



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
for
Navajo Nation Tribal Consortium
Arizona Locations Only
Schools**

**ADDENDUM #3
RFP#20-01-2233LE
Issued 2-4-2020**

Response to Service Providers Questions

Since the Service Provider sent one set of questions instead of separate questions for each of the four RFP's, we have sent one response with the exception of adding one library site to RFP #20-01-2231LE

Question 1

RFP states "the Navajo Nation Tribal Consortium must have dedicated, symmetrical transport bandwidth of 200 Mbps initially with Service Level Agreement (SLA) guarantees between the designated endpoints. The solution must be scalable to 10 Gbps. Price quotes are requested for 12 month and 36 month terms of service".

Is it acceptable for a bidder to submit price quotes for services less than 200 Mbps and/or services scalable to only 1 Gbps for some sites?

Response: Our preference is for services that can be scalable from 100Mbps to 10Gig. But, we will not reject bids that can't scale up to 10Gig.

Question 2

The RFPs for AZ schools/Chapters/Head Starts state "The network design for the Navajo Nation Tribal Consortium seeks to connect all the sites listed in this RFP to the Navajo Nation Department of Dine Education located at Window Rock, Arizona which be the schools, head start facilities and libraries network hub - the equivalent to a public school district's wide area network topology. This private network will be the wide area network for the tribal schools and libraries in Arizona and will also be connected to the University of New Mexico located in Albuquerque, New Mexico".

Are bidders required to submit a separate quote for the connection from Window Rock, AZ hub to the Albuquerque, NM hub? If yes, could you please provide more details/the requirements for this connection?

Response: Our intent was to allow Service Providers to run their individual fiber for the Arizona locations to a central aggregation point in Arizona and then deliver over a single pair(s) of fibers to the New Mexico point if it was cheaper to do so.

Question 3

The RFPs state "if there is a cost savings to "bundle" some of the sites together or of the Service Provider can make a case to reduce the price the cost of installation by "bundling" those sites, they can provide alternate pricing for such sites.

Can a bidder "bundle" sites from multiple RFPs when developing alternate pricing i.e. include sites in a "bundle" that are in two or more RFPs.

Response: If significant cost savings can be received by "bundling" bids, we are encouraging Service Providers to do so. But, be aware that separate departments will be signing separate contracts for services so each site must still be bid separately. Especially the schools as each school district will be signing their own separate contract(s). And, since each department and each school will be evaluating their own sites and may choose to accept or reject bids, that's why each site must be bid separately.

Question 4

Please confirm that the end user sites will provide onsite terminating equipment capable of delivering the speeds required by the RFP?

Response: Per USAC rules, Category One networking equipment is eligible for E-Rate funding. Therefore, we are expecting that Service Providers will be supplying a router for each site capable of running connection speeds up to 500Mbps. Each site will supply the rest of their network outside of E-Rate. But, it is expected that in Funding Year 2021, a Category Two project will be put out to update the rest of the wireless network at each site. Per the RFP, the one-time installation charges, network equipment, maintenance and ISP services shall all be bid separately and independent from one another.

Question 5

The RFP States "Section 3 WAN: Network designs must provide point-to-point connections between all entities in this RFP and at the pueblo education network point of interconnection in the UNM Suite at 505 Marquette, Albuquerque, New Mexico."

Please clarify whether it is a requirement that each site must have an individual interface at the Hub location or whether several individual sites may be aggregated at some point prior to interfacing with the Hub location.

Response: Per our response in Question 2, if there is a cost savings to aggregate circuits, we would not be opposed to looking at pricing for this solution.

Question 6

Please confirm that the Latitude and Longitude provided for the sites below are accurate.

- Tohatchi Chapter (Tohatchi, NM)
- Red Lake Chapter (Navajo, NM)
- Coyote Canyon
- Red Rock Head Start

Response: The sites below should be bid:

- Tohatchi Chapter Latitude 35.853613 Longitude -108.763091
- Red Lake Chapter Latitude 35.909378 Longitude -109.030737
- Coyote Canyon Latitude 35.774723 Longitude -108.618947
- Red Rock Head Start Location can be found on www.navaohs.org under District II tab.

Question 7

Please confirm the omission of the following Head Start locations from the RFP

- Becenti Head Start
- Rock Springs Head Start
- Naschitti Head Start
- Red Lake Head Start
- Carson Head Start
- Borrego Pass Head Start

Response:

Becenti HS – Closed indefinitely due to facilities issues

Rock Springs HS – Closed indefinitely due to facilities issues

Naschitti HS – Closed indefinitely due to facilities issues

Red Lake HS – Closed indefinitely due to facilities issues

Carson HS – Closed indefinitely due to facilities issues

Borrego Pass HS – known as Nahodishgish (Dalton Pass) located in Borrego Pass School.

Question 8

Please confirm the eligibility of the location below

- Little Water Head Start

Response: Red Rock Head Start Location is to be bid. The location can be found on www.navaohs.org under District II tab.

END OF ADDENDUM