

INVITATION TO REGISTER INTEREST AND SUBMIT A DRAFT UNIVERSAL SERVICE PLAN AS A UNIVERSAL SERVICE PROVIDER UNDER THE COMMUNICATIONS AND MULTIMEDIA (UNIVERSAL SERVICE PROVISION) REGULATIONS 2002 FOR THE INSTALLATION OF NETWORK FACILITIES AND DEPLOYMENT OF NETWORK SERVICE FOR THE PROVISIONING OF PUBLIC CELLULAR SERVICES AT THE UNIVERSAL SERVICE TARGETS UNDER THE JALINAN DIGITAL NEGARA (JENDELA) PHASE 1 INITIATIVE

Questions & Answers

No.	Question	Answer
1	Who should Certified True Copy (CTC) the following documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFP(I) License • Latest Corporate Information issued by the Company Commission of Malaysia namely SSM e-info - • Bank Statements • Audited Accounts 	For NFP(I) License & SSM info we accept CTC from your company's CEO. For bank statements and audited accounts the CTC should be from the company's auditor.
2	Our last audited report date on 31/12/2019 . Please advice whether it's acceptable by MCMC. For year 2020, we haven't start do the audit and can't be ready by 31 st March 2021.	Yes, it is acceptable.

No.	Question	Answer
3	Our company have a few bank, pls advice whether need to provide the bank statements for all bank or just for main bank only.	Bank statements from account that will be used to fund the project & showing your cash flows.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="309 400 1162 544">i. We have no ideal how Part 2 going to design their network topology thus unsure of the suitable tower location, thus can i do the site survey just purely based on lat long provided in the tender? <li data-bbox="309 552 1162 624">ii. Do i need to consider part 2 requirement when doing site survey? <li data-bbox="309 632 1162 855">iii. Due to tender requirement that max 1 hop is allowable and my submission is based on info in this tender. How are we going to handle if during the role out, additional tower or repeater require by Part 2 to obtain line of site, who is responsible on this Part 2 request i.e cost and building tower/repeater. 	<p data-bbox="1184 400 2029 544">Yes, the interested licensee for Part 1 must consider the Part 2 requirements as far as it is possible. This will be the basis by which the Commission will assess the proposals from both Part 1 and Part 2.</p> <p data-bbox="1184 592 2029 895">The successful Part 1 and Part 2 licensees within a given cluster will need to finalise the actual location based on the optimum network design and coverage. This is inclusive of the requirement for a repeater site(s), if required for the purposes of establishing a line of sight. Both parties are then required to finalise the sites along with the revised cost for the Commission to consider before being designated as a DUSP. Please refer to subparagraph 2.2 of the RFP on this matter.</p>
5	Can licensee propose rapole, monopole other than the 3 legged tower?	Please refer to Section 3.5 of the RFP on the requirements for a customised Bill of Quantity. The Commission has no preference for the tower height and type. However, please bear in mind that the structure must be able to accommodate four public cellular service providers. Thus, it is the responsibility for the interested licensees to propose the best network design taking into consideration the population density, capacity, possible backhaul connectivity and coverage requirements at the location(s).

No.	Question	Answer
6	<p>If there are towers already at the locations stated in the Appendix 1 of the tender documents, should we move the coordinates?</p>	<p>The coordinates provided only act as a reference for the interested licensees to propose the most suitable location that will best serve the uncovered populations within the targeted area (by specifically taking into consideration the population distribution, backhaul connectivity etc.) at all the locations, as specified in Appendix 1 of the Invitation.</p>
7	<p>Refer to Appendix 4: Summary of the Technical Proposal for Part 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Site Name refer to the “Specified Location In The UST” stated in the Appendix 1? 	<p>Yes, it is correct.</p>
8	<p><u>Insurance, Item 4.10:</u> The relevant insurances must also be procured and maintained during Implementation Period of this Project. Failure on the part of the Part 1 Designated Universal Service Provider to comply with this requirement shall result in the Part 1 Designated Universal Service Provider being solely responsible for any liabilities and/ or losses that may arise.</p> <p><u>Insurance, Item 5.22:</u> The relevant insurances must also be procured and maintained at all times by the Part 2 Designated Universal Service Provider, both during Implementation and subsequent to the completion of this Project. Failure on the part of the Part 2 Designated Universal Service Provider to comply with this requirement shall result in the Part 2 Designated Universal Service Provider being solely responsible for any liabilities and/ or losses that may arise.</p>	<p>For Part 1, the insurance must be maintained during the Implementation Period of this Project (9 months).</p> <p>Whereas for Part 2, the insurance must be maintained during the Implementation Period (9 months), and Operational Period (5 years). It is advisable for the designated universal service provider for Part 2 to maintain such insurance after the completion of the Project</p>

No.	Question	Answer
	<p>The period of coverage for Insurance is silent, please confirm the following: -</p> <p>a) Part 1: whether is 9 + 12 = 21 months? b) Part 2: whether is 9 + 60 = 69 months?</p>	
9	<p><u>APPENDIX 3 - LICENSEE'S INFORMATION</u></p> <p><u>Instructions:</u> The submission shall be arranged in the following manner: A. Folder 1 All Items (1 to 14) listed below B. Folder 2 Items 11, 12, 13 and 14 without the name/ logo of the Interested Licensee. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the disqualification of the Interested Licensee's submission</p> <p>Based on the Instructions given, Items 11 to 14 will appear in both Folder 1 & Folder 2, please confirm.</p> <p>Folder 1 & Folder 2 are put into a sealed envelope marked "LICENSEE'S INFORMATION" and submit in 1 "ORIGINAL" copy only, please confirm or advise otherwise.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, items 11 to 14 will appear in both Folder 1 & Folder 2. • Yes, Folder 1 & Folder 2 are to be put into a sealed envelope marked "LICENSEE'S INFORMATION". Please ensure that both folder are labelled accordingly. <p>As stated in clause 7.7.4 of the revised RFP:</p> <p><i>In addition to the hardcopy, digital copies of the Technical Proposals, Financial Proposals and Licensees' Information shall be submitted in compact discs or thumb drives. The digital copy shall be in PDF format.</i></p>
10	<p><u>APPENDIX 4 - SCOPE OF DRAFT UNIVERSAL SERVICE PLAN</u></p> <p><u>Section B2:</u></p> <p>Please attach the proposed BOQ for each location without name and price. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the disqualification of the Interested Licensee's submission.</p>	<p>As stated in clause 7.8 of the revised RFP:</p> <p>The Interested Licensee is prohibited from displaying or including its name in the Technical Proposal. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the disqualification of the Interested Licensee's submission</p>

No.	Question	Answer
	"without price" refer to a blank BOQ, kindly clarify on "without name".	
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Can I burn all clusters information as require in this tender in single CD assuming I am going to participate in few clusters? ii. Where should I attach this CD? To Licensee information folder? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Yes, it is acceptable and please separate the CD for technical and financial submissions. Please label the CDs accordingly. ii. Please include the CDs to the respective boxes for technical & financial submissions.
12	Is 2 sites printing allowable in this tender?	Yes, double-sided printing is most encouraged to reduce the volume of submission.
13	<p>Product information or booklet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is it necessary to have 2 copies on this i.e. original and copy? Or sufficient to have one copy? 	<p>It is sufficient to submit one copy.</p> <p>Please also refer to subparagraph 7.14 in the RFP:</p> <p><i>Handbooks and any other literature, if any, shall be bound in separate covers.</i></p>
14	<p>4G related</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. One of the major objective of this tender is to improve download speed from 25Mbps to 35Mbps! <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is this based on per user? ii. Or concurrent users? If yes, how many concurrent users? iii. Or concurrent users from concurrent 4 telco? If yes, 	Please refer to Section B3 under Appendix 4 of the invitation for this matter.

No.	Question	Answer
	how many user/s per telco?	
15	<p>b. Backhaul</p> <p>i. Some USP sites are in deep rural area and only option is via VSAT. Technically VSAT as backhaul is noncompliance to provide 4G services. How shall we handle this type of site? To provide 2G service only?</p> <p>ii. IF fiber connectivity is compulsory by hook or crook, and taking into but not limited to distance, logistic or environment challenges, 9 months' time frame to complete project is not doable! Please help to advice MCMC stand on this.</p>	<p>Based on existing projects under USP, 4G services can be provided through VSAT backhaul although the latency would be higher. The interested licensee is expected to provide a sensible and workable solution based on its experience and capabilities.</p> <p>Only capable licensees will be considered.</p>
16	<p>This tender splits between Part 1 and Part 2, and all this while previous tender stated the tower specification requirement which consists of tower height and loading. As we would not have privy on what would be Part 2 equipment specification in terms of loading requirement, could MCMC indicate what tower specification would be suitable for the implementation of this Project. This structure loading and height carry a fundamental assumption in our costing, hence confirmation on this matter is appreciated.</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 3.5 of the RFP on the requirements for a customised Bill of Quantity. The Commission has no preference for the tower height. Thus, it is the responsibility for the interested licensees to propose the best network design taking into consideration the population density, capacity and coverage requirements at the location(s).</p> <p>The successful Part 1 and Part 2 licensees within a given cluster will need to finalise the actual location based on the optimum network design and coverage. Both parties are then required to finalise the sites along with the revised cost for the Commission to consider before being designated as a DUSP. Please refer subparagraph 2.2 of the RFP on this matter.</p>

No.	Question	Answer
17	<p>How many set of Licensee's Information shall we submit if we participated in 5 clusters?</p>	<p>As stated in clause 7.1 of the revised RFP:</p> <p>"The Interested Licensee shall submit a single document in a separate sealed envelope marked as "LICENSEE'S INFORMATION", which shall consist of the following....."</p> <p>Hence, only 1 set of Licensee's Information should be submitted for each Interested Licensee.</p>
18	<p>We would like to know in the case of a location that has a good coverage connection, can we shift the site to another location in the same UST/District?</p> <p><i>For example, there was one MCMC site located in a housing area that already has 2 new existing monopoles. According to the landowner, the 2 monopoles own by an NFP who lease them to Webe, U-mobile and Celcom and we were told by the landowner that Maxis will join in a few month's time. The 2 monopoles located just about 380 meters from MCMC Nominal and the coverage and dBm test shows that the area has an excellent connection.</i></p> <p>For this case, we feel that the responsibility for us to plan and utilized the USP fund rightly and faithfully, so we look around for an area (mainly in the sub-urban) that has weak coverage connectivity BUT we still proposed a candidate located in the same UST/District area.</p> <p>We need your kind advice regarding this matter and we greatly appreciate your opinion.</p>	<p>The coordinates provided only act as a reference for the interested licensees to propose the most suitable location that will best serve the uncovered populations within the targeted area (by specifically taking into consideration the population distribution, backhaul connectivity etc.) at all the locations, as specified in Appendix 1 of the Invitation.</p>

No.	Question	Answer
19	<p>Refer to Appendix 4: Technical Proposal of Part 1. Which section of B can we put in the details of the technical proposal?</p>	<p>You shall include the details of the technical proposal in Section B2.</p>
20	<p>Can we ask our banker to CTC the bank statements?</p>	<p>For bank statements, please sought CTC from your company's auditor.</p>
21	<p>The following are some queries whereby usually part 2 are the one to conduct it such as :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Required tower height – for their coverage and MW Link (if fiberisation then no need MW) 2. Structure type – monopole or tower (we are thinking safe scenario propose 60m) 3. Population coverage 4. Signal for the operator in that area – we need to use tools or else can we use the normal phone with different telcos sim card to test their signal power in dBm. 5. If the nominal point is not suitable due to space, how much we can enlarge the search ring (max 500m for example) 	<p>The successful Part 1 and Part 2 licensees within a given cluster will need to finalise the actual location based on the optimum network design and coverage. Both parties are then required to finalise the sites along with the revised cost for the Commission to consider before being designated as a DUSP. Please refer subparagraph 2.2 of the RFP on this matter.</p>

No.	Question	Answer																		
22	<p>i. Our company is participating in Part 1 of the Jendela tender. Our question are as below: Do we need to submit a technical site survey report?</p> <p>ii. May I know in order for us to submit the Draft Universal Service Plan, it's a must for an interested licensee to conduct a ground site survey and submit the detail survey report as well together with the technical proposal?</p>	<p>At this juncture, the interested licensee is only required to fulfil the requirements under section 3.2 to section 3.7 of the RFP. This would include the undertaking of preliminary site surveys and evaluations for the technical and financial proposal submission (with customised BOQ).</p> <p>A comprehensive technical site survey report as mentioned under Section 4 of the RFP is only required to be submitted by the successful licensee which is appointed as the designated universal service provider to the Commission at a later stage.</p>																		
23	<p>On item No.13 at Appendix 3-Licensee Information, can I proposed to use the below table to show the number of tower(s) owned or provided by the Interested Licensee in the state where the Universal Service Target is located, if any:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="280 852 1151 979"> <thead> <tr> <th>NO</th> <th>SITE ID</th> <th>SITE NAME</th> <th>STATE</th> <th>CLIENT</th> <th>STRUCTURE TYPE</th> <th>STRUCTURE HEIGHT (M)</th> <th>DELIVERY TIMELINE /YEAR</th> <th>PROJECT VALUE (RM)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	NO	SITE ID	SITE NAME	STATE	CLIENT	STRUCTURE TYPE	STRUCTURE HEIGHT (M)	DELIVERY TIMELINE /YEAR	PROJECT VALUE (RM)										<p>No change of format is permissible. Please use the format specified in Appendix 3 of the RFP.</p> <p>However, you may attach the proposed table if you feel it will help the Commission to assess your capability.</p>
NO	SITE ID	SITE NAME	STATE	CLIENT	STRUCTURE TYPE	STRUCTURE HEIGHT (M)	DELIVERY TIMELINE /YEAR	PROJECT VALUE (RM)												
24	<p>In the RFP, it mentioned that 2g is for voice call. Can we assume there will be no data service at all on 2g?</p>	<p>Yes, the 2G network is for voice services, not for data. The need for 2G takes into consideration the socio-economic profile of the population within the underserved areas. Not everyone within the identified locations will be equipped with VoLTE capable LTE devices. As such, voice connectivity through 2G is still relevant in these areas.</p>																		

No.	Question	Answer
25	<p>Clauses 5.1.3 and 5.1.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. In the event that fiberisation is not feasible, and the only option is either 2-hops microwave or VSAT, which option is of higher priority? ii. Does microwave always have higher priority than VSAT regardless of how many hops? iii. If no, what is the max hops before VSAT can be used? 	<p>Please note that only 1 microwave hop is acceptable under this Invitation. If the Interested Licensee is able to evidentially substantiate the need for more than 1 microwave hop, the Interested Licensee must clearly state, justify and explain this in the technical draft plan submitted to the Commission.</p>
26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Do MCMC has any recommended technical specification for tower structure e.g. 3-legged or 4-legged? ii. What is the technical specification for the proposed site e.g. type of fencing, cabin size, other utilities etc.? 	<p>Please refer to Section 3.5 of the RFP on the requirements for a customised Bill of Quantity. The Commission has no preference for the tower height and type. However, please bear in mind that the structure must be able to accommodate four public cellular service providers. Thus, it is the responsibility for the interested licensees to propose the best network design taking into consideration the population density, capacity, possible backhaul connectivity and coverage requirements at the location(s).</p>
27	<p>We had submitted our Registration of Interest (RoI) and currently pursuing the relevant document preparation for the draft universal plan.</p> <p>One question, will it be good and accepted by the tender committee if we submit additional clusters as compared to the clusters already indicated in our RoI ?</p> <p>Example, a NFP indicate 5 clusters in the RoI and then decided to submit draft universal plan for 7 clusters (additional 2 clusters). Please advise.</p>	<p>Pursuant to regulation 6 of the USP Regulation 2002, any Interested Licensee which has registered its interest with the Commission pursuant to the Invitation issued under the USP Regulations 2002, shall submit its draft proposal(s) within the specified time frame – no later than 31 March 2021.</p> <p>A licensee which fails to comply with this regulation commits an offence under this Regulations.</p> <p>Pursuant to regulation 39 of the USP Regulations 2002, any interested licensee who commits an offence shall on conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding RM300,000 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 3 years or to both.</p> <p>As explained in the revised RFP issued on 15 January 2021, the</p>

No.	Question	Answer
		Interested Licensee may register its interest for any cluster, or at all clusters. Please make sure the cluster(s) submitted in the Registration of Interest form match with the submission of the draft plan(s).
28	<p>Appendix 3 – LICENSEE’S INFORMATION</p> <p>8. Financial details</p> <p>a) Assets (RM) :</p> <p>b) Liability (RM) :</p> <p>c) Net Worth (Assets – Liabilities) (RM) :</p> <p>The Interested Licensee is required to update by month ,years or how? If by years, how many years to update?</p>	Please provide your current information for the said details.
29	<p>For Part 1 APPENDIX 1</p> <p>For cluster 22,23,26,27,29,30,31 & 34. The Interested Licensee require existing tower nearby the cluster. Reason request is to avoid duplicate with the existing tower.</p>	The coordinates provided only act as a reference for the interested licensees to propose the most suitable location that will best serve the uncovered populations within the targeted area (by specifically taking into consideration the population distribution) at all the locations, as specified in Appendix 1 of the Invitation.
30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With reference to the RFP invitation, Part 1 and Part 2 to conduct actual site surveys and site evaluations for finalization of all sites and specifications • Part 1 as a result of their site survey shall factor in the tower heights and submit its tender for the related commercial proposal • Part 2 as a result of its coverage and transmission Line of 	The successful Part 1 and Part 2 licensees within a given cluster will need to finalise the actual location based on the optimum network design and coverage. Both parties are then required to finalise the sites along with the revised cost for the Commission to consider before being designated as a DUSP. Please refer subparagraph 2.2 of the RFP on this matter.

No.	Question	Answer
	<p>Sight survey shall highlight on the required tower heights</p> <p>Question : Should there is a different in tower heights requirements between Part 1 and Part 2 in their submitted tender, how can this be addressed post award as there will be impact to the commercial proposal?</p>	
31	For key repeater sites, is there any population required around its location?	No, there is no requirement for this stipulated in the RFP. Please note that the requirement for microwave repeaters as backhaul shall be limited to one hop only.
32	Should we prepare a report for the new key repeater sites?	You must explain clearly in the draft plan the reasons why you wish to put in place a repeater, and substantiate this evidentially (based on your study and technical proficiency).
33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Is it expected that operators contribute their spectrums at these sites without charging one another? ii. Although spectrum fees (SA and/or AA) are part of operating costs, are there any plans to exempt Jendela sites from the payment of spectrum fees? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Yes, the public cellular service providers will be required to use the existing radio spectrum resources assigned by to them by the Commission for service provisioning at the site. This is the only way to ensure sufficient bandwidth to deliver an average speed of 35Mbps per user. ii. No exemption fee is applicable as the cost for AA fees is claimable during the operational period under the OPEX. SA fees are not claimable as this is paid for upfront and for the band as a whole, and not on a per apparatus.

No.	Question	Answer
34	<p>The Cluster 55 site JEN1_0859 SK Binsulung (6.2794, 116.8954) need MCMC to confirm the location as it is suspected to be wrong. It is surrounded by sites from Cluster 62. The actual school name is SK Binsulung (6.279449, 117.31716) actual location is 46.6km away from MCMC declared location.</p>	<p>The identified location under the RFP is correct, at SK Binsulung in the UST of Beluran, Sabah. As specified in subparagraph 1.6 of the RFP, the coordinates provided in the RFP are meant as reference points only. As highlighted in your enquiry, you may use the coordinates as mentioned.</p>
35	<p>5G Readiness What does “5G-ready” means?:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Does 5G ready mean that equipment (RRU and BBU, etc...) have the capability of supporting 5G and when is needed, additional cards or controllers to be added to bring 5G on air? ii. If answer to QA above is yes, will the Part 2 USP (Universal Service Provider) be allowed to claim for the USP Fund the additional capex, opex and other charge incurred to bring 5G on air at the later stage; or iii. The site is required to have the entire mechanism/system and capability to bring 5G on air? In this situation the costing of the USP plan Part 2 will include both the costs for 4G and 5G. Please elaborate if this understanding is correct. iv. Are separate commercial negotiation required with the MOCN partners to rollout 5G when the time comes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Yes, your understanding is correct. ii. Any upgrading throughout the operational period shall be borne by the Part 2 designated universal service provider at no additional cost to the Commission. This is as explained clearly in subparagraph 12.2 of the RFP. iii. Any upgrading throughout the operational period shall be borne by the Part 2 designated universal service provider at no additional cost to the Commission. This is as explained clearly in subparagraph 12.2 of the RFP. iv. Yes, this will require commercial negotiations between the relevant parties.
36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. We are aware as for JENDELA submission on part technical proposal, the Site Survey must be done by physically but since the government has imposed the MCO on the whole country for except for Sarawak (CMCO), therefore we 	<p>Yes, desktop survey is allowed for the said purpose.</p>

No.	Question	Answer
	<p>would like to know if desktop survey is allowed for this purpose.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition, the site survey that must be done by us is around 1020 sites, with the restrictions and conditions, it will be hard to be done within two months. ii. Due to limited movement control conditions, especially in the red zone, it seems we cannot complete the site surveys in time for the registered clusters. Can we do a desktop assessment for the sites that cannot be visited in order to complete our technical proposal? 	
37	<p>Due to the volatile movement control conditions due to the Covid-19 pandemic, we recommend that a draft universal service plan submission for Sarawak be made in Kuching.</p> <p>Accordance to clause 9.6, we hope that MCMC will issue a notice as soon as possible so that we can take into account the courier factor if submission still needs to be done at the MCMC headquarters.</p>	<p>The Commission will issue a public notice to advise all Interested Licensees, which have submitted their Registration of Interest, on the locations where the Draft Universal Service Plan submissions can be made, if any, within a reasonable period of time before the closing date.</p>