

ADDENDUM #1

DATE: 10/12/2026
APPLICANT: Shaker Heights City SD
BEN: 129488
FORM 470 #: 270000413
FOR: Shaker Heights City SD Managed Services
CLOSING DATE/TIME: 11/10/2026 before 5 PM ET

CLARIFICATIONS

The following are responses to questions received via e-mail during the scheduled inquiry period.

-
- Q1.** The Pricing Attachment includes switches, access points, UPS units, PDUs, and related accessories, but does not include any firewalls or security appliances. Does the district manage firewalls internally, or are firewall management services covered under a separate contract? If the latter, is there a plan to consolidate firewall management into this MIBS agreement in future renewal periods?
- A1.** Firewall is under a separate MIBS contract. We are not planning to consolidate at this time.
-
- Q2.** The Pricing Attachment notes that "equipment makes/models may change over the life of the contract and/or renewal periods. If new equipment categories are added during the contract term, how will pricing adjustments be handled? Will there be a formal change order process, or is the expectation that the annual fee covers any equipment changes?
- A2.** The expectation is that the annual fee covers equipment changes. The contract should cover the equipment listed, and as new equipment is replaced with old. We do not expect the contract to cover additional equipment added over time. In other words, we expect the contract to cover the listed quantity of devices; any increases to that quantity would require either an amendment or a new procurement.
-
- Q3.** Are there any additional network devices at any of the 13 locations, such as routers, network management servers, or wireless controllers; that are not listed in the Pricing Attachment but may require MIBS support during the contract term?
- A3.** No.
-
- Q4.** The service specification references the "operation, management, and monitoring" of existing Category 2 equipment. What are the district's expectations regarding on-site support? Specifically:

	• Is there a minimum number of on-site visits expected per month or per year across the 13 locations? • Should offerors include regularly scheduled on-site maintenance visits, or is the expectation primarily remote management with on-site support on an as-needed basis? • Is there a required on-site response time SLA (e.g., 4-hour, next business day)?
A4.	There is no minimum number of on-sites visits expected per month or per year, and the expectation is primarily remote management with on-site support on an as-needed basis. In the rare cases that require an on-site response, the required response time is 4 hours.
Q5.	Does the district have IT staff at each of the 13 locations who can serve as "hands and eyes" for remote troubleshooting, or should offerors assume that a technician dispatch will be required for any issue that cannot be resolved remotely?
A5.	Yes, the district has IT staff that can assist with troubleshooting and assistance of remote support.
Q6.	For the Ludlow Early Learning Center (noted as an ineligible Pre-K site), are the on-site support expectations the same as for the other 12 locations?
A6.	Yes, but only in that there are no on-site support expectations, and that on-site support is only anticipated on an as-needed basis.
Q7.	The evaluation criteria state that "cost of E-Rate eligible services" carries the greatest weight. Can the district provide any additional detail on the relative weighting of evaluation criteria?
A7.	No. As stated in the service specification, "Other factors that may be considered include but are not limited to E-Rate ineligible costs, the technical merit or the ability of the staff and/or solution to support the requirements of the solicitation, the Applicant's prior experience with the vendor, and/or completeness of the vendor's proposal response. The Applicant reserves the right to weigh these criteria as it deems appropriate, or not at all, and may consider additional factors not listed above."
Q8.	Is there an incumbent MIBS provider for the district? If so, can you share the current annual contract value for benchmarking purposes?
A8.	There is an incumbent MIBS provider for the district. We cannot share the annual contract value, but FCC Form 471s from prior years are publicly available. These should provide you with the benchmarking that you need.
Q9.	Does the district have a preferred network management or monitoring platform already deployed (e.g., HPE Aruba Central, Cisco DNA Center), or is the offeror expected to provide their own tooling?
A9.	The District utilizes HPE Aruba Central and is also open to vendor specific monitoring tools that will allow for real-time monitoring of both Cisco and HPE Aruba network equipment.

All other specifications, terms, and conditions remain unchanged.