
RFP #2012-17: Clarifications 1a

February 6, 2012



Evergreen Public Schools

Information Technology Administrative Services Center

Prepared by

Kurt Gazow Manager / Information Technology

Bill Thackeray.....Manager / Accounting & Purchasing

Connie Bosckis Purchasing Lead

1. Is it a requirement of Evergreen School District the entire installation of the proposed service is installed and fully operational by July 1, 2012?

RESPONSE: It is the Evergreen School District's (hereafter referred to as 'District') desire to begin the installation process by July 1, 2012, completing the installation as quickly as possible thereafter. This is both to align with the E-rate year, as well as minimize repetitive charges from the incumbent vendor, should they not be chosen to continue providing service to the District. The District would desire a date no later than August 6, 2012 in order to minimize the impact on returning staff and school start-up. Should this implementation date not be achievable, the vendor may submit a proposal indicating when they believe their network would be accessible.

2. Will the District require the Apparent Successful Vendor (ASV) to reimburse for lost E-rate funding in the event this date is not achieved?

RESPONSE: No.

3. On page 11, the RFP states "installation startup (target)" is July 1, 2012. Does this mean the 153 days for installation is prior to that date? Please clarify.

RESPONSE: July 1, 2012 represents a date 153 days after the original posting of the RFP on the District's website (January 30, 2012). It is hoped that the work of provisioning a replacement network, if required, could begin after the initial award of the contract (on or about March 13, 2012) and the Installation Start-up date (July 1, 2012) in order to minimize the crossover described in item 1 of this document.

4. Will Washington State Intent and Affidavit of Prevailing Wage apply to this project? If yes, to which aspects of the project does it apply?

RESPONSE: Should any "Last Mile" components be required as part of this project, any associated work should comply with Washington State Prevailing Wage requirements. Documentation should be provided to the District confirming the Vendor's compliance therewith.

5. Section 2.0.3 refers to a Reference form. Is there a specific reference form in the RFP?

RESPONSE: A vendor reference and response form shall be provided to Pre-RFP meeting attendees and posted to the District RFP website on 2/6/2012

6. How many references is Evergreen School District requiring?

RESPONSE: All proposers should supply at least three but no more than five references.

7. Would Evergreen School District entertain a proposal for an Interactive Video service as an option to be included in the RFP response?

RESPONSE: The District is at this time only interested in Metro Area Network / Metro Area Ethernet services. Any optional items submitted with a Vendor RFP should relate to this project.

8. Would EPS consider using the terms and conditions established in the State of Washington Department of Information Services Secondary Transport Services contract in lieu of the terms stated in the RFP in order to expedite the contracting timeline?

RESPONSE: A Vendor may submit a proposal which references an existing contract available for services through Washington State DIS, Interlocal Agreement with a Washington School District, Washington Municipality, or available contract agency (NASPO/WSCA, GSA, etc.). However, any contract of this type should be submitted as an option only. Should the District find the terms and conditions of the available contract not to be agreeable, the Vendor shall be prepared to enter into Contract negotiations, and to complete any such negotiations prior to March 19, 2012.

9. Section 1.5.9.1 Can EPS please identify where the conduits terminate at the District office? Maps would be ideal.

RESPONSE: Our Facilities group has been contacted to determine whether an underground pathway print exists to outline this in greater detail. The entry point at the District office is in the northeast corner of our datacenter.

10. Section 1.5.9.2 - Can you clarify what it means to differentiate between various traffic? Is the goal to differentiate between campuses or simply traffic types?

RESPONSE: In full, section 1.5.9.2 states that: "The District will need to be able to differentiate between the various campuses in terms of traffic flow." The intent of this section is specifically related to the campus environments where multiple sites exist. In the event that two sites on a single campus are served by one physical link provided by the Vendor, we should be able to both determine what amount of traffic is coming from one site or the other, as well as limit available bandwidth to one site or another. For example, on a campus where a middle school and elementary school exists, the District would prefer to both be able to determine the percent utilization by each site, as well as limit the bandwidth available to the elementary and middle school sites to unique limits.

11. Section 2, 1.0 - Can you please define or clarify your definition of 'Highly Available'?

RESPONSE: "Highly Available" is defined as a connection with multiple levels of redundancy built into it. It is not the expectation that this be defined as multiple entry points to each physical school or campus to insulate against a cable cut, but rather that the network itself be redundant insofar as its engineering is concerned. Multiple entry points are applicable as an option for core sites, where service levels are much higher.

In many cases, redundant paths and/or "highly available" links are not in use. In most cases, a true "highly available" connection would only be warranted at our ASC site. It is our expectation that the mid-availability level will be what is selected at each school site. As the District is not familiar with the offerings from each vendor, or desire is to have the opportunity to review a pricing proposal encompassing each option.

12. For links at the ASC, can the network be "oversubscribed" (i.e. two 10GbE links provided when the aggregate links create a 30GbE potential high water mark)?

As described in section 1.5.2 of the RFP documents, "over subscribing" the network may be proposed. Existing bandwidth utilization patterns may support a model of this type. If this option is presented to the District as a pricing alternative, it should be clearly

identified as such, as well as what, if any, additive costs would be incurred when a burst condition was experienced, and whether burst traffic is supported in the proposed model.

13. Is the Nortel switch detailed on RFP documents part of the District's network equipment?

RESPONSE: No; the Nortel switch is part of the incumbent carrier's CPE.

14. Purpose – Relative to Internet Access. Can you elaborate and/or clarify if there is a requirement for the successful proposer to participate in the K-20 network?

RESPONSE: The successful proposer is not required to participate in the K-20 network. This RFP is for the District's metro area connectivity only. Our connection to the K20 shall continue to be handled under a separate agreement with the State of Washington.

15. Would it be possible to distribute the RFP in a Word document format?

RESPONSE: No. The RFP is only available in PDF format, though the Vendor Response forms shall be made available in Microsoft Word format for easier completion / submission.