

August 11, 1995

TO: Vendors who have requested RFP #608149

FROM: R.Craig Woods, RFP Coordinator

SUBJECT: Amendment #4 to RFP #608149

Proposal Due Date Extension:

The response due date will be extended one week. Therefore, section 2.1.5 is amended thus: "**Responses due: 3:00 pm, September 7, 1995.**"

Clarification:

Regarding section 7.1, Functional Requirements, item number 1, System Life Cycle Costs for WAN Access.

The intention is for Offerors to identify costs in such a manner as to permit VT/VCCS/ODU to determine the cost per site for network access. This applies not only to the pilot phase but to the full scope of the network.

We realize that not all Offerors can provide access to all locations identified in RFP section 6, Scope of Network. At a minimum, however, **Offerors must provide costs for all sites identified in section 6 which are within their service area.** Any sites not included will be presumed to be outside of the range of their specific proposal.

Begin Sprint Questions

>Priority: Urgent
>Date: Fri, 4 Aug 1995 14:57:09 -0500
>Reply-To: wan-rfp Discussion List <WAN-RFP@listserv.vt.edu>
>Sender: wan-rfp Discussion List <WAN-RFP@listserv.vt.edu>
>From: Fritzie Greene <fritzie.greene@QM.SPRINTCORP.COM>
>Subject: VA Tech WAN - RFP 60814
>To: Multiple recipients of list WAN-RFP <WAN-RFP@listserv.vt.edu>

>

> Subject: Time: 14:47

> Sprint

> (r) VA Tech WAN - RFP 60814 Date: 8/4/95

> Fritzie Greene (703) 904-2421 office/2069 fax

>

>In order to provide a comprehensive response to the subject RFP, the Sprint

>Team requires the following clarifications:

>

>1) Can Virginia Tech project the bandwidth requirements between the backbone
>and the Internet for Phase 1 and Phase 2.

It is expected that Internet access will be provided to individual sites in variable bandwidth allocations. Ideally, this would be adjustable depending on time of day and special application requirements. Depending on the means for providing access to individual sites or groups of sites adopted by the service provider, the concept of "bandwidth between the backbone and the Internet" may be inapplicable.

However, the projected Internet access bandwidth requirement aggregated among all Phase I participants is projected to be a 45 megabits per second. For Phase II the minimum aggregate Internet access bandwidth is projected to be 45 megabits per second initially and should keep pace with Internet access point and information exchange advances (in lieu of a definable "Internet backbone"). Some participants may require this much bandwidth individually.

>2) Can Virginia Tech project the bandwidth requirements between the backbone
>and the a public ATM network for Phase 1 and Phase 2.

It is possible, of course, that the backbone and the "public ATM network" will be indistinguishable. In general, it should be possible to establish a virtual circuit between any participant in Phase I or Phase II and any "reachable" site at any bandwidth available that meets the functional requirements.

>3) Virginia Tech has stated the new network should connect to out-of-state

>networks. Please provide details on quantity of networks, bandwidth,
>protocols involved, transport media and any other pertinent details available.

We assume you are referring to page 32, Section 7, second paragraph, last bullet: " * plan to link the Virginia broadband network with out-of-state networks."

The intention is to indicate our interest in maintaining interconnectivity to other initiatives. Generally, this will depend on adherence to a standards-based approach. The onus will be on service providers to maintain an open, non-proprietary set of network strategies. Perhaps the "public ATM network" referred to in question #2 will provide the vehicle for establishing interconnectivity. If so, then the appropriate criteria will be compatibility with that network.

>

>4) What are the timeframes expected for dial access to the network? What
>access speeds and quantity of users envisioned? What protocols (asynch, PPP,
>SLIP, X.25, etc.) will be supported?

Dial access is an optional service. It will be preferable to establish dial access immediately upon deployment of the network.

The minimum protocol support must include SLIP and PPP.

Modems employed must support:

- V.34, V.32, V.32bis, and V.22bis protocols.
- V.42 error correction
- V.42bis and MNP-5 compression

The Virginia Community College System has approximately 75,000 full time students and over 200,000 full and part-time students statewide. It is anticipated that some percentage of these students will use dial-access services if available. Other participating institutions also have large user communities which may participate.

>

>5) On page 29 of the RFP, the NPA-NXX for the Eastern Shore Community College
>location in Molfa appears to be incorrect. The listed NPA-NXX, 804-797,
>appears to be a Danville location, which is not near the Eastern Shore.
>Please clarify.

The information in the RFP is incorrect. Actually, there are two errors for this location. The community name should be Melfa instead of Molfa. The NPA-NNX code should be 804-787 instead of 804-797.

>

>6) Will a carrier's SONET loop architecture on its backbone network meet the >reliability goals for the WAN in place of mesh and diversity routing?

Yes.

>7) Can Virginia Tech identify the manufacturer and model number of the ATM >switch that will be procured by the Universities to be used at the regional >hub sites

Virginia Tech will issue an invitation for bid for ATM switch equipment for use in our campus internetwork. Once the IFB is released, we will provide a copy of the specification to anyone upon request. IFB release is imminent.

>8) Section 1.2 states Phase I will be Virginia Tech, Northern Virginia >Graduate Center, New River Community College, and Blue Ridge Community >College. Section 6 references numerous other locations that may be added to >Phase I. Can you please clarify what locations constitute Phase I for purpose >of pricing and evaluation of Phase I.

Per addendum #3, the default implementation for Phase I has been amended to include Virginia Tech, the Northern Virginia Graduate Center, New River Community College, Blue Ridge Community College, and Old Dominion University. Per page 4, paragraph 3, we will permit Offerors to propose alternative or additional pilot sites. Additionally, in section 1.6 other initiatives led by VCU, Radford, and ODU are identified for early participation in Phase I pending feasibility. The intention is to be as flexible as possible to permit participation by any capable entity. Offerors should provide enough information to determine feasibility for participation for all potential parties.

Per page 4, paragraph 2, Offerors must identify actual fees which will be assessed for Phase I and must present a good faith estimate of fees which would be applicable for full deployment. Offerors MUST provide pricing for all sites listed in section 6, Scope of Network which are in their service areas.

End Sprint Questions

Begin Bell Atlantic Question

> Does Virginia Tech have an IXC (or IXCs) that you would prefer that > the LEC's work with? Would you direct us (the LEC's) to them by name?

We do not prefer any IXC though that may change pending results of this procurement. From our perspective, LECs should work with IXCs or combinations of IXCs to yield the most effective and economical solution. IXC companies we know of include Sprint, MCI, AT&T, Metropolitan Fiber Systems, and ValleyNet. Other entities, such as VTIA, may be in a position to work with LECs to transcend boundaries as well.

We are aware that regulatory obstacles may prevent Bell Atlantic and other providers from pursuing the most cost effective, comprehensive strategies. Per

RFP section 1.5, page 4, paragraph 3, we encourage Offerors to identify these obstacles within their proposals and to suggest solutions if possible. We intend to address these issues during contract negotiation. Per the RFP, Virginia Tech, VCCS, [and ODU] will in good faith work with Offerors and with the relevant Virginia state agencies to attempt to coordinate appropriate solutions.

End Bell Atlantic Question

Begin MCI Question

> In section eight (Evaluation) the RFP states, "Evaluation of proposals >will be performed using a weighted point system." Please clarify the weighting >factors of cost and all other criteria as discussed in section eight.

We are not yet prepared to disclose actual point assignments which will be used in the evaluation process. Here are the generalized criteria listed in order of priority. We may adjust this list somewhat to create the final evaluation instrument.

- 1. Cost**
- 2. References**
- 3. Scalability and Extendability**
- 4. Functionality**
- 5. Network Management**
- 6. Interoperability**
- 7. Bandwidth**
- 8. Reliability**
- 9. Security**

It is anticipated that the evaluation process will be followed by concurrent contract negotiations with one or more vendors per section 5.19 of the RFP.

End MCI Question