP language indicating that capacity may be “as determined in the needs assessment” and that configurations should consider operational requirements for each site type, the design should evaluate and recommend site-specific capacities (CSI, Police Stations, etc.), including consideration for scalability or future expansion where operationally justified.

Question # 4:

Reference:

P25 Compatibility

Question:

For the interoperability assessment of P25 radio systems, are there any cybersecurity hardening guidelines issued by PRITS or any other entity that must be specifically incorporated into modernization recommendations?

Response:

The RFP requires the assessment to identify gaps related to current interoperability and cybersecurity standards for P25/LMR systems. Proposers should therefore apply applicable industry standards, federal guidance, and relevant Government of Puerto Rico cybersecurity requirements.



Question # 5:

Reference:

Cooling and Environmental needs.

Question:

The RFP requests evaluation of cooling and environmental control needs. Are newly proposed HVAC systems required to be integrated with the battery backup system, or is backup power intended exclusively for telecommunications equipment?

Response:

The RFP indicates that the battery backup solution is primarily intended to support telecommunications equipment circuits specifically.

Question # 6:

Reference:

Allowance for supplemental services (10%)

Question:

What will be the formal process and estimated approval timeline to activate funds from the Allowance for supplemental services (10%) for specialized studies such as geotechnical or advanced structural analyses?

Response:

The approval for allowance services supplemental services shall only utilized upon prior written authorization form PRBP, following a formal determination that the requested service is necessary for the development and regulation compliance of the project. Proposer Should also anticipate that any supplemental services funded through the allowance is subject to all applicable federal and Puerto Rico laws, regulations and requirements.



Question # 7:

Reference:

Attachment L

Question:

Attachment L details payments at 30%, 60%, and 100% deliverables. Is there any provision for partial payments by groups of completed sites, given the large volume of 343 locations, to facilitate the Proponent's cash flow?

Response:

At the moment there are no additional provisions beyond what is established in Attachment L.

Question # 8

Question:

The RFP indicates that Phase 1 documents do not constitute construction-ready bid packages. Will the Proponent selected for Phase 1 face any restrictions or conflicts of interest in participating in Phase 2 construction or equipment supply?

Response:

Given that Phase 1 services under this RFP involve a planning-level initial assessment, the successful proponent will not be eligible to participate in any subsequent Phase 2 procurement for the design-build implementation of the same facilities. This restriction is intended to avoid any actual or perceived organizational conflicts of interest arising from a proponent's prior involvement in the preparation of the design documents.

Question # 9:

Reference:

3.3 CDBG-MIT Grant Requirements

Question:

Are there specific percentage targets for contracting with Section 3-eligible companies or SMWOB (Minority/Women-Owned Businesses) that PRBP considers as "minimum acceptable" to achieve maximum scoring in this category?



Response:

As stated in the RFP (Please see section 3.3: CDBG-MIT Grant Requirements), PROMB and PRBP encourage Proposers to engage local subcontractors, professionals, and service providers headquartered in Puerto Rico to the greatest extent possible and recognize their obligation to promote maximum feasible participation by small businesses, minority businesses, women's business enterprises, veteran-owned businesses, and labor surplus area firms consistent with 2 C.F.R. § 200.321. However, at this time, PRBP has not established fixed minimum percentage participation requirements or mandatory numerical thresholds for, Minority-Owned Businesses, Women-Owned Businesses or Veteran-Owned Businesses, Labor Surplus area firms for purposes of proposal automatic maximum scoring.

Question # 10:

Reference:

Bid Bond / Performance Bond

Question:

What are the Bid and/or Payment and Performance bond requirements, if any?

Response:

At this time, PRBP does not anticipate requiring a Bid Bond for the submission of proposals under this RFP, as the solicitation is for professional Architectural and Engineering (A/E) Services and not for construction services. However, PRBP reserves the right, to require bonds, guarantees, or other financial assurances during contract negotiations or contract performance if deemed necessary to protect the interests of the Program, address project-specific risks, or comply with applicable federal and Commonwealth requirements.

Question # 11

Question:

The asterisk (*) note on page 4 of the RFP states that ""Proposers shall submit one (1) electronic copy of their proposal through the Smart Island platform at www.smartisland.pr.gov", but Section 7 (p. 40) states that ""All proposals shall be submitted electronically via e-mail to the following email address (also specified in this RFP): prbif@smartisland.pr.gov". Please clarify.



Response:

All proposals should be submitted via the smartisland portal as the first option. In the case that any proponent were to have any issues uploading their proposal via the smartisland portal, then they may opt for the alternative method.

Question # 12

Question:

Section 2.6 of the RFP (p. 12) states that ""Submissions shall consist of a single PDF file not exceeding 10 MB and must include all required exhibits and/or attachments in order to be deemed complete."" Including all required documents in a single PDF file can make it difficult to keep the file under 10 MB. Is it possible to increase the maximum size to 20 or 30 MB?

Response:

Files must be kept under 10 MB. "

Question # 13

Question:

RFP Exhibits list on page 60 refers to Exhibit 1 - PRTRP-Locations, and this Exhibit 1 is empty on page 96. Please provide the referenced information or confirm whether this refers to the provided KMZ file.

Response:

Please refer to KMZ file which was shared on the smart island RFP page titled: ""KMZ | Locations""

Question # 14

Question:

Can you confirm the specific locations referred to in Section 1.4 as "PR Gov Critical Communications Site (9)"?

Response:

Please refer to KMZ file which was shared on the smart island RFP page titled: ""KMZ | Locations".



Question # 15

Question:

Please confirm the quantity of locations to be assessed - the RFP refers to both 343 and 453 "FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THREE -343)". This clarification will help us better estimate the level of effort and logistics required.

Response:

The total number of sites should be 343.

Question # 16

Question:

Can you confirm whether the LMR inventory includes mobile radios assigned to users/vehicles or is it limited to fixed infrastructure under the CDBG-MIT eligibility criteria?

Response:

It is limited to fixed infrastructure under the CBDG-MIT eligibility criteria"

Question # 17

Question:

Does the PRBP/OMB or the Agencies have updated inventories of existing equipment, network diagrams, maintenance contracts and available technical information?

Response:

The existing inventory is not updated; the scope of this engagement is to obtain an accurate and reliable inventory.

Question # 18

Question:

Will testing of current electrical system requirements be needed to properly size the backup resilience systems? If so, will testing need to be conducted over a full week and certified by a licensed professional?



Response:

The RFP requires the Proposer to evaluate existing electrical loads, battery runtime, and operational requirements necessary to support backup resiliency system recommendations. Any studies, analyses, or deliverables requiring professional certification under applicable laws or regulations shall be certified by the appropriately licensed professional.

Question # 19

Question:

Can PRBP clarify what types of services are expected to be covered under the 10% allowance budget? How do you expect this allowance to be authorized and tracked?

Response:

As per the footnote included on p. 94 of the RFP:

"In accordance with the requirements of this RFP, planning-level studies and technical analyses that are dependent on site-specific conditions, specialized expertise, or additional technical evaluation are excluded from the base scope of services and are addressed through a separate Allowance Budget. This allowance is intended to support, as needed and upon authorization, services including but not limited to specialized engineering analyses, structural evaluations beyond standard condition assessments, environmental and other site-specific technical studies, geotechnical investigations, telecommunications systems analysis, planning-level permitting and regulatory coordination, and other supplemental technical evaluations required to inform future project phases. The allowance has been established based on anticipated levels of effort and historical benchmarks for comparable projects and represents approximately ten percent (10%) of the total Phase 1 Initial Assessment services cost."



Question # 20

Question:

Does the PRBP/OMB have specific criteria to determine eligibility of equipment and improvements under CDBG-MIT?

Response:

For further guidance as it pertains to the solicited information, PRBP ask that proponents refer to Section 3 of the RFP. Should a proponent be interested in obtaining further guidance, they may refer to the recuperacion.pr.gov portal for more detailed information about the grant requirements.

Question # 21:

Question:

In the event that multiple proponents are selected, how will the scope be divided (e.g., by region, discipline, or task orders)?

Response:

At the moment, the PRBP is not considering selecting multiple proposals. In the event the Evaluation Committee should consider adjudicating the RFP to multiple proponents, they will determine the best approach and solicit additional information (as needed) to ensure effective coordination.

Question # 22:

Question:

We understand that Professional Engineer (PE) or Registered Architect (RA) licenses are required for the key staff. Based on the technical scope of the RFP, will specialized professional profiles also be required such as Structural Engineers, Licensed Electrical Engineers, Telecommunications experts, etc.?

Response:

PRBP will only require professional designations included in the RFP for select key staff, however it is the proponents responsibility to preset a team with the profesional background to ensure the projects success.



Question # 23:

Question:

How will PRBP evaluate lump-sum versus hourly pricing approaches in the Cost Form?

Response:

As indicated in Section G of the RFP, Proposers are encouraged to present pricing on an hourly-rate basis rather than solely as a flat fee, unless otherwise justified. This preference is intended to promote pricing transparency, facilitate cost reasonableness evaluations, and support potential adjustments associated with project scope change or supplemental services. In the event a Contract is awarded pursuant to this RFP, Proposers are hereby advised that their budget breakdown and/or proposed pricing structure could be reasonably updated/adjusted following well-grounded market conditions.

Question # 24:

Question:

We understand that the three tables in the Cost Form are intended to sum to the same Total Cost - please confirm.

Response:

Total cost for tables I & III should match, however for table II, the proponent must provide the rate per hour for each resource included per location. For further guidance, please refer to Section G of the RFP."

Question # 25:

Question:

Will invoices be accepted on a monthly basis based on the percentage of completion of each main task defined in Cost Table 1?

Response:

PRBP anticipates requiring monthly progress reports throughout the term of the contract to document project status, activities performed, percentage of completion and issues requiring attention. However, invoicing is expected to be tied to the completion and acceptance of each deliverables. All invoices will remain subject to PRBP review.



Question # 26:

Question:

Please confirm the authoritative total number of PRTRP-Locations at 343. (Section 1.4 of the RFP writes out FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THREE but enumerates 343 locations).

Response:

The total number of sites should be three hundred and forty three (343)."

Question # 27:

Question:

Will the scope include infrastructure (wireless tower sites, huts, base stations, colocations and other communications-related infrastructure) beyond the listed 343 locations? Are these assets (e.g., towers) owned or leased? If leased, will the available, and if so, will they be provided?

Response:

Proponent should only refer to Section 3 of the RFP for the full. Statement of Work for this project. Also, the only locations which should be considered by the proponent are the ones listed on the KMZ.

As for the ownership, this is information that will be provided to the selected proponent (as needed).

Question # 28:

Question:

Does the scope include tasks associated with the inventory and assessment of backhaul infrastructure? What are the associated backhaul network fiber miles? Is the backhaul infrastructure owned or leased? If leased, will the Proposer be granted access?

Response:

Proposer should consider that they will be provided access to all locations.

For additional information related to the scope of work for the RFP, please refer to Section 3 of the RFP, particularly p. 14.



Question # 29:

Question:

Is there a complete asset inventory list or will we be discovering and identifying assets as we proceed?

Response:

Proponent should consider that they will be establishing a new inventory without any prior information. The scope of this engagement is to obtain an accurate and reliable inventory.

Question # 30:

Question:

Are the assets under the stewardship of more than one government entity? If so, will there be a single point of government contact that will manage and coordinate interaction with all the entities?

Response:

All coordination activities will be managed in conjunction with the PRBP personnel. "

Question # 31:

Question:

Will PRBP provide a site access coordination protocol and agency POC list at NTP? Are any PRTRP locations on federal, military, or restricted property requiring independent clearance?

Response:

Proponent will be provided with all needed information to ensure effective coordination with government entities. Proponents should not assume that any of the locations will require independent clearance.



Question # 32:

Question:

Some bullet points in the scope imply the performance of actual tasks versus a review. For instance, “Install sensors for temps, humidity, water, smoke. Is this an oversight or intended as part of the Phase 1 assessment?”

Response:

RFP’s overall scope and the repeated references to planning-level assessments, studies, recommendations, and conceptual deliverables, Phase 1 is limited to assessment and planning activities rather than physical implementation or construction. References such as “install sensors for temps, humidity, water, and smoke” are interpreted as items to be evaluated and recommended as part of the Initial Assessment and mitigation strategy, not as requirements for actual installation during Phase 1 services.

Question # 33:

Question:

Will the Government Parties provide a centralized geodatabase (e.g., ArcGIS) containing precise coordinates, current equipment manifests, and historical maintenance logs for all 343 locations, or are these implicit deliverables?

Response:

Proposers should assume responsibility for conducting the required inventories, field verification, data collection, and documentation activities identified in the Scope of Work.

Question # 34:

Question:

Documentation Quality: What is the current availability and accuracy of asset documentation, including:

- as-built and other site documentation
- service, maintenance and replacement logs
- existing service and equipment agreements and contracts



If available, can you provide an approximate quantity of each document type? In what form and location are these documents? Are they centralized or scattered throughout the system?

Response:

Proposers should anticipate that documentation quality and availability may vary by location and should include reasonable assumptions for field verification, data validation, and document consolidation activities as part of the Initial Assessment effort.

Question # 35:

Question:

Does the RFP require a detailed audit, inventory and compilation of equipment, maintenance logs and contracts or is general verification and issue identification sufficient? If the PRBP requires a thorough audit, does it want each asset tagged with a sequentially numbered official sticker which is logged in the asset detail?

Response:

The RFP requires a detailed inventory and assessment of telecommunications, radio, power, generator, and related infrastructure systems sufficient to support the Initial Assessment, resiliency evaluation, lifecycle planning, interoperability analysis, and future implementation planning. This includes documentation of equipment characteristics, maintenance information, and existing service agreements as identified in the Scope of Work.

Question # 36:

Question:

Are Proposers expected to perform full structural and electrical surveys for every site, or is a full evaluation needed only on select mission critical facilities?

Response:

Proposers should perform evaluations sufficient to identify existing conditions, vulnerabilities, resiliency gaps, and mitigation requirements consistent with the objectives of the Initial Assessment phase. Where site conditions, operational criticality, or observed deficiencies warrant additional analysis, Proposers should recommend more detailed structural or electrical evaluations as part of the planning-level assessment and mitigation strategy."



Question # 37:

Question:

Does the PRPB or other agency have access to special pricing arrangements (e.g., government discounts) for hardware equipment and service contracts? Will this pricing be available to the Proposer to use in preparing their cost estimates?

Response:

As per Section 2.4 of the RFP: ""the PRBP will determine whether a response is appropriate or necessary, subject to the disclaimers and reservation of rights included in Section 9.0 of this RFP.

Question # 38:

Question:

With respect to equipment replacement and lifecycle management, does PRPB have a preferred methodology?

Response:

PRBP does not prescribe a specific proprietary or mandatory lifecycle management methodology for equipment replacement planning.

Question # 39:

Question:

Should the inventory of Land Mobile Radio (LMR) equipment include field units (portables/mobiles), or is the assessment limited to fixed infrastructure (repeaters, base stations, and controllers)?

Response:

Proposers may therefore assume that fixed infrastructure is the primary assessment focus, while field/mobile/portable radio inventories should be documented to the extent necessary to evaluate interoperability, operational dependencies, and system-wide communications capabilities.



Question # 40:

Reference:

Technical Specifications

Question:

Section D requires proposers to describe how they will leverage existing infrastructure and accommodate PRBP's design philosophy as a scored narrative element. Is there a PRBP Design Standards document, resiliency master plan, or preferred technology framework that proposers should reference? Is there a preferred battery chemistry, backhaul type, or P25 phase standard?

Response:

Proposers should apply industry best practices and appropriate engineering standards relevant to public-safety telecommunications infrastructure, resiliency, interoperability, and continuity of operations when developing their proposed technical approach and recommendations.

Question # 41:

Reference:

Technical Specifications

Question:

The RFP requires a complete LMR frequency inventory and assessment of interoperability gaps. Is FCC license verification, frequency coordination, and identification of lapsed or expiring licenses within the A&E scope of work?

Response:

Yes the identification and validation is part of the A&E scope of work.



Question # 42:

Reference:

Technical Specifications

Question:

Backhaul Preferences: Does the OMB have a preferred satellite provider or technical standards for the tertiary backhaul options (VSAT, LEO, or MEO)?

Response:

As this is a component which is mostly needed for the preliminary design which will be dependent on the findings of the initial assesment, the PRBP will not be providing guidance for any design components as a part of this RFP.

Question # 43:

Reference:

Technical Specifications

Question:

Fire Suppression: Does the OMB require Clean Agent fire suppression for all three hundred and forty three (343) sites, or only for the 9 Critical Communications Sites?

Response:

Proposers should evaluate fire suppression needs on a site-specific basis and provide recommendations consistent with applicable codes.

Question # 44:

Reference:

Timeline and Deliverables

Question:

What is PRPB's anticipated duration for completion of tasks outlined in the RFP? Does PRPB have a priority or preferred order of completion by task, technology, or geographic location?



Response:

Proponents should consider a maximum duration of 1 year. As for any priority, the proponent should consider what is most effective for their proposed implementation of project activities.

Question # 45:

Reference:

Timeline and Deliverables

Question:

Review Cycles: What is the anticipated duration for the Government Parties to provide comments on the 30%, 60%, and 90% progressive deliverables?

Response:

PRBP anticipates a review cycle of approximately 30-45 days for review and approval of deliverables, as well as payment processing depending on the level of effort.

Question # 46:

Reference:

Timeline and Deliverables

Question:

As Sections 3.4 and Tasks 1.2-1.4 consistently reference 90% completion as the final progressive deliverable submission, does the Attachment L 100% cost milestone represent a separate final acceptance event from the 90% deliverable submission, and if so what triggers it?

Response:

After the Phase 1 deliverable completion, a ten percent (10%) of the final payment shall be retained until PRBP has finished its final inspection and resulting observations have been addressed by the Selected Proponent.



Question # 47:

Reference:

Timeline and Deliverables

Question:

Milestone Schedule: Is there a fixed "Ready to Work" date following contract execution, and how will delays in government review affect the performance period?

Response:

After Notice To Proceed is emitted, resources should be prepared to begin work within two (2) weeks of the contemplated contract execution date.

Question # 48:

Reference:

Content

Question:

The RFP requires Proposers to describe collaboration touch points with "the Oversight Management firm" (specifically on pages 13 and 93) but does not disclose the entity's name, organizational structure, nor decision authority. Section D explicitly scores coordination planning with this entity. Who is the Oversight Management firm, what is their review authority, and what are typical turnaround times for comment cycles?

Response:

Proposers should assume that the Oversight Management firm will participate in technical review, coordination, and quality oversight activities in conjunction with PRBP/OMB and PRDOH representatives. Any detailed governance structure, review authority, communication protocols, and expected review timelines would likely be further defined during contract kickoff and project execution coordination.



Question # 49:

Reference:

Budget and Financials

Question:

Allowance Budget Specifics: What is the total dollar value of the "Allowance Budget," and what specific specialized studies (e.g., geotechnical or environmental) are intended to be covered by it?

Response:

As per the footnote included on p. 94 of the RFP:

"In accordance with the requirements of this RFP, planning-level studies and technical analyses that are dependent on site-specific conditions, specialized expertise, or additional technical evaluation are excluded from the base scope of services and are addressed through a separate Allowance Budget. This allowance is intended to support, as needed and upon authorization, services including but not limited to specialized engineering analyses, structural evaluations beyond standard condition assessments, environmental and other site-specific technical studies, geotechnical investigations, telecommunications systems analysis, planning-level permitting and regulatory coordination, and other supplemental technical evaluations required to inform future project phases. The allowance has been established based on anticipated levels of effort and historical benchmarks for comparable projects and represents approximately ten percent (10%) of the total Phase 1 Initial Assessment services cost."

Question # 50:

Reference:

Budget and Financials

Question:

Phase 2 Preclusion: Does performing the Phase 1 Initial Assessment and cost estimating preclude the firm or its subcontractors from bidding on the Phase 2 implementation, design-build, or construction management contracts?



Response:

Given that Phase 1 services under this RFP involve a planning-level initial assessment, the successful proponent will not be eligible to participate in any subsequent Phase 2 procurement for the design-build implementation of the same facilities. This restriction is intended to avoid any actual or perceived organizational conflicts of interest arising from a proponent's prior involvement in the preparation of the design documents.

Question # 51:

Reference:

Conflicts of Interest

Question:

Phase 2 Preclusion: Does performing the Phase 1 Initial Assessment and cost estimating preclude the firm or its subcontractors from bidding on the Phase 2 implementation, design-build, or construction management contracts?

Response:

Given that Phase 1 services under this RFP involve a planning-level initial assessment, the successful proponent will not be eligible to participate in any subsequent Phase 2 procurement for the design-build implementation of the same facilities. This restriction is intended to avoid any actual or perceived organizational conflicts of interest arising from a proponent's prior involvement in the preparation of the design documents.

Question # 52:

Reference:

Conflicts of Interest

Question:

Site Observation: Is there a formal period prior to the proposal deadline for Proposers to visit a subset of facilities to verify typical site conditions?

Response:

No, the proponent is not expected to make any site visits prior to the proposal deadline.



Question # 53:

Reference:

Format

Question:

Will the PRBO make available a fillable form or interactive PDF versions of the required RFP forms?

Response:

No, proponents should use formats made available through smartisland portal.

Question # 54:

Reference:

Locations

Question:

Does OMB have a site priority list?

Response:

proponent should consider what is most effective for their proposed implementation of project activities.

Question # 55:

Reference:

Locations

Question:

Section 1.4 of the RFP mentions ""Four Hundred and Fifty-Three (453)"" locations in text, but ""(343)"" in numbers. Furthermore, the KMZ/Excel file only lists 341 sites. Please confirm the exact number of locations to be assessed and provide the missing sites' details if any.

Response:

The total number of sites should be three hundred and forty three (343).



Question # 56:

Reference:

Locations

Question:

Are all sites owned by the government? If not, can we have a list of asset ownership by site?

Response:

Proponents should consider that most sites are owned by government.

Question # 57:

Reference:

Locations

Question:

Is there a public/private database that identifies who owns tower/land?

Response:

No.

Question # 58:

Reference:

Locations

Question:

Do any/all sites have special site access requirements? e.g. keys, codes, head count, time restrictions, escort only, etc.

Response:

The project includes public safety, emergency management, law enforcement, and critical communications facilities, Proposers should anticipate that certain sites may require coordinated access procedures, escorts, security clearances, scheduling restrictions, or other operational controls.



Question # 59:

Reference:

Locations

Question:

Please define the foreseen personnel or resources available to coordinate site visits.

Response:

The personnel, agency representatives, and coordination resources that will support scheduling and access for site visits are expected to be defined during the contracting and project kickoff process.

Question # 60:

Reference:

Site Data Collection

Question:

Phase 1 requires data often stored off-site (acquisition dates, vehicle radio logs, generator maintenance records). What type of documentation is/will be available? i.e. As-built CDs, structural analysis, equipment acquisition records, historical maintenance records, etc.

Response:

This item is part of the assessment 1st phase and will be evaluated and validated as part of the project assessment activities.

Question # 61:

Reference:

Site Data Collection

Question:

What mechanism or portal will be provided to access these records and confirm equipment assignments?



Response:

Any available systems, repositories, agency records, or coordination mechanisms for accessing and validating equipment inventories and assignments are expected to be identified and coordinated during the project kickoff process.

Question # 62:

Reference:

Site Data Collection

Question:

What OEM equipment is used on existing sites? e.g. Motorola, L3 Harris, Kenwood

Response:

This item is part of the assessment 1st phase and will be evaluated and validated as part of the project assessment activities.

Question # 63:

Reference:

Equipment

Question:

If equipment upgrades are required, does OMB have preferred equipment or a preferred equipment OEM? e.g. Motorola, L3 Harris, Kenwood

Response:

CDBG-MIT and federally funded projects do not allow the specification of particular brands or equipment models.



Question # 64:

Reference:

Documents

Question:

Can we get a structure type by location with the KMZ file?

Response:

KMZ files are available for download on the Smart Island Website.

Question # 65:

Reference:

Contract

Question:

Is there an expected timeline/completion date for Phase 1 activities?

Response:

12 months "

Question # 66:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Will details on the fiber/microwave backhaul network architecture be provided?

Response:

This item is part of the assessment 1st phase and will be evaluated and validated as part of the project assessment activities.



Question # 67:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Are existing towers expected to be climbable?

Response:

Tower conditions may vary by site and that some structures may have access limitations, operational restrictions, or safety concerns that could affect climbability.

Question # 68:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Are existing microwave path studies and performance characteristics available?

Response:

The availability, completeness, and accuracy of existing microwave engineering documentation may vary by site and agency. To the extent existing studies, performance data, or operational records are available, such information may be provided during project execution and coordination activities.

Question # 69:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Will service provider contracts be provided?

Response:



This item is part of the assessment 1st phase and will be evaluated and validated as part of the project assessment activities.

Question # 70:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Is FAA/ASR part of the tower inventorying; if yes will FRNs be provided?

Response:

Available regulatory documentation may vary by site and should include reasonable assumptions for verification and documentation activities necessary to support the Initial Assessment objectives.

Question # 71:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Is FCC licensing part of the initial antenna inventorying?

Response:

Yes"

Question # 72:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Will a site visit to any representative project locations (based on project characteristics) be conducted prior to proposal submission?

Response:

No.



Question # 73:

Reference:

Cost Form

Question:

Please clarify the required level of deliverables. Pages 21–22 reference deliverables at the 30%, 60%, and 90% stages, while page 93 (Cost Form – Attachment L) references 30%, 60%, and 100%.

Response:

30%, 60%, 90% and 100%.

Question # 74:

Reference:

Proposal Submission

Question:

Please confirm the official method of proposal submission: portal or email. The RFP Schedule and Section 2.6 (Proposal Submission) indicate that proposals must be submitted via the Smart Island platform (www.smartisland.pr.gov), while Section 7.1 (General Proposal Requirements) states that proposals should be submitted by email to prbif@smartisland.pr.gov.

Response:

All proposals should be submitted via the smartisland portal as the first option. In the case that any proponent were to have any issues uploading their proposal via the smartisland portal, then they may opt for the alternative method.

Question # 75:

Question:

Please provide a copy of the Services Agreement for this project.

Response:



The PRBP will not be providing template service agreements at this time. Proponents are advised to refer to the Comptrollers Contract registry for further guidance."

Question # 76:

Reference:

Locations

Question:

The mapping of the FOUR HUNDRED number (453) conflicts with the parenthetical number (343). This AND FIFTY-THREE (343) locations. However, the written discrepancy represents a core scope-of-work issue. The accurate number of PRTRP-Locations is essential for determining site-visit schedules, resource distribution, field-team staffing, and lump-sum pricing in Attachment L. Without clear confirmation of the site count, proposers cannot develop an accurate cost proposal.

Response:

The total number of sites should be 343 and KMZ files are available for download on the Smart Island Website.

Question # 77:

Reference:

Proposal Submission

Question:

Section 2.6 mandates submission exclusively through the Smart Island portal (www.smartisland.pr.gov) as ""a single PDF file not exceeding 10 MB."" Section 7.1 states: ""All proposals shall be submitted electronically via e-mail to the following email address: prbif@smartisland.pr.gov."" These are two distinct, mutually exclusive submission mechanisms.

Response:

All proposals should be submitted via the smartisland portal as the first option. In the case that any proponent were to have any issues uploading their proposal via the smartisland portal, then they may opt for the alternative method.



Question # 78:

Reference:

Joint ventures, consortia and professional pools

Question:

Section 7.3, under Section B: Background on Firm, states: "Joint ventures, consortia, professional pools, and similar teaming arrangements may submit proposals under this RFP, provided that the proposal identifies a prime Proposer."

However, Section 7.3, under "Section D: Work Plan," states the direct opposite: "the PRBP will not accept proposals from joint ventures, consortia, syndicates, professional pools, or entities with similar arrangements." These statements are irreconcilable and appear within the same section (7.3), creating an absolute contradiction that directly determines the legal eligibility of entire classes of prospective proposers.

Response:

Both statements distinguish each other to the extent that Section 7.3(D) specifically provides that "joint ventures" and such are not acceptable if both entities have "similar arrangements". In fact, Section 7.3(B) requires that for a "prime Proposer" to be identified and also notes that, for the Selected Proponent subcontract, it must seek PRBP prior written approval.

Question # 79:

Reference:

Proposal Submission

Question:

Section 7.1 states in bold capitals: "PROPOSALS SHALL BE VALID FOR A PERIOD OF NINETY (90) DAYS AFTER THE PROPOSAL DUE DATE." Section 9.1 states: "Proposers shall be bound by their proposals only for the sixty (60) days specified in this RFP." The 30-day difference in the binding. validity period has



direct financial implications for proposers, including commitments to pricing stability, subcontractor hold requirements, insurance certificate terms, and legal exposure during the evaluation period.

Response:

This was an oversight by the PRBP. Proponents shall be bound by the 90 day period stated on section 7.1 of the RFP.

Question # 80:

Reference:

Locations

Question:

Page 96 references ""Exhibit 1 – PRTRP-Locations"" and states:

"The Proposer shall acknowledge review of Exhibit 1 – PRTRP Locations and confirm that its proposal accounts for the full site inventory identified therein." However, Exhibit 1 contains no site data — only a blank acknowledgment instruction. No list, map, table, or dataset of the PRTRP-Locations is provided anywhere in the RFP package. Without the site inventory, proposers cannot assess geographic distribution, site types, travel logistics, or access constraints — all of which are primary cost drivers for a field assessment contract of this scope.

Response:

The total number of sites should be 343 and KMZ files are available for download on the Smart Island Website.

Question # 81:

Reference:

Cost Form

Question:

Attachment L (Cost Form) establishes lump-sum pricing for deliverables at 30%, 60%, and 100% completion. However, the Statement of Work (Sections 3.4, Task 1.2, Task 1.3, and Task 1.4) consistently describes deliverables at 30%, 60%, and 90% completion, with the 90% milestone marking a distinct review and-



revision phase before final delivery. The Cost Form omits the 90% milestone entirely and replaces it with "100%," which the SOW treats as a separate, final submission stage. This misalignment prevents accurate cost allocation across the payment schedule.

Response:

It should be 30%, 60%, 90% and 100%

Question # 82:**Reference:**

Contract

Question:

Section 4.1 defines the required SME as having "at least ten (10) years of experience in related areas such as structural, geotechnical, hydrology, MEP, or other specialized engineering divisions." The entire scope of work (Section 3.1–3.2) centers on telecommunications infrastructure: P25/LMR radio systems, network backhaul, PSAP/dispatch systems, microwave links, satellite systems, and repeater networks. Not a single required SME specialty listed in Table 1 addresses telecommunications engineering, radio-frequency (RF) systems, or public-safety communications — the core technical domain of this contract. This creates a direct mismatch between the staff requirements and the technical demands of the engagement.

Response:

The examples of SME specialties identified in Table 1 are not intended to limit the inclusion of other specialized engineering disciplines relevant to the PRTRP scope. Given the telecommunications-focused nature of the project, Proposers are encouraged to include appropriately qualified telecommunications, RF, microwave, public-safety communications, network infrastructure, and related technical specialists as part of their proposed team structure to support the required assessment and technical evaluation activities.

Question # 83:**Reference:**

Funding

Question:



Section 2.1 states: ""This program will be funded as defined in Section 1.2 Available Funding of this RFP."" Section 1.2, titled "Community Development Block Grant – Mitigation Program,"" contains no subsection titled ""Available Funding."" No section in the RFP is titled ""Available Funding." This cross-reference may cause proposers to misunderstand the applicable funding framework, total funding ceiling, or program-specific compliance obligations.

Response:

Proponent should include cost necessary to ensure the efficient implementation of project activities. No additional funding information will be provided at this time.

Question # 84:**Reference:**

Non -Collusion Affidavit

Question:

Attachment F (Non-Collusion Affidavit) contains the following text: ""to secure any advantage against the Municipality of _____ or any person interested in the proposed contract."" This RFP is issued by the Puerto Rico OMB/PRBP — a Commonwealth instrumentality — not a municipality. The word ""Municipality"" appears to be a carryover from an unrelated municipal procurement template. Proposers are required to swear to this affidavit, and a materially inaccurate instrument may create ambiguity about its legal enforceability.

Response:

PRBP acknowledges that the reference to "Municipality" in Attachment F (Non-Collusion Affidavit) appears to be a template carryover and was not intended to limit, alter, or mischaracterize the identity of the procuring entity for this RFP. For clarification purposes, this procurement is being conducted by the Puerto Rico Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Puerto Rico Broadband Program (PRBP), which operate as components and instrumentalities of the Government of Puerto Rico.

Question # 85:**Reference:**

Public Law 115-123

**Question:**

Section 9.6 (footnote 2, page 56) references ""Public Law 115- 123 Financial Management and Grant Compliance Certification"" and provides a HUD Exchange URL, indicating it is a required compliance document. The associated checklist file (CDBG-MIT Financial Management Grant Compliance Certification Checklist.pdf) is included in the RFP package. Still, it is never listed among the required compliance forms in Section 7.3 (Section I: Compliance Forms), Exhibit 2 (Compliance Evaluation Criteria), or the cover page. It is unclear whether this checklist must be submitted with the proposal or is for reference only.

Response:

Section 9.6 is clear in requiring ""[t]he Proposer [to] provide a description of experience in dealing with these and any other applicable provisions and requirements and affirmatively certify that the Proposer shall comply"" with the laws and regulations listed under said Section.

Question # 86:**Reference:**

Cost Form

Question:

Attachment L (Cost Form, Part II) includes ""Project Manager"" as a distinct billable labor category with a required hourly rate. However, Section 4.1 (Table I: Key Staff Requirements) does not list Project Manager as a required key staff position — only Professional Engineer (PE)/Registered Architect (RA), Engineers/Architects in Training, Subject Matter Expert (SME), and Draftsman are defined. There is no qualification standard, role description, or responsibilities matrix for the Project Manager in the RFP, making it impossible to appropriately staff or price this category.

Response:

Should proponent require the use of a Project Manager, his/her rates must be divulged as an hourly rate in the Proposal. For reference, please refer to Attachment L - Table I.

**Question # 87:****Reference:**

3.3 CDBG-MIT Grant Requirements

Question:

Section 3.3 requires the selected proposer to "adhere to the applicable requirements of the CDBG-DR and CDBG-MIT grants initiatives." This program is funded exclusively under CDBG-MIT (as stated in Sections 1.2 and 1.3). CDBG-DR (Disaster Recovery) and CDBG-MIT (Mitigation) are distinct programs with different Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) requirements, Federal Register notices, eligible activities, and cross-cutting federal requirements. Proposers citing CDBG-DR compliance may incur unnecessary costs, misapply procurement standards, or create audit exposure by conflating the two.

Response:

PRBP acknowledges that this procurement is funded exclusively through the CDBG-MIT program. Accordingly, compliance with CDBG-MIT requirements, including the applicable Federal Register notices, HUD guidance, and related mitigation program requirements, shall govern the performance of the resulting contract. The reference to CDBG-DR in Section 3.3 is intended to recognize the whole regulations framework that can apply to HUD CDBG related funding. Moreover, the Proposer remains responsible for determining if the above-listed requirements have been revised or updated.

Question # 88:**Reference:**

RFP Evaluation

Question:

The RFP establishes two separate evaluation stages: the Compliance Evaluation (Exhibit 2, 100 points, 75% pass threshold) and the Technical Evaluation (Exhibit 3, 100 points). Section 8.2 describes both but provides no formula, weighting, or methodology for combining both scores into a final ranking. It is unclear whether Exhibit 3 scores are additive, whether the



Compliance Evaluation score is factored into the final ranking, or whether Exhibit 3 alone determines the award. This gap prevents proposers from understanding how their scores translate into competitive standing.

Response:

PRBP acknowledges the referenced inconsistency identified in the question. Any incorrect or inconsistent reference to the solicitation will be clarified or corrected through an addendum.

Question # 89:

Reference:

EIT and AIT requirements

Question:

Section 4.1 requires Engineers in Training (EIT) or Architects in Training (AIT) to have ""been a Licensed Engineer or Architect in Training for the last five years in Puerto Rico."" This requirement is ambiguous in three respects: (1) it is unclear whether ""last five years"" means continuous licensure for five consecutive years in Puerto Rico, (2) EIT/AIT designations are typically transitional designations held for 2–5 years before obtaining PE/RA licensure, meaning a 5-year EIT/AIT is likely overdue for full licensure, and (3) mutual recognition or reciprocity for out-of-island EITs working in Puerto Rico is not addressed.

Response:

PRBP confirms that the “Engineers or Architects in Training” category is intended to include individuals with a valid Engineer in Training (EIT) or Architect in Training (AIT) credentials, as applicable under the laws and professional licensing framework of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The intent of this requirement is to establish that EIT or AIT are permitted, as long as the proponent ensures that a licensed professional will be directly supervising these individuals. PRBP may issue a further clarification or revision to the RFP language to clearly distinguish between fully licensed professionals (Professional Engineers/Licensed Architect) and Engineers or Architects in Training (EIT/AIT) in order to avoid ambiguity during proposal preparation and evaluation.



Question # 90:

Reference:

Conflicts of Interest

Question:

Section 8.1 states that "any Proposer that has previously performed for the Government Parties similar, related, and/or incidental services than those considered under the Scope of Work is precluded from participating in this RFP." The terms "similar," "related," and "incidental" are left undefined. Given the broad scope of government A/E work in Puerto Rico — including prior disaster recovery assessments, infrastructure inventories, and telecom-adjacent engineering — this provision could inadvertently exclude the most qualified firms in the market. No mechanism is provided for firms to seek waivers, disclosures, or reviews of mitigation.

Response:

Section 8.1 seeks to avoid potential conflicts of interest. As such, please refer to response provided for Question 8 and 51 for additional context as to said Section.

Question # 91:

Reference:

Allowance Budget

Question:

Sections 5.1 and 5.2 refer to an "Allowance Budget" to cover supplemental services and mandatory reimbursable costs (CIAPR, CAAPPR fees, permit taxes). Attachment L footnote 6 specifies the allowance as "approximately ten percent (10%) of the total Phase 1 Initial Assessment services cost." However, neither the base-contract ceiling nor the allowance's absolute dollar amount is disclosed anywhere in the RFP. Without a disclosed allowance cap, proposers cannot determine whether their supplemental service needs are within budget, price the allowance line on Attachment L (Cost Form, Part III, Item 2), or assess the financial feasibility of the engagement.



Response:

For clarification purposes, the Allowance Budget is intended to function as a provisional and controlled funding mechanism for potential supplemental services, reimbursable expenses, regulatory fees, permit-related costs, and other project-specific items that may become necessary during contract performance but cannot be fully quantified at the time of issuance of the RFP. The reference to “approximately ten percent (10%) of the total Phase 1 Initial Assessment services cost” is intended as a general estimating guideline, not a guaranteed or fixed fund authorization.

Question # 92:

Reference:

Conflicts of Interest

Question:

Section 8.1 states that Proposers that have previously performed ""similar, related, and/or incidental services"" for the Government Parties are precluded from participating. It is unclear whether this restriction applies exclusively to services performed under the PRTRP program or whether it extends to any services performed for any Government of Puerto Rico entity. Given the breadth of architectural, engineering, and telecommunications-related work across Commonwealth agencies, we need clarification on the scope of this exclusion.

Response:

Restriction applies exclusively to services performed under the PRTRP program"

Question # 93:

Reference:

A/E Services

Question:



The terms "similar," "related," and "incidental" services are not defined within the RFP. These terms could be interpreted broadly to include general A/E services, telecommunications work, infrastructure assessments, or disaster recovery programs. Please clarify the specific criteria PRBP will use to determine whether prior services fall within these categories for purposes of proposer eligibility.

Response:

For clarification purposes, the Allowance Budget is intended to function as a provisional and controlled funding mechanism for potential supplemental services, reimbursable expenses, regulatory fees, permit-related costs, and other project-specific items that may become necessary during contract performance but cannot be fully quantified at the time of issuance of the RFP.

Question # 94:**Reference:**

7.3 Proposal Contents and Organization

Question:

Section 7.3 (Section F) requires Proposers to submit three (3) references for similar Design & Engineering services. However, Section 8.1 appears to preclude participation by firms that have previously performed similar services for the Government Parties. These provisions appear contradictory. Please clarify whether firms with relevant and comparable experience — including work performed for Puerto Rico government agencies outside of PRTRP — remain eligible to participate in this RFP.

Response:

PRBP clarifies that prior experience performing services for Puerto Rico government agencies, public corporations, municipalities, instrumentalities, federal agencies, or other governmental entities does not automatically preclude a firm from participating in this procurement. The reference requirements contained in Section 7.3 are intended to allow Proposers to demonstrate relevant qualifications, comparable experience, technical capacity, and successful performance on projects of similar scope, complexity, or technical nature, including projects performed for governmental entities.

Section 8.1 is not intended to categorically prohibit participation by firms that have previously performed services for government entities or public-sector



clients. Rather, Section 8.1 is intended to address actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest that could impair impartiality, create an unfair competitive advantage, compromise procurement integrity, or otherwise materially affect contract performance or compliance.

Question # 95:

Reference:

Conflict of Interest

Question:

The Scope of Work requires site assessments across PRTRP Locations. It is unclear whether firms that have previously performed engineering, construction, telecommunications, or infrastructure work at any of these locations would be considered to have a conflict of interest. Please clarify whether such prior site-specific experience would constitute a disqualifying conflict or whether mitigation measures may be considered.

Response:

Prior site-specific experience would not constitute a disqualifying conflict, however in the case that the PRBP should identify any possible conflicts of interest, then the PRBP will engage with proponents directly to provide notification or to discuss any possible mitigation measures on a case-by-case basis.

Question # 96:

Reference:

Conflicts of Interest

Question:

Section 8.1 indicates that the Government Parties may impose conflict mitigation strategies, including the use of independent subcontractors. However, it is unclear under what conditions mitigation will be accepted instead of disqualification. Please clarify whether Proposers with potential or perceived conflicts may remain eligible through mitigation measures (e.g., firewalls, task segregation, independent subcontracting), and the process for proposing and approving such mitigation.

Response:



The reference requirements contained in Section 7.3 are intended to allow Proposers to demonstrate relevant qualifications, comparable experience, technical capacity, and successful performance on projects of similar scope, complexity, or technical nature, including projects performed for governmental entities.

Question # 97:**Reference:**

Conflicts of Interest

Question:

The RFP does not specify any time limitation on prior services that may trigger a conflict of interest. It is unclear whether this restriction applies to services performed within a specific lookback period (e.g., 3-5 years) or to all historical contracts. Please clarify the applicable timeframe for evaluating prior services under this provision.

Response:

PRBP clarifies that the RFP does not establish a fixed or automatic temporal limitation for evaluating potential conflicts of interest arising from prior services, contractual relationships, professional engagements, or related activities. Conflict-of-interest matters will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis considering the nature, materiality, duration, continuity, and potential impact of the relationship on procurement integrity, impartiality and independent judgment, unfair competitive advantage, program compliance, public trust, and contract performance. For clarification purposes, PRBP generally anticipates focusing its review on recent or ongoing relationships that could reasonably create an actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest in connection with this procurement or the resulting contract. As a general guideline, Proposers are encouraged to disclose relevant relationships, services, engagements, or contracts occurring within approximately the last three (3) to five (5) years where such matters may reasonably relate to the subject matter of this procurement; locations involved; affiliated entities, subcontractors, or consultants; governmental stakeholders or oversight entities; access to non-public or competitively sensitive information; and/or any circumstance that could create an unfair competitive advantage or impair objectivity. The existence of a prior relationship does not automatically require disqualification. Any evaluation of disclosed relationships, conflicts of interest, and proposed mitigation measures shall be conducted consistent with: applicable federal



laws and regulations; 2 C.F.R. Part 200 procurement and conflict-of-interest requirements; applicable HUD, CDBG-MIT, and Puerto Rico Department of Housing requirements; the Puerto Rico Government Ethics Act of 2012 (Act No. 1-2012, as amended); the Anti-Corruption Code for the New Puerto Rico (Act No. 2-2018, as amended); applicable Puerto Rico procurement laws and regulations; applicable professional ethics obligations; and any other applicable federal or Puerto Rico legal authorities governing ethics, integrity, impartiality, procurement compliance, and public contracting.

Question # 98:

Reference:

Attachment A

Question:

Can you provide Attachment A without blank page #71?

Response:

Section 8.1 is not intended to categorically prohibit participation by firms that have previously performed services for government entities or public-sector clients. Rather, Section 8.1 is intended to address actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest that could impair impartiality, create an unfair competitive advantage, compromise procurement integrity, or otherwise materially affect contract performance or compliance.

Question # 99:

Reference:

Attachment E

Question:

Can you provide Attachment E without blank page #78?

Response:

Conflict-of-interest matters will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis considering the nature, materiality, duration, continuity, and potential impact of the relationship on procurement integrity, impartiality and independent judgment, unfair competitive advantage, program compliance, public trust, and contract performance.



Question # 100:

Reference:

Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Question:

Can you arrange the SF-LLL Instructions for Completion of SFLLL Disclosure of Lobbying Activities on one page?

Response:

Proposers shall use in its original format as provided in the RFP package.

Question # 101:

Reference:

Attachment L

Question:

Can you arrange Attachment L into two pages?

Response:

Proposers shall use Attachment L in its original format as provided in the RFP package.

Question # 102:

Reference:

Exhibit 2

Question:

Can you arrange Exhibit 2 into one page?

Response:

Proposers shall use Exhibit 2 in its original format as provided in the RFP package."



Question # 103:

Reference:

Additional Time

Question:

Section 2.3 states that the deadline to submit proposals is May 29, 2026. Also, indicates that the responses to questions will be posted on May 15, 2026. After a brief review of the bid package documentation requirements, given the tight schedule and the limited time available to prepare the proposals after we receive the answers to the questions, we respectfully request additional time to submit the proposals.

Response:

At the moment, the PRBP is not considering any extensions beyond the deadline established in the RFP. Should the PRBP provide any extensions, they will be posted as an addendum on the smartisland portal.

Question # 104:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

The Scope of Work requires comprehensive telecommunications inventories, interoperability assessments, and infrastructure evaluations across all PRTRP-Locations. However, the RFP does not specify whether existing asset inventories, as-built drawings, GIS data, FCC licensing records, network topology diagrams, or prior assessment documentation will be made available to proposers before field activities. The absence of this information materially impacts field assessment durations, staffing assumptions, validation effort, and pricing development. Please clarify what existing telecommunications documentation and datasets, if any, will be provided to the selected proposer(s).

Response:



Proposer is clearly expected to perform comprehensive telecommunications inventories, interoperability assessments, and infrastructure evaluations across all PRTRP-Locations.

Question # 105:

Reference:

6.0 Key Deliverables

Question:

The RFP references numerous deliverables, including dashboards, inventories, reports, GIS-related data, and telecommunications assessments. However, the RFP does not define required templates, deliverable formats, naming conventions, GIS standards, metadata structures, photo documentation requirements, or reporting schemas. Without standardized requirements, proposers cannot accurately estimate the effort required for reporting, data normalization, and quality control. Please clarify whether PRBP/OMB will provide standardized deliverable templates, reporting structures, GIS standards, or asset naming conventions for the required submissions.

Response:

The project contemplates a broad range of structured deliverables, including:

Inventories, assessment reports, dashboards, GPS and mapping-related information, planning-level drawings, technical documentation, and telecommunications infrastructure assessments.

Question # 106:

Reference:

6.0 Key Deliverables

Question:

The Scope of Work references planning-level assessments, technical recommendations, drawings, specifications, and cost estimating activities related to telecommunications infrastructure. However, the RFP does not clearly distinguish whether telecommunications-related deliverables are intended to remain conceptual/planning-level assessments or whether proposers are expected to prepare implementation-ready engineered telecommunications designs. This distinction materially impacts staffing



requirements, professional liability exposure, level-of-effort assumptions, and pricing development. Please clarify the expected level of development for telecommunications deliverables under this procurement.

Response:

Telecommunications-related deliverables are intended to remain at a planning-level and pre-design level of development during Phase 1, rather than constituting final implementation-ready engineered telecommunications designs.

Question # 107:

Reference:

4.0 Staff Requirements

Question:

The Scope of Work includes assessment of telecommunications systems, interoperability, resiliency, and cybersecurity-related considerations. However, the RFP does not define whether cybersecurity activities are limited to observational infrastructure reviews or whether proposers are expected to perform formal cybersecurity audits, vulnerability assessments, penetration testing, or compliance evaluations against standards such as NIST, CJIS, or CISA frameworks. This ambiguity materially affects required staffing, technical scope, liability exposure, and pricing assumptions. Please clarify the intended scope of cybersecurity related assessment activities under this RFP.

Response:

Cybersecurity activities under this RFP are limited to: Infrastructure-level observations, documentation reviews, identification of apparent resiliency and interoperability gaps, high-level cybersecurity considerations associated with P25/LMR systems and network infrastructure.

Question # 108:

Reference:

4.0 Staff Requirements

Question:

The RFP repeatedly references certification of deliverables by licensed professionals and requires compliance with professional engineering



standards. However, it is unclear whether telecommunications-related deliverables prepared by subcontractors or telecommunications specialists must be independently certified by a telecommunications Professional Engineer (PE), or whether certification responsibilities will reside exclusively with the Prime Contractor's licensed professionals. This distinction materially impacts subcontracting structure, insurance requirements, staffing assumptions, and professional liability exposure. Could you clarify the certification responsibilities for telecommunications-related deliverables under this procurement?

Response:

PRBP clarifies that all deliverables requiring professional certification, sealing ("sello profesional"), signing, or professional responsibility under applicable laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico must be certified by licensed professionals authorized to practice in Puerto Rico within the applicable discipline. For purposes of this procurement, PRBP anticipates that final deliverables will be certified, signed, and sealed, as applicable, by the contractors duly licensed Professional Engineer(s) (PE) and/or Licensed Architect(s) responsible for the work product and professional services. Proposers are responsible for structuring their teams, subcontracting arrangements, insurance coverages, and professional liability protections in a manner consistent with their proposed technical approach and applicable professional practice requirements.

Question # 109:**Reference:**

5.1 Tasks

Question:

The Scope of Work requires assessments across all PRTRP Locations. Still, it does not specify whether PRBP/OMB will coordinate site access, facility escorts, local agency points of contact, security clearances, or scheduling support for public safety and critical infrastructure facilities. Access coordination materially impacts field logistics, staffing utilization, scheduling assumptions, travel costs, and assessment durations. Could you clarify the level of access coordination and operational support that PRBP/OMB will provide for field assessment activities?

Response:



Section 3.2 requires the Proposer to “conduct site visits to all PRTRP-Locations” and perform detailed infrastructure assessments, the document is silent regarding the operational responsibilities associated with site access management.

Question # 110:

Reference:

6.0 Key Deliverables

Question:

The RFP references mapping activities, GPS coordinates, infrastructure inventories, dashboards, and reporting requirements related to telecommunications infrastructure. However, the RFP does not specify whether the deliverables must integrate with an existing GIS, PMO, asset management, or reporting platform maintained by PRBP/OMB or another Government Party. The absence of this information materially impacts data architecture, software compatibility requirements, reporting workflows, and implementation effort. Please clarify whether proposers will be required to integrate deliverables into an existing platform or system environment and identify any required software, GIS, or reporting standards.

Response:

The project clearly contemplates geospatial, inventory, and reporting-related deliverables, including:

Mapping of PRTRP locations, GPS coordinates for towers and infrastructure, infrastructure inventories, dashboard reporting, and tracking of all 343 site locations.

Question # 111:

Reference:

Key Deliverables

Question:

The RFP contemplates multiple progressive deliverable submissions, review cycles, revisions, and updates throughout the Initial Assessment process. However, the RFP does not clarify whether additional site visits, reassessments, or field validation activities resulting from agency review comments,



inaccessible equipment, unavailable facility personnel, or requested revisions will be treated as part of the base scope or as additional services. This ambiguity materially impacts labor assumptions, scheduling contingencies, and pricing development. Please clarify how revisits and additional field activities resulting from review comments or site-access limitations will be handled under the Contract.

Response:

The Selected Proposer must incorporate a reasonable level of review cycles, revisions, coordination meetings, and progressive updates within the base scope of Phase 1 services.

Question # 112:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Can PRBP provide any existing baseline assessments, inventories, or prior studies for the 343 sites, or do we have to start from 0?

Response:

Proponent should assume starting from 0.

Question # 113:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

What is the expected level of engineering detail for Phase 1 (conceptual, preliminary engineering, or near-design level)?

Response:

Phase 1 deliverables are expected to remain at a pre-design level to support resiliency evaluation, conceptual mitigation strategies, and implementation.



Question # 114:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Are there any standard design guidelines or preferred architectures already defined by PRBP?

Response:

Proposers are expected to apply applicable industry standards, engineering best practices, resiliency principles, interoperability requirements.

Question # 115:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Should the proposer assume uniform solutions across sites or fully site-specific designs?

Response:

While the PRBP will hope to establish a certain level of uniformity from a resiliency and hardening standpoint, the expectation is for it to be site specific depending on each sites situation.

Question # 116:

Reference:

Locations

Question:

Are there any priority sites or tiers (critical vs non-critical)?

Response:



Priority sites, operational tiers, and any critical versus non-critical classifications will be established and coordinated during the project kickoff meeting.

Question # 117:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Is there a preferred list of vendors or technologies?

Response:

CDBG-MIT and federally funded projects do not allow the specification of particular brands or vendors."

Question # 118:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Are there existing network diagrams or topology maps available?

Response:

If available, such documentation and related records will be provided during site visit coordination and project execution.

Question # 119:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Should redundancy be designed at (Site Level, Regional Level, Island-wide Level)?

Response:

Site Level



Question # 120:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Can PRBP provide existing load profiles or energy consumption data per site?

Response:

This item is part of the assessment 1st phase and will be evaluated and validated as part of the project assessment activities.

Question # 121:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

What is the target backup duration per site (24h, 72h, 7 days)

Response:

Backup should have the capacity to operate for 1 week.

Question # 122:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Should battery/solar solutions be Standardized or Tailored by site

Response:

Tailored by site.



Question # 123:

Reference:

Scope of Work.

Question:

Are there existing generator maintenance records available?

Response:

Not all locations have generator maintenance records available.

Question # 124:

Reference:

Cost Estimate

Question:

What is the estimated budget for Phase 1 services

Response:

It is the proponent responsibility to provide an estimated budget which they consider necessary to ensure the responsible implementation of the proposed scope.

Question # 125:

Reference:

Cost Estimate

Question:

Is there a per-site budget cap or a global cap?

Response:



No, however the proponent must include sufficient detail to confirm the reasonableness of proposed cost per, as well as to provide a complete understanding to the PRBP of how they arrived at the proposed cost.

Question # 126:

Reference:

2 CFR 200 / HUD / CDBG-MIT Compliance

Question:

Will PRBP provide standard templates for compliance with documentation and reporting?

Response:

At this time, PRBP does not have mandatory standardized templates deliverables under this procurement. PRBP will be open to utilizing the selected Proposer's standard templates, methodologies, and reporting formats, provided that such formats comply with applicable industry standards and professional practices; are clear, organized, and technically supportable; are suitable for compliance review, and audit purposes; and contain sufficient detail to support planning-level evaluations, technical analysis, and decision-making processes. Deliverables shall be prepared using generally accepted architectural, engineering, planning, and cost estimating practices appropriate for federally funded projects and should include all reasonable information to support PRBP review and approval.

Question # 127:

Reference:

3 CFR 200 / HUD / CDBG-MIT Compliance

Question:

Who is responsible for validating CDBG-MIT eligibility of proposed solutions?

Response:

PROMB and PRDOH. The services contemplated under this RFP are generally anticipated to fall within eligible CDBG-MIT planning, mitigation, engineering,



and technical assistance activities. proposed activities and recommendations are expected to be evaluated in relation to the applicable CDBG-MIT national objective requirements.

Question # 128:

Reference:

4 CFR 200 / HUD / CDBG-MIT Compliance

Question:

Is the proposer expected to support HUD reporting and audits?

Response:

Yes.

Question # 129:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Are there specific environmental review requirements (NEPA) expected during Phase 1

Response:

Phase 1 services under this procurement are generally anticipated to consist primarily of planning-level assessments, technical evaluations, infrastructure inventories, feasibility analyses, resiliency assessments, cost estimating, and related professional services. At this time, PRBP does not anticipate requiring the selected Proposer to complete full project-level NEPA reviews or formal environmental clearance determinations as part of the core Phase 1 Initial Assessment scope unless otherwise specifically authorized or directed by PRBP. However, Proposers should anticipate that Phase 1 activities may require consideration of environmental compliance factors and constraints relevant to future mitigation, infrastructure, resiliency, or implementation activities. Accordingly, Phase 1 scope is generally intended to support planning-level analysis and identification of potential environmental and regulatory



considerations rather than completion of final environmental approvals; Proposers are expected to exercise reasonable professional judgment in identifying environmental review considerations that could affect future project implementation, eligibility, permitting, cost, schedule, or feasibility.

PRBP reserves the right to request supplemental environmental technical support, documentation, or planning-level analyses where deemed necessary for Program planning or future project development.

Question # 130:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Does PRBP have a preferred format for site reports, ROM cost estimates, LCRP (Life Cycle Replacement Plans)?

Response:

At this time, PRBP does not have mandatory standardized templates for site reports, ROM (Rough Order of Magnitude) cost estimates, or LCRP (Life Cycle Replacement Plan) deliverables under this procurement. As stated above, PRBP will be open to utilizing the selected Proposer's standard templates, methodologies, and reporting formats, provided that such formats comply with all applicable industry standards and professional practices; are clear, organized, and technically supportable; are suitable for compliance review, and audit purposes; and contain sufficient detail to support planning-level evaluations, technical analysis, and decision-making processes.

Question # 131:

Reference:

Deliverables

Question:

Should deliverables be per site, regional or Centralized?

Response:



The Proposer shall consider a minimum of progressive planning-level deliverables, which may be issued at approximately 30%, 60%, and 90% completion of the Initial Assessment.

Question # 132:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Are there requirements for GIS integration or visualization tools?

Response:

There are no specific requirements, however it would be a plus.

Question # 133:

Question:

Will PRBP provide templates for dashboards or reporting platforms?

Response:

RFP requires the Proposer to provide “reports or dashboard status of all 343 site locations” as part of the reporting requirements associated with the Initial Assessment for this using industry-standard reporting tools, formats, and practices.

Question # 134:

Question:

Who will be the primary technical point of contact?

Response:

It will be provided during the kick-off meeting.

Question # 136:

Question:



What is the review and approval timeline for deliverables?

Response:

2-4 weeks"

Question # 137:

Reference:

Proposal Evaluation Procedure and Criteria

Question:

Can PRBP share the evaluation criteria and scoring weights?

Response:

Please refer to Exhibits 2 and 3 of the RFP.

Question # 138:

Reference:

Budget and Financials

Question:

What is the budget for this project?

Response:

The RFP states that PRDOH allocated a total of approximately \$70 million in CDBG-MIT funding to OMB for administration and implementation of the Puerto Rico Public Safety Telecommunication Hardening, Resiliency, and Redundancy Program (PRTRP).

Question # 139:

Question:

Who was selected, and what is the status, of the RFP issued in 2024, A/E Services for the PRPSWCI, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Project?

Response:



Pursuant to Section 2.4 of the RFP, PRBP will only be answering questions which are relevant to the services being procured with this RFP.

Question # 140:

Reference:

Staff Qualifications

Question:

All of the labor categories defined in the RFP, including subject matter experts, are required to be licensed engineers or architects, although much of the scope of work is better performed by a public safety radio communications expert, which is not a licensed discipline. Would the OMB consider revising the requirements for the Subject Matter Expert (SME) positions?

Response:

As reflected in Section 4.2 of the RFP, the Selected Proposer is responsible for securing, at its own expense, all personnel necessary to perform the required services and for ensuring that assigned staff are appropriately qualified, authorized, permitted, certified, and/or licensed, as applicable to the specific role and scope of services being performed. Accordingly, PRBP does not intend to prohibit the use of qualified public safety radio communications experts or similar specialized consultants solely because such discipline is not separately licensed under Puerto Rico professional licensing statutes.

Question # 141:

Reference:

Staff Qualifications

Question:

Is the prime required to be a licensed engineer or architect? Would the OMB consider proposals from a public safety consulting firm that includes licensed engineers on the team or as sub-consultants?

Response:



PRBP clarifies that the Prime Proposer is not necessarily required to be itself a licensed engineering or architectural firm, provided that the proposed team includes licensed professionals legally accepted to perform professional responsibility for any task or service that requires a professional license under Puerto Rico laws and regulations. PRBP may consider proposals submitted by public safety consulting firms, telecommunications consulting firms, technology consulting firms, program management firms, or other qualified entities, provided that the proposed team includes duly licensed Professional Engineers (PEs) and/or Registered Architects (RAs), as applicable to the scope of services; all professional engineering and architectural services are performed under the responsible supervision of a licensed professionals authorized to practice in Puerto Rico and the Proposer demonstrates the organizational, technical, managerial, and professional capacity necessary to successfully perform the contract.

Question # 142:**Reference:**

Scope of Work

Question:

The RFP lists multiple police stations, fire department, emergency management, and other sites. Does the OMB expect any architectural, structural, or operational assessment of these facilities, beyond the following scope of work stated in the RFP's purpose: evaluating telecommunication infrastructure power and cooling needs, battery backup power systems with solar panels and intelligent transfer switches/charge controllers, and inventorying radios and interoperability equipment on selected sites, all in accordance with engineering codes.

Response:

Phase 1 assessment is limited to evaluation of conditions directly affecting telecommunications infrastructure, resiliency, interoperability, power continuity, environmental conditioning/cooling, equipment protection, and related telecommunications support systems.

Question # 143:**Reference:**

Locations



Question:

The RFP references four hundred and fifty-three (343) PRTRP locations. Please confirm the correct total number of locations included in Phase 1.

Response:

The Correct number of sites is three hundred forty-three (343).

Question # 144:

Reference:

Exhibit 1

Question:

Please confirm that Exhibit 1 represents the final site list for proposal pricing, staffing, and scheduling assumptions.

Response:

Yes it represents de final site list."

Question # 145:

Reference:

Locations

Question:

Is EXHIBIT 1 PRTRP-Locations the file shown on the website as "CDBG_MIT_00302.kmz

Response:

KMZ files are available for download on the Smart Island Website."

Question # 146:

Reference:

Locations

Question:



The Scope of Work requires site visits to all PRTRP locations. Please clarify exactly how many locations this includes.

Response:

It require visite to all three hundred forty-three (343) sites.

Question # 147:

Reference:

Proposal Submission

Question:

Is physical, on-site access required for 100% of these locations, or will desktop/records-based assessments be acceptable for restricted or low-risk sites?

Response:

Physical, on-site access is required for all locations.

Question # 148:

Reference:

Locations

Question:

Will PRBP/OMB coordinate site access with owning agencies, or is access coordination the responsibility of the proposer?

Response:

Sites Point of Contacts will be coordinated.

Question # 149:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

The RFP requires detailed telecommunications and LMR inventories. Should inventories rely primarily on available records supplemented by field verification, or is full asset-level data capture expected at every site?



Response:

A full asset-level data capture at every site

Question # 150:

Reference:

Deliverables

Question:

How should missing or unavailable asset data be documented for compliance and evaluation purposes? For example, firmware versions are often only obtainable by the vendor.

Response:

This RFP specifically requires detailed inventories for P25/LMR systems, repeaters, generators, towers, and related infrastructure, including manufacturer, model, serial number, firmware version, acquisition date, configuration details, maintenance history, and operational condition.

Question # 151:

Reference:

Deliverables

Question:

The Scope includes inventory of portable and mobile LMR radios while noting potential CDBG-MIT ineligibility. Should portable and mobile radios be inventoried strictly for system context, without mitigation recommendations or cost estimates?

Response:

PRBP clarifies that portable and mobile Land Mobile Radio (LMR) devices may be inventoried as part of the overall system assessment of the existing communications environment. However, Proposers should recognize that the inclusion of portable and mobile radios within the inventory process does not necessarily indicate that such equipment will qualify as an eligible standalone CDBG-MIT mitigation expenditure or replacement recommendation under the Program. However, if during the assessment process the Contractor identifies



portable or mobile radio-related vulnerabilities that materially affect overall system resiliency, such observations may be documented at a planning level for PRBP review."

Question # 152:

Reference:

Deliverables

Question:

Will PRDOH/HUD provide written eligibility guidance distinguishing fixed LMR infrastructure from ineligible personal property?

Response:

PRBP cannot guarantee that PRDOH and/or HUD will issue project-specific written eligibility determinations or formal written guidance specifically distinguishing fixed Land Mobile Radio (LMR) infrastructure from potentially ineligible personal property for purposes of this procurement process.

However, PRBP anticipates coordinating, as appropriate, with PRDOH and other applicable oversight entities regarding CDBG-MIT eligibility considerations.

Question # 153:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

The RFP describes an "ideal" battery/solar configuration (e.g., Li ion ≥ 18 kWh, 1 hour to 1 week runtime). Are these parameters intended as planning-level reference configurations or minimum standards to be universally applied?

Response:

Backup solution should have the capacity to operate for 1 week.

Question # 154:

Reference:



Scope of Work

Question:

Should battery/solar runtime and technology selections be site-specific and risk-based where physical or environmental constraints exist?

Response:

Backup power configurations, and telecommunications infrastructure solutions are expected to be developed based on site-specific operational requirements, infrastructure conditions, and assessment findings.

Question # 155:

Reference:

Scope of Work

Question:

Phase 1 requires progressive ROM cost estimates and includes an Allowance Budget for supplemental services. Should ROMs be based on Puerto Rico-specific cost data, national averages, or another defined basis?

Response:

Estimates should reasonably be based primarily on Puerto Rico-specific cost conditions, supplemented as necessary with industry-standard estimating references where local data is unavailable.

Question # 156:

Reference:

Budget and Financials

Question:

Will the Allowance Budget be established as a fixed amount at contract award, and what is the approval process and typical response time for authorizing Allowance services?

Response:

Allowance Budget is intended to be incorporated into the contract as a predefined allowance amount established at contract award, to be used only for approved supplemental services beyond the base Scope of Work.



OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

OMB

GOBIERNO DE PUERTO RICO

Question # 157:

Reference:

Proposal Evaluation Procedure and Criteria

Question:

The RFP states that the PRBP reserves the right to award contracts to more than one qualified firm. Is there a maximum number of firms who would be selected?

Response:

This determination will be made by the Evaluation Committee.