



LUZERNE INTERMEDIATE UNIT



Request for Proposals
Northeastern Pennsylvania Regional Wide Area Network
E-Rate Purchasing Consortium
Addendum #1 - Response to Vendor Questions
(10/29/2020)

Q1. Regarding the pricing when the bids are submitted, will it be acceptable to provide product pricing that is location specific, e.g. a 1G at location A could be a different price than a 1G at location B due to vendor serviceability, or is the expectation for vendors to provide “blended” pricing, e.g. the same 1G cost for each remote/branch site location submitted by a vendor?

A1. We are not requiring "postage stamp" pricing for sites in this RFP. The pricing spreadsheet for Service Group A allows for each site to have independent pricing. As always our goal remains to get the best possible pricing for all consortia members and we realize our more rural districts pose additional complexities for vendors.

Q2. Is scalability a requirement such that a 1G quote MUST account for 10G scalability/port capacity so that if a 1G quote with 10G capacity cannot be met that a "no bid" would be expected for that portion of the bid or just no BID placed.

A2. While it is desirable to have scalability to 10 GB for all sites we understand if a vendor cannot provide this for all sites. In addition to clearly identifying the limitation in your proposal you should also mark up the pricing spreadsheet for Service Group A in the applicable sheets as unable to provide this service.

Q3. If pricing submissions can be either scalable or non-scalable how will the IU know what the pricing represents? Would labeling a quote "quoting 1Gb with the capacity to scale to 10Gb" or "quoting 1Gb without the capacity to scale to 10Gb" be required to meet the requirements of a concise explanation of the costs?

A3. The pricing spreadsheet for Service Group A clearly identifies each service category. This, coupled with the written response, would be sufficient for us to understand the vendors limitations.

Q4. Section 2.2.2 states: “However, the IUs and buyers have a stated preference for WAN design: IU Core Regional WAN with a preferred connection method: Ethernet Virtual Private Line (EVPL) as defined in MEF 6.2 and MEF 10.3. The preferred delivery method is via 10 GB User Network Interface (UNI) Type 1.2 as defined in MEF 13 at the IU Hub-Site.” Being that the RFP is requesting bandwidth options, up to 10Gbps, for up to (26) remote/branch

locations, is the IU considering bandwidth options beyond 10Gbps at the main/hub site (1200 Line Street Archbald)?

If yes, will the IU be able to accommodate a 100Gbps interface/handoff at the main/hub site?

If no, and the aggregate bandwidth of all remote/branch sites exceeds 10Gbps, how does the IU intend to handle this "oversubscription" of required bandwidth to the main/hub site?

A4. Section 2.2.2 states a preference not a requirement.

Regarding 100 gigabit interfaces: We do not have the ability to accept a 100G handoff nor do we currently foresee supporting it in the future.

Regarding oversubscription: We cannot accept any oversubscription. The expectation is that vendors will provide a thorough network design that meets the requirements of the RFP.

When this is not possible to meet the preference, vendors can submit a Provider's Choice submission using their preferred topology. If altering the topology, please make sure that the narrative RFP response identifies and clearly delineates the alternate method.

Q5. Is there a distinction or preference for EVPL (VLAN-based service – Service Multiplexed environment) versus EPL (Port-based All-to-One-Bundled service environment)?

A5. Yes, please see section 2.2.2 of the RFP.

Q6. At the main/hub location specifically, is there a requirement, or preference, for a single physical handoff (EVPL – Service Multiplexed VLAN-based service), or separate/individual handoffs – one per remote/hub school site (EPL – Port-based All-to-One Bundled service).

A6. We would prefer to limit the number of vendor connections at the Hub Location. When this is not possible, vendors can submit a Provider's Choice submission using their preferred topology. If altering the topology, please make sure that the narrative RFP response identifies and clearly delineates the alternate method.

Q7. Has the IU considered ELAN service (EP-LAN and/or EVP-LAN), versus the EVPL topology referenced in Section 2.2.2 of the RFP?

A7. Yes, we have considered ELAN service, and would prefer all vendors follow the standards outlined in Section 2.2.2 of the RFP. When this is not possible, vendors can submit a Provider's Choice submission using their preferred topology. If altering the topology, please make sure that the narrative RFP response identifies and clearly delineates the alternate method.

Q8. Would the IU consider having the Internet or school circuits delivered to IU18 as a Provider's Choice option?

A8. No, unfortunately there is not scalable infrastructure in place between the LIU 18 Location and the NEIU 19 network core to make this feasible. We encourage vendors who have concerns with connectivity to IU 19's location to consider partnering with another vendor for last mile connectivity to the site.

Q9. Please provide drawings for each school that shows the following:

- A. Street entrance location for new fiber builds.
- B. Conduit system routing for new fiber builds.
- C. Location where new equipment will be installed to support services.

A9. Unfortunately there are not engineering drawings for this project. All these school sites are separate entities who currently have a fiber network connection to their hub buildings. This type of information may be obtained through attendance and participation in site visits for which we have outlined a process in our RFP. Each RWAN member will have a person on site during the site visits and we encourage you to pose specific questions for which you were unable to obtain the necessary information during the site visit. This is why the deadline for vendor questions was set for after the site visit schedule. If you would like to attend site visits but missed the deadline for such, please submit a request via email and we will try to accommodate the request.

Q10. Are there any restrictions on month of installation of service if the commencement of new service date of 7/1/2021 cannot be accomplished? The virtual pre-bidder conference acknowledged that the requested installation date of services could be challenging due to construction and short window between MSA signatures and requested installation of service 6/21/21.

A10. It is expected that vendors work to transition to new circuits before the start of the school year to minimize any downtime at the schools during the instructional year. If not possible then we request that you provide a realistic date for the transition to new service and we will undertake necessary steps to ensure continuity of service in the event that the vendor is awarded a contract.

Q11. Do you own your Public IP Address space for each current Internet connection or are they provided by the current ISP?

A11. NEIU owns enough IPv4 addresses to operate WAN. The current ISP provides a /30 "Routing Network." This configuration works well and it is expected to continue in the future.

Q12. Are you running BGP with the current Internet service provider?

A12. No. BGP peering is not a requirement at this time but is possible if it is the vendor's preference.

Q13. How is failover from between the Internet circuits accomplished today (ie: BGP routing protocol)?

A13. There is no failover today. We have a single ISP that provides four (4) 10 GB interfaces configured in a LAG via LACP.

Q14. Regarding RWAN, are individual port hand-offs required for each school at the hub sites?

A14. No, Section 2.2.2 of the RFP states *“preference for WAN design: IU Core Regional WAN with a preferred connection method: Ethernet Virtual Private Line (EVPL) as defined in MEF 6.2 and MEF 10.3. The preferred delivery method is via 10 GB User Network Interface (UNI) Type 1.2 as defined in MEF 13 at the IU Hub-Site.”* The intention is to minimize the amount of physical interfaces required at the hub site.

Q15. Clarification that all sections (1-5) must be responded to with detailed response and box must be checked at the end of each section?

A15. Vendors should refer to section 1.6 of the RFP for a full explanation on how to return the RFP Response, but yes, each section requires a vendor affirmation they have read and will comply as well as checking the box in each section. Detailed responses are only required to explain the vendor's solution, and how they will meet the requirements of the RFP, not for all sections.

Additional Clarifications:

Pricing Spreadsheet A and D has been updated with the correct Street Address of 1970c Easton Turnpike for the Western Wayne School District Hub Site.

Pricing Spreadsheet C has been updated to reflect the correct addresses of the Mountain View School District's Hub Site and Elementary School. The High School Hub Site is located at 11749 SR 106, Kingsley PA 18826, while the Elementary School is located at 11748 SR 106, Kingsley PA 18826.