

ADDENDUM TWO

DATE: December 5, 2012

TO: All Vendors

FROM: Michelle Musick/Mary Lanning, Buyers
 State Purchasing Bureau

RE: Questions and Answers for RFP Number 4180Z1
 to be opened December 21, 2012 2 PM Central Time

Following are the questions submitted and answers provided for the above mentioned Request For Proposal. The questions and answers are to be considered as part of the Request For Proposal.

For Appendix A: The description cells are locked and cannot be edited. The data cells are unlocked and may be used for entering cost information.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>1. On page 21, 1623 Farnam Suite 950 is listed as an aggregation site. Based on current information from the building management at Nebraska Collocation Centers (1623 Farnam St.) all interconnect activity is to take place at the third floor meet-me-room. Have concessions been made in regard to this RFP that negates this requirement? If true, and contracts are awarded, what carrier would circuitry need to be terminated to?</p>	<p>Amendment One of RFP 4180Z1 (posted 11/27/2012) corrects the aggregation location for 1623 Farnam as Suite 300:</p> <p>Carrier "Hotel" 1623 Farnam Street, Suite 300 Omaha, NE 68102</p> <p>If bidders submit bids for circuits aggregating at 1623 Farnam, they must include any indirect costs of reaching Suite 300, NOT Suite 950.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>2. On page 21, Section IV Project Description and Scope of Work, you mention the 5 Network Nebraska sites. What is the address for the Hastings site?</p>	<p>The location for the Hastings aggregation site is listed in the top row of Appendix A and is identified as a potential aggregation location for a subset of the sites being bid. The address is included below:</p> <p>Hastings Middle School 201 N Marian Rd. Hastings, NE 68901-4671</p>
<p>3. Some of these schools are already under a 48 month contract, and yet they appear on this RFP. Is that for additional service?</p>	<p>See response to Question #4.</p>
<p>4. Earlier this year we were awarded Distance Learning circuits to the following sites:</p> <p>Battle Creek Tilden Madison Orchard</p> <p>Would you like a revised response for additional bandwidth?</p>	<p>Appendix A included the following sites:</p> <p>Circuit 10: Battle Creek High School Circuit 11: Elkhorn Valley High Schools at Tilden: Circuit 12: Madison High School: Circuit 13: Nebraska Unified District 1- Orchard High School</p> <p>None of these sites are seeking additional bandwidth or additional circuits and will be removed from the RFP. See Amendment Three and the amended spreadsheet on the State Purchasing website.</p>
<p>5. Earlier this year Frontier Communications was awarded, contracted for a term of 48 months and installed High Speed Transport to the following locations that are listed on RFP4180Z1.</p> <p>These locations are:</p> <p>Elkhorn Valley–Tilden Nebraska Unified District One– Orchard Madison Public Schools- Madison</p> <p>Is the state looking for expanded bandwidth or additional circuits to these locations?</p>	<p>See response to Question #4.</p>
<p>6. Is Springfield Plattview Community Schools planning on participating in the Network Nebraska RFP process this year?</p>	<p>Springfield Platteview Community Schools will not be participating in the Network Nebraska RFP process this year.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>7. The timeline shows the evaluation period and ‘oral interviews/demonstrations’ being on December 22-26th. Being that the 22nd and 23rd are Saturday and Sunday and the 25th is Christmas, are you considering changing these dates?</p>	<p>The State of Nebraska is not considering an alteration of these dates. Evaluation will take place as scheduled and ‘oral interviews/demonstrations’ will not be requested as part of this RFP.</p>
<p>8. In reference to page 27 – Section 6C- - Does the State of Nebraska desire any Layer 2 CoS enforcement from the Service Provider? If certain Jitter and Latency requirements are desired, please provide the level of enforcement required by the network.</p>	<p>The state does not require any Layer-2 CoS enforcement from the Service Provider, but it is expected that the connection provided will meet accepted minimum requirements for Video over IP transmission. Generic video equipment can tolerate latency much more than jitter with most equipment requiring a less that 100ms jitter metric (RFP Section 6 - Technical Requirements, Item c). Acceptable video performance will require jitter to be under 100ms. ITU-T G.114 recommends a maximum of 150ms one-way latency, so the provided connection must also meet that minimum to be considered acceptable for the voice transmission component.</p>
<p>9. What are the acceptable requirements for supporting latency, jitter, frame-loss or other QoS levels?</p>	<p>The state does not require CoS/QoS enforcement from the provider but CoS and QoS tags from the customer must be carried through the provider’s network intact (RFP Section 6 -Technical Requirements, Item a).The previous question 8 addresses the latency and jitter requirements. Frame-loss should always be kept to a minimum. Frame-loss levels of 5% or greater will be considered unacceptable for video transmission and would not meet connection RFP requirements. It is expected that any data input and output levels above the contracted amount may be indiscriminately discarded.</p>
<p>10. Can you explain how vendors are notified when new RFP’s are released?</p>	<p>State Purchasing sends a U.S. Mail letter to an “Interested Vendors” list provided by the state agency most closely associated with the RFP. In RFPs when federal E-rate is involved (e.g. RFP4180Z1), a Form 470 is also posted to the USAC website: http://www.slforms.universalservice.org/Form470Expert/Search_FundYear_Select.aspx</p>