

**NOTES ON SPECIFIC ITEMS IN THE CHECKLIST ABOVE:**

**2. Request For Proposal (RFP):**

Each prospective service provider was sent a list of descriptions of potential projects in order to determine which projects they may be interested in. This list of projects was sent in exactly the same format to every service provider. The only change was to the date listed at the top of the list of projects, as well as the title of the attachment. The list of projects was first made available on December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

**3. All bid responses received for all Priority I & Priority II funding requests.**

Application #	FRN #	#of bids received	Vendor Selected
821849	2238374	3	XClutel Communications
821849	2238373	3	XClutel Communications
821839	2238328	3	McLeod [PaeTec]
821839	2238316	3	Illinois Bell Telephone Company

**4. Vendor selection process description (created during the bidding process).**

1. Who conducted the vendor selection process? Explain each individual's level of involvement.

St Procopius School made all final decisions regarding the service provider selection for the funding requests for their project. The criteria St Procopius School used to make their selection includes:

- The ability to implement the project quickly and thoroughly without service interruptions
- Dedicated Account Management, Customer Service, and Technical Support
- Competitive Pricing
- The Service Provider's ability to customize the solution specifically for their school

As St Procopius School discussed the project they wanted to file in detail, Coleman Group described the process of filing the Form 470 and evaluating the responses from different service providers. St Procopius School was made verbally aware of the steps in the competitive bidding process.

2. How the entity was made aware of the decisions/steps in the competitive bidding process?

St Procopius School was initially made aware of the fact that they had a very good chance of getting an internal project funded for their school. Coleman Group discussed the various eligible categories that were available to them. Once St Procopius School decided on a project they wanted to file for funding, Coleman Group outlined the timing of the steps necessary to complete the E-Rate process. Coleman Group talked with St Procopius School about the Form 470 and the described verbally the steps in the competitive bidding process.

3. Who made the final decisions pertaining to the competitive bidding process, specifically, vendor selection?

The final decision to move forward with generating the estimate for the project was made by St Procopius School. St Procopius School met with XClutel Communications and agreed they were comfortable moving forward with the project. XClutel drafted a particular version of their contract that will only go into effect upon approval from E-Rate, and specifically upon St Procopius School filing the Form 486. Once the Form 471 is approved, the school will decide whether or not they ultimately would like to move forward with the project for their school by filing the Form 486 and initiating the contract.

**6. Correspondence between the consultant/service provider and the school/library regarding the competitive bidding process and the application process.**

Attached is a scanned image of the written correspondence between the selected service provider (XClutel Communications), the Consultant (Coleman Group Consulting) and St Procopius School regarding the E-Rate funding process for 2011 / 2012. We have already sent a separate email with scanned images of all of the correspondence with each service provider.

**7. Organizational Structure, such as organizational flow chart, reporting structure, etc.**

The Applicant is St Procopius School. Coleman Group Consulting is the Consultant used by St Procopius School in support of the ERate funding requests. XClutel Communications is the Service Provider. As per the instructions of this request, since each organization functions in a single mutually exclusive capacity, we haven't included organizational charts.



Universal Service Administrative Company  
Schools & Libraries Division

---

**Administrator's Decision on Appeal – Funding Year 2011-2012**

December 12, 2013

Stephen Weiss  
Coleman Group  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 3430  
Chicago, IL 60606

Re: Applicant Name: POPE JOHN PAUL II CATHOLIC  
SCHOOL  
Billed Entity Number: 70648  
Form 471 Application Number: 822024  
Funding Request Number(s): 2238784  
Your Correspondence Received: August 18, 2013

After thorough review and investigation of all relevant facts, the Schools and Libraries Division (SLD) of the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) has made its decision in regard to your appeal of USAC's Funding Year 2011 Funding Commitment Decision Letter for the Application Number indicated above. This letter explains the basis of USAC's decision. The date of this letter begins the 60 day time period for appealing this decision to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). If your Letter of Appeal included more than one Application Number, please note that you will receive a separate letter for each application.

Funding Request Number(s): 2238784  
Decision on Appeal: **Denied**  
Explanation:

- According to our records, on the cited establishing FY 2011 FCC Form 470, you indicated that you did not intend to release a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the products and/or services that you sought within the above funding requests. During a review, it was determined that you issued an "Erate Project Narrative Description" which contained significantly more detail than the "services requested" listing on the FCC Form 470. FCC rules require applicants to "submit a complete description of services they seek so that it may be posted for competing service providers to evaluate" and formulate bids. The applicant's FCC Form 470 should inform potential bidders if there is, or is likely to be, a Request for Proposal (RFP) issued for services requested. It was determined that

the Erate Project Narrative Description issued is a de facto RFP in that it contains service descriptions that go beyond that listed on the FCC Form 470. Since you failed to inform potential service providers that an RFP was available for the products and/or services requested, you have violated the competitive bidding process of this support mechanism. On appeal, you state that in your response to a USAC information request, you inadvertently categorized the Project Narrative Description as an RFP and that the Erate Project Narrative Description is not an RFP. During the appeal review process, it was determined that since the Project Narrative Description contains descriptions of specific services sought and gives an indication that pricing/bids were sought from those service providers who were recipients of this document. In your appeal, you did not demonstrate that USAC's decision was incorrect. Consequently, the appeal is denied.

Since your appeal was denied in full, dismissed or cancelled, you may file an appeal with the FCC. Your appeal must be postmarked within 60 days of the date on this letter. Failure to meet this requirement will result in automatic dismissal of your appeal. You should refer to CC Docket No. 02-6 on the first page of your appeal to the FCC. If you are submitting your appeal via United States Postal Service, send to: FCC, Office of the Secretary, 445 12th Street SW, Washington, DC 20554. Further information and options for filing an appeal directly with the FCC can be found under the Reference Area/"Appeals" of the SLD section of the USAC website or by contacting the Client Service Bureau. We strongly recommend that you use the electronic filing options.

We thank you for your continued support, patience and cooperation during the appeal process.

Schools and Libraries Division  
Universal Service Administrative Company

Stephen Weiss  
Coleman Group  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 3430  
Chicago, IL 60606

Billed Entity Number: 70648  
Form 471 Application Number: 822024  
Form 486 Application Number: