



## **ADDENDUM #1**

**To:** All Companies Interested in Submitting a Proposal  
**From:** Rebecca Johnson, CPPB, Purchasing Agent  
**RFP:** Redundant Internet Link (RFP #PUR1118-115); Dated: January 4, 2019  
**Subject:** Addendum #1 (3 pages)  
**Date:** January 23, 2019

---

The following questions and/or clarifications were asked relative to the above-listed Request for Proposal. This memo is sent for clarification to all companies to whom the RFP was sent.

**Question:** 4.2.1 – If a separate point-to-point transport connection (non-internet) will be required between the primary and the redundant internet feed locations, does the City expect to contract for that connectivity separately from this agreement, or does the City plan to use existing JCN fiber connectivity? Or, does the City want the Contractor to include that transport circuit within this RFP design and response?

**Answer:** This will be provided by the City.

**Question:** 4.2.3 – Load balancing is mentioned in this section. Is the City referring to BGP-level load balancing or something else?

**Answer:** Yes, BGP is correct.

**Question:** 4.2.4 – Will the City or the Contractor provide on-going administration labor for the BGP environment and associated new hardware? (i.e. routers, transceivers, etc.)

**Answer:** Contractor shall provide.

**Question:** 4.2.4 – Does the City want the Contractor to include manufacturer's maintenance and support agreements with any hardware the Contractor is providing as part of this proposal? If so, 4-hour response or next business day? (e.g. Cisco SmartNet, etc.)

**Answer:** Yes. The City is asking for this to be turnkey and part of the service agreement. Next day response will be acceptable as long as one of the two internet routes is operational.

- Question:** 4.2.11 – This section outlines a quantity of 1 copper cross connect for the new redundant internet service. Does the City want a second, redundant internet connection from the Contractor?
- Answer:** Yes. A primary part of this proposal is a secondary, resilient internet link to be provided by the Contractor.
- Question:** 4.2.12 – Can the IP address block come from the Contractor? Or does the City require the Contractor to obtain IP addresses from IANA/ARIN?
- Answer:** Acquiring addresses from ARIN is not going to be required, however, the City would like to understand the effort, cost, and requirements for such if we choose to do so.
- Question:** Proposal Pricing Submittal Form (Page 22 of RFP) – this section will demonstrate the price per Mbps of internet bandwidth at three different volume amounts. Does the City want the other services, such as BGP environment administration labor, hardware and manufacturer’s support built into the “Total Amount per Month”? Or does the City prefer the proposing Contractor to show those other items separately on page 22, or as a separate attachment?
- Answer:** The City would like to see these service costs split out so we will have the flexibility to choose which services will be of the most value when determining award of the contract. Please use additional pages as needed to include the itemized pricing.
- Question:** Does the City have entrance conduit for the City Services Center (500 15<sup>th</sup> Ave SW) and the Central Fire Station (713 First Ave SE)? If entrance conduit exists, can a conduit map be made available for this RFP?
- Answer:** There are 2 locations at each site with feeder cables already in place. For the City Services Center there are handholes located at 10<sup>th</sup> Ave SW and 4<sup>th</sup> St SW and at 14<sup>th</sup> Ave SW and 6<sup>th</sup> St SW. For the Central Fire Station there are handholes located at 1<sup>st</sup> Ave SE and 7<sup>th</sup> St SE and at 1<sup>st</sup> Ave SE and 8<sup>th</sup> St SE.
- Question:** Section 4.2.1 requests that the redundant link be “in a geographically separated location from the primary link”. Does this location refer to the point where we hand off the internet link to the City? Or does this location refer to where we receive our internet link from our providers?
- Answer:** The location refers to where the internet link is handed off to the City. Exception – CenturyLink (current primary internet provider) link does not meet spec for the purposes of this RFP unless proven that it is blended from various other parties.

**Question:** Section 4.2.4 states that “contractor shall provide demark, equipment and support for balancing and maintaining WAN connectivity for both the existing primary link and the new redundant secondary link”. Are you asking that we provide this for not only our link but also for the existing third-party link?

**Answer:** Yes. The City is asking the Contractor who is awarded this contract to provide the redundant link to provide demark, equipment and support for balancing and maintaining WAN connectivity for both the existing primary link and the new redundant secondary link.

**Question:** Section 4.2.4 – building on the previous question, are you looking for 2 separate BGP routers to handle each redundant connection? Or do you have a BGP router in place today to handle your existing primary link?

**Answer:** The City is requesting a turnkey solution provided by the Contractor that is listed as a separate service from ISP cost.

---

All addenda that you receive shall become a part of the contract documents and shall be acknowledged and dated on the bottom of the Signature Page (Attachment C). The deadline for proposal submittal is Thursday, January 31, 2019 before 3:00 p.m. CST.