



STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

RFQ 16-1600

***Ethernet Transport Services
for the
K-20 Education Network***

AMENDMENT NO. TWO (2)

OFM RESPONSE TO BIDDER QUESTIONS

08.29.2016

OFM Answers to Bidders' Questions

This OFM Answer to Bidders' Questions may only explain or clarify some aspect that is already addressed in the RFQ. However, some of the answers may also supplement or change what was previously stated in the RFQ or in an exhibit.

Therefore it is important that bidders review all questions and answers, and not just those which they may have submitted.

1. **Question:** *Could you please verify that the address listed (1065 Fir Street) for Darrington is correct?*

OFM Answer: 1065 Fir Street (Tech Portable), as listed on Attachment A, is correct. It has been confirmed by the site contact and is the address of the existing service.

Question: *Can you please verify that it shouldn't be 1085 Fir?*

OFM Answer: I have already answered your question about this site.

2. **Question:** *On the K20 solicitation RFQ 16-1600, what is the difference between 'Attachment A', and the amendment, 'Attachment A (unprotected)'? Is it simply that the spreadsheet has been unlocked, or are there content differences?*

OFM Answer: There are no substantive differences between the documents – one has just been unlocked.

3. **Question:** *For the 18345 Campus Way NE, Bothell site, does UW give us permission to place fiber in their existing conduit?*

OFM Answer: UW's response to the Cascadia College use of UW conduit is no, see below.

According to the UWIT infrastructure team, they can't allow vendors to use existing UW conduits on campus.

4. **Question:** *Can you please verify the address of 911 N Broadway, Everett? Should this possibly be 2000 Tower Street?*

OFM Answer: 911 N Broadway is correct

5. **Question:** *Section 4.13, Can K-20 please clarify the intent to use LACP in the network?*

OFM Answer: Here's the clarification regarding the use of LACP:

The intent of section 4.13 is to require Vendors to utilize standards based link aggregation protocols (LACP – IEEE 802.3ad) in situations where aggregated bandwidth to the Purchaser's devices exceeds the Purchaser's standard single interface handoff capacities (typically 1Gb or 10Gb Ethernet unless an alternate interface type has been agreed upon by Vendor and Purchaser). While a Multi-Chassis LACP configuration would be desired in this situation, it is not a requirement. An example of this would be if Vendor is handing off 17Gbps of contracted bandwidth to the Purchaser, the utilization of 2x10Gb Ethernet connections in a LACP bundle would be expected, with a desire that the two connections to be homed to two different chassis (thus Multi-Chassis LACP) in the Vendors network providing chassis redundancy.

6. **Question:** *We have a question regarding Section "2.10 CONTRACT" – Exhibit C.*

(We) currently provide Ethernet Services for K-20 and entered into a contract (# KXXXX) on February 27, 2015. If we are selected as a winning bidder for all or some of these circuits, can we bypass a new contract negotiation and augment or amend the existing contract that was just executed last year? This would save time and effort for both parties. Thanks for your considerations.

OFM Answer: A new contract will be written.