

**August 21, 1995**

**TO:** Vendors who have requested RFP #608149

**FROM:** R.Craig Woods, RFP Coordinator

**SUBJECT:** Amendment #5 to RFP #608149

We received requests for clarification from multiple vendors regarding VT RFP #608149 Addendum #4. In the interest of securing the highest quality proposals possible, we have issued the following responses. We will accept requests for clarification regarding Addendum 4 ONLY through August 25, 1995. Questions or requests for clarification not related to addendum 4 will not be accepted.

Note that the electronic bidders conference has been closed and the wan-rfp listserve server will no longer accept messages from participants. To submit any requests for clarification please contact Craig Woods, cwoods@vt.edu, 540 231-8573 for instructions.

**Note that the proposal due date has been extended to September 21, 1995** in response to Sprint's request below.

## Begin Sprint Questions

>Please clarify Amendment #4. VA Tech has asked that all locations  
>identified in Section 6 be priced. In order for vendors to provide  
>location specific pricing, more information is required to determine  
>the bandwidth capacity required at each location. Section 7  
>states the assumption to be used are that carriers provide OC-3  
>SONET backbone links between hub sites and provide OC-3 SONET links  
>between user sites and the regional hubs. Are these the same  
>assumptions to be used for all locations in Section 6 or would multiple access  
>requirements be needed depending upon a particular locations needs.

**As stated in section 1.5 of the RFP, we do ultimately expect to have a range of access options available to meet individual site requirements. To maintain consistency, however, Offerors must assume OC-3 SONET or DS3 access will be extended to all sites per RFP section 7.**

>Will VA Tech provide all of selected customer presemis locations for the ATM  
>hub sites?

**We have not pre-defined hub locations. The requirement for and location of hub locations will depend on the proposed network configuration. Offerors may recommend customer premise hub locations within their proposals.**

>If in fact, all of Section 6.0 must be individually priced, Sprint  
>respectfully requests a further extension of 2 additional weeks. Please  
>confirm receipt of this message. Thank you.

**The original RFP clearly states in section 1.5 that Offerors MUST provide pricing for all locations. The addendum was intended only to provide clarification of this requirement.**

**In the interest of securing the best proposals possible, however, we will extend the deadline. Accordingly, RFP sections 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.1.7, and 2.1.8 are amended:**

2.1.5	Responses due: 3:00 p.m., September 21, 1995
2.1.6	Evaluation of responses complete: October 30, 1995
2.1.7	Contract negotiation: November 1, 1995 - December 1, 1995
2.1.8	Award: December 5, 1995

## End Sprint Questions

## **Begin AT&T Questions**

>

>In the RFP, page 32, section 7, vendors are asked to "design a mesh  
>network..."

>

>By a "mesh network" do you mean that each of the regional hub sites should be  
>connected directly to each of the other sites?

>

>Thank you.

**Not necessarily. We request that you propose a network which minimizes cost and which provides acceptable reliability. To the extent it is reasonable to provide greater reliability and bandwidth through a mesh design, and with diverse routing, we would like to consider those options.**

>Regarding the locations in Section 6, Scope of Network, specifically section  
>6.2, Virginia Community College System, where NPA and NXX information is  
>missing (e.g. Blue Ridge, Waynesboro, VA), are these locations to be omitted  
>at this time from the network design? If not, please provide NPA-NXX, and  
>address information for each.

**Germanna, Fredericksburg, 703 899  
Blue Ridge, Waynesboro, 703 949  
New River, Christiansburg, 703 382  
Southside Virginia, Emporia, 804 634  
Thomas Nelson, Williamsburg, 804 221**

>

>Of the locations in Section 6, what are the bandwidth requirements?

**Assume all sites have OC3-SONET or DS3 access.**

>And, with the clarification requiring that Offerors provide costs for all  
>sites in Section 6, should we assume that the five locations forming the  
>primary test bed will be the "regional ATM hub sites," or will other sites be  
>selected and made known that more logically serve the locations identified in  
>Section 6?

**We have not pre-defined hub locations. The requirement for and location of hub locations will depend on the proposed network configuration. Offerors may recommend customer premise hub locations within their proposals.**

## **End AT&T Questions**