

Question and Answers for Bid #JP14001 - WSCA-NASPO Data Communications Products & Services

---

**Overall Bid Questions**

**Question 1**

Will WSCA/the State of Utah entertain responses and potentially enter into contracts with entities that are not manufacturers? (Submitted: Jul 3, 2013 3:49:24 PM MDT)

**Answer**

- The focus of this contract is for manufacturers and their designated vendor partners. Bids must come from manufacturers. (Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)

**Question 2**

What other states are participating? (Submitted: Jul 8, 2013 10:41:13 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- The focus of this contract is for manufacturers and their designated vendor partners. Bids must come from manufacturers. (Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)

**Question 3**

Can a vendor submit responses in certain categories and not bid other categories? Thank you (Submitted: Jul 9, 2013 4:12:32 PM MDT)

**Answer**

- The focus of this contract is for manufacturers and their designated vendor partners. Bids must come from manufacturers. (Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)

**Question 4**

Can a vendor submit responses in certain categories and not bid other categories? Thank you (Submitted: Jul 9, 2013 4:12:35 PM MDT)

**Answer**

- The focus of this contract is for manufacturers and their designated vendor partners. Bids must come from manufacturers. (Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)

**Question 5**

Regarding Section 3.1.3 ¿ is it acceptable to meet the coverage limits with excess or

umbrella policies? **(Submitted: Jul 11, 2013 6:46:16 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Potentially, yes. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 6**

In Section 1.1 on page 3 of 45, the RFP states that this invitation is open to qualified manufacturers. Will WSCA-NASPO/State of Utah entertain responses from organizations providing integrated managed and hosted solutions? For example, solution providers and carriers offer hosted and managed solutions, such as hosted Unified Communications, that will be excluded if responses are limited to equipment manufacturers only. Thank you.

**(Submitted: Jul 12, 2013 2:41:09 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- This procurement is for hardware and related software products and services, so a manufacturer should be able to address both areas either on their own or with their designated partners. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 7**

This RFP has been referenced on Bid Sync by at least two other states; Maine and California. Do bidders need to respond to just the Utah RFP, or are State specific responses required? **(Submitted: Jul 15, 2013 11:47:05 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Respond to the Utah RFP. Some States post as a matter of law or rule, but bids need to be filed with Utah as the lead state. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 8**

For section 5.3.0 Unified Communications; will hosted or cloud based solutions be considered? Other sections of the RFP, 5.2.6.7 and 5.2.9.5, ask for cloud based options for web/email security and wireless, but cloud based services are not mentioned in the Unified Communications section. **(Submitted: Jul 15, 2013 11:50:11 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Hosted solutions will be considered. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 9**

Understanding that typically WSCA is for OEM manufacturers, would you consider opening this bid up to resellers to get offerings in all categories? **(Submitted: Jul 15, 2013**

**3:45:20 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- The bid is limited to manufacturers and their designated partners. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 10**

Regarding Section 25 of the WSCA-NASCO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions - regarding payment of fees. Can the contractor require the reporting and payment of this fee to be fulfilled by resellers who are authorized to sell product under this agreement, or is it the responsibility of the Contract holder? **(Submitted: Jul 17, 2013 2:44:09 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Reporting and the payment of fees are the responsibility of the contract holder. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 11**

Section 5.2.4.2 - Will products having CWDM capabilities, as opposed to DWDM capabilities, be acceptable? **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 10:07:25 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- DWDM is preferred since it represents newer technology, however CWDM may be bid, but interest may also be limited. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 12**

Section 5.2.8.1 - Will products that don't have 10Gig uplink capabilities be entertained for potentially small office locations where 10Gig may not be warranted? This could also pertain to classrooms or conference rooms where the inclusion of 10Gig support may not be warranted/desired. If OK, we can ensure that non-10Gig switches are listed separately to avoid any confusion. **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 10:08:04 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, the context of this RFP includes small through large environments and related equipment, software, and services. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 13**

Section 5.2.8.2 - Will products that don't currently have 40/100Gig interfaces available today, yet are already architecturally designed for future inclusion of 40/100Gig interfaces, be considered? Would that apply to MACsec as well? Will standards based Ethernet fabric

technology (802.1aq), providing VPLS functionality, be acceptable? **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 10:08:38 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, vendors should bid products that support existing and forthcoming technology whenever possible. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 14**

Section 5.2.8.3 - Will products that don't support Cisco's proprietary Dynamic Trunking Protocol be considered? The NSA suggests Dynamic Trunking Protocol be disabled given its security risk. **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 10:09:15 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, other approaches will be considered. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 15**

Section 5.2.8.4 - Hardware-based Inter-Switch Link (ISL) trunking is a Cisco proprietary implementation, while an IEEE standard (802.1Q) exists and is used industry wide. Even Cisco is depreciating the use of this protocol in their devices. Would 802.1Q be acceptable for trunking? **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 10:09:49 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, 802.1Q could be potentially acceptable. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 16**

Section 5.2.8.7 - The IEEE/IETF has a new standard for Carrier Ethernet deployments known as Shortest Path Bridging (IEEE 802.1aq/IETF RFC 6329). Rather than stacking customer VLAN's with carrier VLAN's, as in the case with Q-in-Q (IEEE 802.1ad), 802.1aq core switches would use MAC-in-MAC encapsulation for flow isolation of individual customer networks/services across the carrier backbone. Carrier Ethernet switches capable of 802.1aq could interface the same way with customer facing edge devices, as with Q-in-Q, however offers a tremendous amount of additional capabilities. Would the inclusion of an 802.1aq solution be entertained in lieu of Q-in-Q capable products? **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 10:10:36 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, 802.1Q could be potentially acceptable **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 17**

Section 5.2.8.8 - Will products not supporting "dying gasp on loss of power", internal stratum 3 clock & SynchE be acceptable? **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 10:11:00 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, this could be potentially acceptable. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 18**

Section 5.2.9.1 - Will products that don't currently have 802.11AC Access Points available today, yet are planned for delivery at the end of this Calendar year, be accepted? Can products that don't currently have a cloud offering, although could be designed that way, be accepted? **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 10:11:31 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, these products are potentially acceptable **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 19**

Section 5.2.9.3 - Will products that don't currently have a cloud offering, although could be designed that way, be accepted? **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 10:11:54 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Products must be actual planned products with established pricing, and not "maybe" products. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 20**

Section 5.2.9.4 - Will products that don't currently have Bonjour/mDNS support be accepted if the product support is planned through a simple software upgrade? **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 10:12:22 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, this is potentially acceptable. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 10:52:58 AM MDT)**

**Question 21**

On page 8, #3 regarding freight costs of the solicitation; Do bids to this RFP need to state that there will be a separate line item for freight charges on the master contract? Or do freight charges only need to be listed as separate line items on individual PO's/contracts? Thanks. **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 2:25:51 PM MDT)**

## Answer

- Per the RFP in section 3.1.4 Delivery

(M) The prices offered shall be the delivered price to any WSCA-NASPO purchasing entity. All deliveries shall be F.O.B. destination with all transportation and handling charges paid by the contractor. Responsibility and liability for loss or damage shall remain the Contractor until final inspection and acceptance (within 30 days after delivery for external damage and 30 days for any concealed damage) when responsibility shall pass to the Buyer except as to latent defects, fraud and Contractor's warranty obligations. The minimum shipment amount will be found in the special terms and conditions. Any order for less than the specified amount is to be shipped with the freight prepaid and added as a separate item on the invoice. Any portion of an order to be shipped without transportation charges that is back ordered shall be shipped without charge. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 11:41:13 AM MDT)**

## Question 22

Is there a bid template to be used for this RFP available to be downloaded? Thanks.  
**(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 2:27:41 PM MDT)**

## Answer

- No bid template is provided. Use the category listings and sub parts to structure your bid response. Please refer to section 2.1 of the RFP document. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 11:41:13 AM MDT)**

## Question 23

Section 5.1.4; Is the prior year's audited financial statement sufficient for this bid? Or how many years is requested? Thanks. **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 2:31:08 PM MDT)**

## Answer

- Two years worth of financial information is necessary. Assuming the prior year's financial statement includes comparative data with at least one prior fiscal year, the prior years financial statement will be sufficient. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 11:41:13 AM MDT)**

## Question 24

5.3.1.1, Maintenance Services; On the cost schedule attached, there doesn't seem to be a place to list percentage discounts for service and maintenance (SLA) contracts for hardware purchases. It seems to list only hourly rates. Where on the costs schedule should we list the percentage discount for maintenance agreements on hardware? Thanks. **(Submitted: Jul 19, 2013 2:44:26 PM MDT)**

## Answer

- List out of warranty maintenance charge discounts within each product category as an additional product option, or as an overall discount as against a standard maintenance price list as you deem appropriate. **(Answered: Jul 22, 2013 11:41:13 AM MDT)**

## Question 25

Attachment C ¿ You ask vendors to specify a discount percentage offered for products in each category. Then, you ask vendors to ¿provide a detailed product offering for each category.¿ Please elaborate on what constitutes a detailed product offering. Are you asking for a parts list? **(Submitted: Jul 22, 2013 12:34:58 PM MDT)**

## Answer

- The detailed product offering is your standard catalog product list, including MSRP. The product offering should also identify each of the products available in a given category or subcategory. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

## Question 26

Attachment C ¿ You have a line item for listing a discount percentage for entire sections (5.2.1, for example). Are vendors allowed to provide different discounts for different subsections? For example, a different discount for section 5.2.1.1 vs section 5.2.1.2? **(Submitted: Jul 22, 2013 12:35:47 PM MDT)**

## Answer

- Yes you may provide different discounts for the subcategories, but an overall % discount off the price by category or subcategory offered is required. Please keep in mind that making interpretation of your discount offerings more complex may unduly complicate your scoring. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

## Question 27

Section 5.2 ¿ Please clarify that a vendor not responding to a subsection within a section does not preclude the vendor from responding to other subsections within a section, or from responding to the section. For example, if a vendor cannot respond to subsection 5.3.0.8.1, does that preclude the vendor from responding to all of section 5.3.0? **(Submitted: Jul 22, 2013 12:36:14 PM MDT)**

## Answer

- Please refer to Addendum # 2. Vendors do not need to respond to every subsection within a category, however breadth of solution offering is scorable, and may be advantageous in some instances. WSCA-NASPO is looking for bids on relevant best products within each section and subsection. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

MDT)

**Question 28**

The Q&A states that bids must come from manufacturers and their designated vendor partners -- can only manufacturers respond or can their designated vendor partners respond directly? (Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 1:11:03 PM MDT)

**Answer**

- Manufacturers must respond and indicate their designated partners. (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

**Question 29**

The Q&A states that bids must come from manufacturers and their designated vendor partners -- can only manufacturers respond or can their designated vendor partners respond directly? (Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 1:11:06 PM MDT)

**Answer**

- Manufacturers must respond and indicate their designated partners. (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

**Question 30**

Is this RFP only open to the vendors listed in Section 1.4 Solicitation Background of the RFP?

To reply as a vendor partner, what type of documentation do you need to demonstrate that we are an approved "designated vendor partner"? (Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 1:14:22 PM MDT)

**Answer**

- Manufacturers must respond and indicate their designated partners. (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

**Question 31**

Section 5.1.2 states: Respondents must indicate their acceptance of the State of Utah Standard Terms and Conditions in addition to the WSCA-NASPO Terms and Conditions attached to this RFP as Attachment A and Attachment B. Any exceptions to these terms and conditions must be clearly identified in the bid response and during the question and answer period on BidSync.

Section 1.16 states: Vendors must clearly identify exceptions to the WSCA-NASPO Standard Master Agreement Terms and Conditions and the State of Utah Additional Terms and Conditions in the bid submission. Vendor exceptions must include proposed solution language.

Please confirm that exceptions to any and all terms of the RFP and proposed solution language must be submitted with the bid response and not with the questions due July 26th. **(Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 1:24:21 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Attachment A is the State of Utah Standard Terms and Conditions that will apply to the Participating Addendum with the State of Utah. The WSCA-NASPO terms and conditions will apply to the Master Agreement resulting from this solicitation. All exceptions to either of the two terms and conditions documents need to be identified in the proposal. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

**Question 32**

Section 1.7 - Does the person who uploads the documents to Bid Sync need to be the person with an authorized binding signature for the corporation? **(Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 5:26:55 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- No. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

**Question 33**

Section 1.7 - If the proposal packet needs to be sent as hardcopy, may we please have the physical addresses of the evaluation team members listed on page 6? **(Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 5:29:15 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- A. Marti Marsh, Purchasing Officer

Nevada State Purchasing Division

515 E. Musser St., Suite 300

Carson City, NV 89701

John Fitter

New Mexico Department of Information Technology

P.O. Box 22550

Santa Fe, NM 87502-2550

Vicente Azarcon

Procurement Specialist

Division of Purchase and Property

New Jersey Department of Treasury

33 West State Street, 8th Floor

Trenton, NJ 08625-0230

Bonnie Bahnsen

State of California

DGS Procurement Division

707 3rd Street, 2nd Floor

West Sacramento, CA 95605

Lori Nordlien, CPPB

State Procurement Analyst

1225 Ferry St. SE U140

Salem, OR 97301-4285

Jennifer Porter

Purchasing Agent / Contract Analyst

1 State Office Building - Suite 3150

Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Ted Fosket

--US MAIL--

State of Alaska

Department of Administration

Division of General Services

P.O. Box 110210

Juneau, AK 99811-0210

Or

--DELIVERY SERVICE--

State of Alaska

Department of Administration

Division of General Services

State Office Building, Suite 700

333 Willoughby Avenue

Juneau, AK 99811 (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)

#### **Question 34**

Section 3.1 - Requirement is to Identify Equipment Offering; should the response merely be a list of items offered or should this section include a brief (or elaborate) description for the offering? If no description is requested here, in what section is a description of the offering requested so that WSCA can evaluate the solution for validity, if applicable? (Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 5:31:12 PM MDT)

#### **Answer**

- That is a vendor decision, but in general, descriptions should include enough

detail to remove uncertainty and address the requirements. (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

### Question 35

Will the state provide a checklist detailing all requirements necessary to submit a compliant response? (Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 5:33:03 PM MDT)

### Answer

- No, all requirements for a compliant response are already included in the RFP. (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

### Question 36

Attachment B - Please confirm the contact name, email address, and due date on the Reference Form to be submitted to the State of UT, Division of Purchasing. (Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 5:33:49 PM MDT)

### Answer

- Please see Addendum # 3 "Attachment B - Reference Form Revised 7-29-13". (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

### Question 37

Section 5 - Mandatory Requirements (M)  
All Respondents must meet the (M) requirements listed in this section, and explain how the requirement is met. A "no" response on the acceptance document or omission of the required explanation will disqualify the service from further evaluation.

Can you clarify to what level of detail (product components, 3rd party evaluations, simple product descriptions) we need to explain how our product meets the requirements? Will supporting documentation be necessary? How many sentences will be sufficient? (Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 5:34:30 PM MDT)

### Answer

- That is a vendor decision, but in general, descriptions should include enough detail to remove uncertainty and address the requirements. (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

### Question 38

Section 4.6 - Conflicting terms used in this section. The terms "Authorized Sub Contractor", "Servicing Subcontractors", "partners", "resellers", "Authorized Data Communications Reseller", "Authorized Contractor", "Data Communication partners" are used

throughout. Would the state consider using a defined term with explanation of the Servicing Subcontractors?

Vendor suggestion:

Vendor suggests the provision be clarified to use Servicing Subcontractor and include reseller and agent relationships as follows: Contractors may name Servicing Subcontractors to individual participating addenda. Such Servicing Subcontractors will be considered a reseller or agent as follows: a) A Contractor authorized reseller to act as a reseller of Contractor to provide quotes, accept purchase orders, provide product/service, invoice and receive payment under the terms and conditions of the Contractor's contract., or b) A Contractor authorized agent to provide pre-sales support for Contractor. Orders may be channeled to EMC through the authorized agent and authorized may receive a fee payment for the sales support. Such fee payment will not affect the pricing specified in the Contractor's Price List. **(Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 5:35:15 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Please refer to the Glossary in Section 1.31 of the RFP. It states that Authorized Sub-Contractors are synonymous with sub-contractor, reseller, partner, etc. For the purposes of responding to this RFP, please use the terms in the glossary. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

### **Question 39**

Section 5.1.4 - Reference is made to Prime contractors working on behalf of Respondents. Is the term Prime Contractor the same as a partner/reseller? If not, please define. **(Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 5:35:50 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Please refer to the Glossary in Section 1.31 of the RFP. The Prime Contractor is the Authorized Contractor on Master Agreement. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

### **Question 40**

Paragraph 4 of WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions - The first sentence refers to any Master Agreement. Please clarify what is meant by any. **(Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 5:37:12 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- "Any" refers to any Master Agreement executed as a result of this solicitation. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

### **Question 41**

Section 3.1.4, Paragraphs 4 and 8 of WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and

Conditions and Paragraph 13 of Attachment A refer to *Special Terms and Conditions*. Please clarify the location of *special terms and conditions*. (Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 5:37:48 PM MDT)

**Answer**

- The special terms and conditions in the WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions referenced in paragraphs 4 and 8, will be specific to the Participating Addendum signed by the individual States as a result of this solicitation. The special terms and conditions referenced in Attachment A State of Utah Standard Information Technology Terms and Conditions, paragraph 13, will be specific to the State of Utah Participating Addendum and are not referring to any additional terms and conditions. (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

**Question 42**

5.1.2 Terms and Conditions -

(M) Respondents must indicate their acceptance of the State of Utah Standard Terms and Conditions in addition to the WSCA-NASPO Terms and Conditions attached to this RFP as Attachment A and Attachment B. Any exceptions to these terms and conditions must be clearly identified in bid response and during the question and answer period on BidSync. Significant exceptions may constitute grounds for rejecting Respondent proposals.

Attachment B is the Reference Form. Can you please revise the above statement to correctly state the grounds of acceptance? (Submitted: Jul 23, 2013 5:38:53 PM MDT)

**Answer**

- In section 5.1.2 Terms and Conditions, the reference to Attachment B is incorrect. To clarify, Attachment A is the State of Utah Standard Information Technology Terms and Conditions, Attachment B is the Reference Form and Attachment C is the Cost Schedule. The WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions is a stand alone document included in the solicitation packet and was not labeled as an attachment. By submitting a proposal, and following the proposal submission instructions in Bidsync, the offeror will be accepting the WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions and the State of Utah Standard Information Technology Terms and Conditions. Any exceptions need to be clearly identified within the proposal submission. (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

**Question 43**

Can you post a list of interested bidders? (Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 8:13:25 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- No. (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

**Question 44**

We are a privately held company and do not release our financials to the public. Is the state of Utah willing to sign a non disclosure agreement so that we can provide the required financial information? **(Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 1:35:03 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- The State of Utah will not sign a non-disclosure agreement. Please refer to Section 1.19 Protected Information on how to submit protected information within a proposal. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

**Question 45**

Section 6.1 General Information, and Section 1.7 Proposal Submittal: We intend to submit our original master proposal packet electronically through BidSync (per Section 6.1, All proposals must be submitted in electronic form. Therefore, please confirm: is a hard copy and an electronic version of our complete proposal (excluding pricing information) also required for each of the additional listed evaluation team members from Alaska, California, Nevada, and New Jersey? Why is a hard-copy required if the required/preferred method is in electronic form? If a hard copy is required, please provide regular US Mail addresses for these individuals. **(Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 2:26:28 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- A. BidSync is the State of Utah's electronic eProcurement system and provides our office with electronic solicitation posting, response collection, and tracking capabilities. Since the evaluation committee members are located in various states, a hardcopy proposal copy is required for each member (to be received before the RFP closing date) as electronic files may be too large to be sent via the state's email system.

Physical Addresses:

Marti Marsh, Purchasing Officer

Nevada State Purchasing Division

515 E. Musser St., Suite 300

Carson City, NV 89701

John Fitter

New Mexico Department of Information Technology

P.O. Box 22550

Santa Fe, NM 87502-2550

Vicente Azarcon

Procurement Specialist

Division of Purchase and Property

New Jersey Department of Treasury

33 West State Street, 8th Floor

Trenton, NJ 08625-0230

Bonnie Bahnsen

State of California

DGS Procurement Division

707 3rd Street, 2nd Floor

West Sacramento, CA 95605

Lori Nordlien, CPPB

State Procurement Analyst

1225 Ferry St. SE U140

Salem, OR 97301-4285

Jennifer Porter

Purchasing Agent / Contract Analyst

1 State Office Building - Suite 3150

Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Ted Fosket

--US MAIL--

State of Alaska

Department of Administration

Division of General Services

P.O. Box 110210

Juneau, AK 99811-0210

Or

--DELIVERY SERVICE--

State of Alaska

Department of Administration

Division of General Services

State Office Building, Suite 700

333 Willoughby Avenue

Juneau, AK 99811 (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT**)

**Question 46**

Section 1.7 Proposal Submittal: Please confirm that Jennifer Porter of Utah (who will receive the original ¿master¿ proposal packet through BidSync) also needs an additional hard copy and electronic version (excluding pricing information). (**Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 2:27:59 PM MDT**)

**Answer**

- Yes, please provide a hardcopy and electronic copy for Jennifer Porter  
(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)

#### **Question 47**

There are four references to "special terms and conditions" in RFP (1), WSCA-NASPO Master (2) and State of Utah Standard Information Technology Terms and Conditions (1). Are there additional "special terms and conditions" that we should be reviewing in addition to ones mentioned above? Following are where these references occur: RFP Document: Section 3.1.4 (Delivery) / WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions: Section 4(Cancellation) & Section 8 (Delivery) / State of Utah Standard Information Technology Terms and Conditions: Section 13 (Termination) (Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 2:29:17 PM MDT)

#### **Answer**

- Please refer to question # 41. (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

#### **Question 48**

Section 1.20 WSCA Administrative Fee: Please confirm amount: one quarter of one percent (0.25%, not 0.025%). (Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 2:29:45 PM MDT)

#### **Answer**

- 0.25% (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

#### **Question 49**

Section 1.20 WSCA Administrative Fee: Please confirm amount: one quarter of one percent (0.25%, not 0.025%). (Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 2:29:51 PM MDT)

#### **Answer**

- 0.25% (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

#### **Question 50**

Section 5.1.3 Experience requests five (5) references, but Section 6.2.1 References requests three (3) references: How many references are required to satisfy this solicitation? (Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 2:50:24 PM MDT)

#### **Answer**

- Five (5) references will be required. (Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)

#### **Question 51**

Section 5.1.3 Experience requests five (5) references, but Section 6.2.1 References requests three (3) references: How many references are required to satisfy this solicitation? **(Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 2:50:30 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Five (5) references will be required. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

**Question 52**

Section 5.1.2 Terms and Conditions: Please clarify that the WSCA-NASPO Terms and Conditions are the stand-alone document and not Attachment B as is referenced in this section (Attachment B is the Reference Form). **(Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 3:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Please refer to question # 42. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

**Question 53**

Section 5.1.4 Financial Stability: Our company's audited financial statements (10-K's) are available on the Investor Relations page of our company website (these reports are typically 200 pages long per year). Please verify that this online availability will satisfy the requirement of this section. If not, which years' reports do you want included in the response package? **(Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 3:04:48 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Online availability will satisfy these requirements. **(Answered: Jul 29, 2013 3:07:42 PM MDT)**

**Question 54**

Section 5.1.4 Financial Stability: If hard copies are required for the other evaluation team members (per Section 1.7), do you want these financial reports included in those hard copies? Which years? **(Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 3:05:16 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- A. Hard copies of financials are not necessary for all evaluation members, however, please make it clear where current financial information can be found to meet this requirement in your proposal response. The two most recent years of financial information is required for comparison purposes. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)**

**Question 55**

Section 7.3.1 WSCA-NASPO eMarket Center: Can a Contractor's Authorized Sub

Contractor provide an eMarket Punch-Out Catalog? If yes, will this fulfill the Contractor's requirement to participate in eMarket per 3.1.7 eMarket Center Cooperation? **(Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 3:05:42 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- No, it is the responsibility of the contract holder to maintain the eMarket Center Punch-Out Catalog. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)**

**Question 56**

Section 5.3.1 SERVICES: Please confirm that you want all of the Services responses to be consolidated under Section 5.3.1, with reference back to the products and services in Sections 5.2.1 through 5.3.0 to which they apply. Do you have a preferred format for the organization of this information? **(Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 3:48:44 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Organize services by category. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)**

**Question 57**

Section 5.2.5.1 Branch Routers: Will a multiservice branch-router without WAN Acceleration be acceptable? **(Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 3:50:52 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Potentially yes. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)**

**Question 58**

Section 5.2.5.1 Branch Routers: Will you consider a device which meets some, but not all of the requirements? I.e., a hybrid solution consisting of our device doing a major portion (routing, QoS, etc.), associated with a third party solution to handle security authentication for instance? **(Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 3:51:30 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Potentially, yes. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)**

**Question 59**

Section 6.2.1 References: Our intent is to provide references for government and public entities; therefore, are we required to submit 'Attachment B - Reference Form' for these government/public entity references or only if we were using business (company) references? **(Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 4:23:42 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, for all references use the Attachment B - Reference Form Revised 7-29-13. (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)

#### **Question 60**

Section 5.2.8.3 ¿ Campus Distribution Switches: This section calls for support of a Cisco-proprietary trunking protocol (DTP). Will you accept an equivalent technology? (Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 4:27:58 PM MDT)

#### **Answer**

- Yes (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)

#### **Question 61**

Section 5.2.9.4 ¿ Wireless LAN Network Services and Management: This section calls for specific support of RFC-1213 and Apple¿s Bonjour/mDNS protocol with Application Identification Capability. Will you accept systems without support for these features? (Submitted: Jul 24, 2013 4:28:16 PM MDT)

#### **Answer**

- Yes (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)

#### **Question 62**

Attachment B ¿ Reference Form.pdf

The date for getting reference response showing in the reference letter is still \_\_2011. Will or when will the new version be available? (Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 11:41:37 AM MDT)

#### **Answer**

- Yes, please see the new reference form titled "Attachment B - Reference Form Revised 7-29-13" (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)

#### **Question 63**

What¿s physical address that we should deliver the hard copies for the section below on page6 of 45 RFP if it¿s a hard requirement:

In addition to the original ¿master¿ proposal packet submission, Respondents are required to send one (1) hard copy and one (1) electronic version (Microsoft Word and Excel) of the complete proposal, excluding pricing information, to each of the evaluation team members listed below. Each proposal packet shall be marked with the solicitation number and be in accordance with the submittal requirements. The original ¿master¿ sent to the WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Administrator identified in Section 1.6 of this RFP will prevail in resolving any discrepancies.

Alaska ¿ Ted Fawcett  
Contracting Officer  
ted.fosket@alsaka.gov

California - Bonnie Bahnsen  
bonnie.bahnsen@dgs.ca.gov

Nevada ¿ Marti Marsh  
Purchasing Officer  
mmarsh@admin.nv.gov

New Jersey ¿ Vicente Azarcon  
Procurement Specialist  
vicente.azarcon@treas.state.nj.us

Utah ¿ Jennifer Porter  
Purchasing Agent  
State of Utah  
jenniferporter@utah.gov **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 11:45:47 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- See response to Question #33 **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)**

**Question 64**

In regards to order fulfillment, as a manufacturer we do not accept purchase orders or provide quotations directly to customers. This is all handled through our resellers/partners. I did not see a section to name partners to resell products and services. How will this be handled in the bid response? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:46:18 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Section 4.6 Authorized Subcontractor Relationships ask vendors to describe current and potential subcontractor relationships and processes. Follow the instructions outlined in this section. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:25:39 PM MDT)**

**Question 65**

In regards to order fulfillment, as a manufacturer we do not accept purchase orders or provide quotations directly to customers. This is all handled through our resellers/partners. I did not see a section to name partners to resell products and services. How will this be handled in the bid response? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:46:32 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Section 4.6 Authorized Subcontractor Relationships ask vendors to describe current and potential subcontractor relationships and processes. Follow the instructions

outlined in this section. (**Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:25:40 PM MDT**)

**Question 66**

Page 6 of 45 ¿ Page 14

We need the mailing addresses of the evaluation team members so we are able to send them a hard copy of the proposal.

Will you provide these addresses? (**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:47:49 PM MDT**)

**Answer**

- See response to Question #33 (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT**)

**Question 67**

Page 6 of 45 ¿ Page 14

We need the mailing addresses of the evaluation team members so we are able to send them a hard copy of the proposal.

Will you provide these addresses? (**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:48:10 PM MDT**)

**Answer**

- See response to Question #33 (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT**)

**Question 68**

Page 6 of 45 ¿ Page 14

We need the mailing addresses of the evaluation team members so we are able to send them a hard copy of the proposal.

Will you provide these addresses? (**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:48:25 PM MDT**)

**Answer**

- See response to Question #33 (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT**)

**Question 69**

Page 6 of 45 ¿ Page 14

We need the mailing addresses of the evaluation team members so we are able to send them a hard copy of the proposal.

Will you provide these addresses? (**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:48:44 PM MDT**)

**Answer**

- See response to Question #33 (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT**)

**Question 70**

Page 10 of 45 ; Page 18

1.21 Interest

The report and associated check for admin fee payment is sent out by two different departments and will not arrive together at the same time. The report will be submitted by the due date, however the admin fee check will always follow as that process takes two to three weeks longer once the report is compiled. Is this acceptable to WSCA-NASPO? (**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:49:43 PM MDT**)

**Answer**

- Yes, as long as the report is filed by the due date. (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:06 PM MDT**)

**Question 71**

Page 10 of 45 ; Page 18

1.21 Interest

The report and associated check for admin fee payment is sent out by two different departments and will not arrive together at the same time. The report will be submitted by the due date, however the admin fee check will always follow as that process takes two to three weeks longer once the report is compiled. Is this acceptable to WSCA-NASPO? (**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:50:00 PM MDT**)

**Answer**

- Yes, as long as the report is filed by the due date. (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:06 PM MDT**)

**Question 72**

Page 10 of 45 ; Page 18

1.21 Interest

The report and associated check for admin fee payment is sent out by two different departments and will not arrive together at the same time. The report will be submitted by the due date, however the admin fee check will always follow as that process takes two to three

weeks longer once the report is compiled. Is this acceptable to WSCA-NASPO? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:50:18 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, as long as the report is filed by the due date. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)**

**Question 73**

Page 10 of 45 ; Page 18

1.21 Interest

The report and associated check for admin fee payment is sent out by two different departments and will not arrive together at the same time. The report will be submitted by the due date, however the admin fee check will always follow as that process takes two to three weeks longer once the report is compiled. Is this acceptable to WSCA-NASPO? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:50:39 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, as long as the report is filed by the due date. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)**

**Question 74**

Page 10 of 45 ; Page 18

1.21 Interest

The report and associated check for admin fee payment is sent out by two different departments and will not arrive together at the same time. The report will be submitted by the due date, however the admin fee check will always follow as that process takes two to three weeks longer once the report is compiled. Is this acceptable to WSCA-NASPO? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:51:12 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, as long as the report is filed by the due date. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)**

**Question 75**

Page 45 or Page 37 of 45

6. Order Acceptance Requirements: Contractor must be able to accept Purchase Orders via fax or cXML.

As a manufacturer we do not accept direct orders from end users. All of our sales are through our resellers/partners. Will the SciQwest/eMarket Center allow for sales to go through these resellers/partners? (Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:51:51 PM MDT)

**Answer**

- The customers purchasing product from the eMarket Center have the ability at checkout to select the reseller from whom they would like the order to be fulfilled. Keep in mind that it will be the manufacturers responsibility to maintain the hosted catalog. (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)

**Question 76**

Page 45 or Page 37 of 45

6. Order Acceptance Requirements: Contractor must be able to accept Purchase Orders via fax or cXML.

As a manufacturer we do not accept direct orders from end users. All of our sales are through our resellers/partners. Will the SciQwest/eMarket Center allow for sales to go through these resellers/partners? (Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:52:11 PM MDT)

**Answer**

- The customers purchasing product from the eMarket Center have the ability at checkout to select the reseller from whom they would like the order to be fulfilled. Keep in mind that it will be the manufacturers responsibility to maintain the hosted catalog. (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)

**Question 77**

Page 45 or Page 37 of 45

6. Order Acceptance Requirements: Contractor must be able to accept Purchase Orders via fax or cXML.

As a manufacturer we do not accept direct orders from end users. All of our sales are through our resellers/partners. Will the SciQwest/eMarket Center allow for sales to go through these resellers/partners? (Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 12:52:30 PM MDT)

**Answer**

- The customers purchasing product from the eMarket Center have the ability at checkout to select the reseller from whom they would like the order to be fulfilled. Keep in mind that it will be the manufacturers responsibility to maintain the hosted catalog. (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)

### **Question 78**

Per your Solicitation #JP14001 for Data Communications Products & Services on page 16, section 5.1.3 you write "... Respondents must be able to provide reference service contracts from a minimum of five government or commercial customers for their Data Communications Product and Services offering."

Then on page 29 section 6.2.1 you write "... Vendors must provide at least three current account references for which your company provides similar Data Communications services for private, state and/or large local government clients."

How are these references different? Will you require the same reference form (Attachment B) for both? If the same, do you require 3 or 5 references?

Of the references required to use Attachment B, please specify the date the reference need to have the forms completed and sent to the State. **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 1:02:46 PM MDT)**

### **Answer**

- Five (5) references are required. Please use the Attachment B - Reference Form Revised 7-29-13 that was uploaded as part of Addendum # 3. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)**

### **Question 79**

Per your Solicitation #JP14001 for Data Communications Products & Services on:

\* page 7, section 1.12, you specify that a discount remains the same for the contract term (~ 7 years)

\* page 7, section 1.13, you specify MSRP price list may be updated once per year. This effectively freezes prices for 12 months. Is this your intent?

\* page 36/37 - section 7.3.1.3 you specify that prices changes must be pre-approved, and may not be updated more than once per quarter. This would appear to conflict with section 1.13 above. Can you clarify please?

\* page 37 - section 7.3.1.3.a states that updated pricing files are due on the 1st of the month, go into effect on the 1st of the following month. Is this for the addition of approved new products only? Does one only submit such price files only annually if there were no product additions? Or does one have to submit their entire approved product line each month? Are customers to receive best pricing assuming price reductions were submitted/approved before they are posted or wait until the are posted on the WSCA web according to this monthly schedule?

**(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 1:04:50 PM MDT)**

### **Answer**

- Section 1.12 refers to the category or subcategory discount off of List Price. It is to remain constant for the term of the contract. Section 1.13 refers to changes in List Price, generally List Prices can be changed once per year on the anniversary of the contract. Section 7.3.1.3 states that prices can be changed outside of the yearly anniversary window but not more frequently than once per quarter. A case for the

pricing changes would have to be made to the Lead Purchasing Agent and be approved by both parties prior to taking effect. Section 7.3.1.3.a explains the process for updating pricing files. When pricing files are updated they need to be submitted by the first of the month and the updates will be put into place for the first of the following month. If no changes are made to the pricing files, then no updated pricing files need to be submitted. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 12:30:07 PM MDT)**

### **Question 80**

Attachment C

Might you consider discounts that might vary per specific models of products within a category? e.g. 5.2.8 Switches. If the entire category of switches must receive the same discount, the discount can not change and the MSRP can only change annually, the discount would naturally be low to accommodate these rules and the breath of product offerings within a category. If individual products can vary, discounts offered may be considerably more on some models even with the rest of the requirements in place. **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 1:06:23 PM MDT)**

### **Answer**

- Offerers products will also be scored by breadth and depth of offering and overall capabilities compliance. Varying pricing approaches have impact, but this is a multiple award contract. Getting 100% of the points for cost does not eliminate a vendor who gets a lower percentage. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:55:34 PM MDT)**

### **Question 81**

Per your Solicitation #JP14001 for Data Communications Products & Services on page 6 you write... "... Respondents are required to send one (1) hard copy and one (1) electronic version (Microsoft Word and Excel) of the complete proposal, excluding pricing information, to each of the evaluation team members listed below...." However, you only provide email addresses and not street addresses for the evaluation team members. Will street addresses be provided or will the evaluation team only need electronic/soft copies? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 1:07:23 PM MDT)**

### **Answer**

- See response to Question # 33 **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

### **Question 82**

Will WSCA/the State of Utah consider extending the Question and Answer period for an additional five business days? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 1:29:25 PM MDT)**

### **Answer**

- No **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:55:34 PM MDT)**

### **Question 83**

In Section 26. Standard of Performance and Acceptance, the statement "Standard of Performance" appears to be a defined term but there is no definition included in the RFP/contract documents. Can you please define? In the alternative, can we change the acceptance language to be a standard acceptance period of 5 days upon product delivery? Thank you **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 1:32:50 PM MDT)**

### **Answer**

- Standard of Performance means the equipment or process performs to the accepted standards, as documented by the manufacturer for equipment or the scope of work for processes, and to the acceptance of the customer. The term of acceptance will not be modified in the Master Agreement but can be negotiated in each of the individual state's Participating Addendums. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

### **Question 84**

Section 5.1.3 Experience requests five (5) reference service contracts and states that references must include environments and complexity that is similar in scope to those described within this RFP. Can you please define "service contracts" in further detail? Are "service contracts" other contracting vehicles that act similarly to WSCA-NASPO? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 2:27:05 PM MDT)**

### **Answer**

- Service contracts refer to current account references for which your company provides similar Data Communications services for private, state and/or large local government clients (preferably government/public entities). **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:55:34 PM MDT)**

### **Question 85**

1) Would State of Utah order from an accepted price schedule without going through the bid process? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:13:43 PM MDT)**

### **Answer**

- Yes, the purpose of this solicitation is to put in place a contract in which the State of Utah and any other participating state can purchase from directly. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

### **Question 86**

2) Would State of Utah accept partial bids, that is, if the vendor does not have the complete solution, bid only the items available? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:14:10 PM MDT)**

### **Answer**

- Yes (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT**)

#### **Question 87**

3) Would State of Utah allow multiple vendor partners on one bid? (**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:14:38 PM MDT**)

#### **Answer**

- Potentially, but it would seem unlikely to have bids from multiple manufacturers as a combined offering. (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT**)

#### **Question 88**

Sections 1.13 and 7.3.1(3) appear to be in conflict. How many pricelist updates can be submitted for new (in scope) SKUs added, removed, price increases and/or price decreases? OEMs generally have robust pricebook with thousands of SKUs that are updated monthly (i.e. adds, deletions, increases and decreases) in order to stay competitive and keep up with market demands. (**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:14:58 PM MDT**)

#### **Answer**

- Section 1.12 refers to the category or subcategory discount off of Price List. Percentage discount is to remain constant for the term of the contract. Section 1.13 refers to changes in List Price, generally Price Lists can be changed once per year on the anniversary of the contract to reflect any new products or services that fall within the scope of a category. Section 7.3.1.3 states that price lists can be changed outside of the yearly anniversary window but not more frequently than once per quarter. A case for the pricing changes would have to be made to the Lead Purchasing Agent and be approved by both parties prior to taking effect. Section 7.3.1.3.a explains the process for updating pricing files. When pricing files are updated they need to be submitted by the first of the month and the updates will be put into place for the first of the following month. If no changes are made to the pricing files, then no updated pricing files need to be submitted. (**Answered: Jul 31, 2013 2:10:52 PM MDT**)

#### **Question 89**

4) Is there a template we should follow for the response? (**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:15:11 PM MDT**)

#### **Answer**

- No bid template is provided. Use the category listings and sub parts to structure your bid response. Please refer to section 2.1 of the RFP document. (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT**)

#### **Question 90**

Would it possible to see an example of a hosted catalog at eMarket? Is there a particular format that is required? If so, can we please get a copy of that template? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:15:47 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- No template will be provided until an award is made. Upon award the vendor will be provided with an Excel template and the proper training necessary to populate the template with the product and pricing information **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 91**

What is the difference between Section 5.1.3 vs. Section 6.2.1 with respect to References? Section 5.1.3 says that a minimum of 5 references are required and Section 6.2.1 says at least 3 references are required and Attachment B must be used. Are these references for service contracts or hardware procurements? Please advise. **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:19:04 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Five (5) references are required. The references would be in relation to the products and/or services the vendor is responding to in their offer. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 92**

Section 5.2 and Attachment C Are you also looking for the Respondents to attach the detailed list of SKUs for each category? This could potentially be a very large file for each category. In addition, the list for each category would obviously change over time due to updates. **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:20:00 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Ultimately the detailed list of SKUs will be required for each category. What ever is provided will have to be updated on an ongoing basis following the guidelines outlined in the RFP. See Question # 79. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 93**

Section 5.1.4 Would it be acceptable to submit the financial statements of the authorized subcontractors/partners after contract award and after each Participating Addendum for a Participating Entity has been executed? To ensure that the right authorized subcontractors are selected to support each Participating Entity and its authorized users, we would prefer to select and vet all potential partners in coordination and consultation with each Participating Entity. **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:20:33 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- The only financials required are for primary vendors. How vendor partners are vetted is an internal matter between the primary vendor and the partner. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

#### **Question 94**

Is lease financing an allowable payment option under this RFP, subject to the laws of each Participating Entity? It is currently available under the existing Data Communications contract. We understand that each Participating Entity, at its sole discretion, may wish to exclude it in its respective Participating Addendum. **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:21:29 PM MDT)**

#### **Answer**

- Yes it is an allowable payment option. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

#### **Question 95**

Proposal Preparation ¿ Would brief descriptions and links to product descriptions and datasheets be acceptable for the manufacturers descriptive literature requirement? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:22:37 PM MDT)**

#### **Answer**

- Yes. However, if links are not working correctly, this may affect the evaluation team's ability to score the proposal. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

#### **Question 96**

Attachment B - Should questions from customer references regarding the form be sent to Jennifer Porter at the state of Utah instead of dgundersen@utah.gov? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:23:49 PM MDT)**

#### **Answer**

- Yes. Please refer to Addendum # 3 and the new Attachment B - Reference Form Revised 7-29-13. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

#### **Question 97**

We offer customers the option to purchase Service Units for installation and training services. Each Service Unit provides one day (8 hours) of professional services or training engagement with expenses included. May we include Service Units as a services price category option in our proposal? Thank you **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:30:43 PM MDT)**

#### **Answer**

- Yes (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)

### Question 98

Can WSCA/State of Utah please elaborate on what would be considered a recognized equivalent rating to 4A2? Thank you (Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:34:05 PM MDT)

### Answer

- Financial strength: 4A is \$10 to 50 million. Composite credit appraisal: 2 is good. Financial statements can demonstrate strength, other credit scoring services could be used to demonstrate creditworthiness. (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)

### Question 99

1.15 Usage Reporting Requirement.

Please provide clarification regarding reporting due dates. In this section of the RFP the reporting dates are different from the WSCA NASPO website required reporting dates. Would the State consider making the RFP reporting dates align with the WSCA NASPO online reporting tool?

Does the reference to annual reporting in the enumerated quarters indicate the State wants annual reports as well? (Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:49:14 PM MDT)

### Answer

- All reporting, for either WSCA-NASPO or the State of Utah, is due within 30 days of the end of a quarter. The reports include the required information from the previous quarters activities. The State of Utah does not require annual reports. The quarterly reporting is sufficient. (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)

### Question 100

4.5 e. When the State asks for contact information for escalation management plan, should the Vendor indicate different points of contact based on the categories, such as, contracts, services, products, etc.? Is it acceptable to provide titles for escalation responders when answering this requirement? (Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 3:50:31 PM MDT)

### Answer

- Yes, but keep in mind, the State is asking how problems are practically resolved. (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)

### Question 101

WSCA-NASPRO Master agreement terms and Conditions, Section 26 ¿Standard of Performance and Acceptance¿. The requirement that the Standard of Performance applies to all

Products purchased under the Master Agreement appears to be overly broad. This means it would apply equally to a tried and true low dollar item as well as to a high dollar valued complex solution. Can the applicability of Section 26 be limited, for example ¿The Standard of Performance will apply to Products purchased under this Master Agreement when an Acceptance Testing period is set out in a Statement of Work¿ ? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:03:42 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Please refer to Question # 83 **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 102**

ATTACHMENT A, STATE OF UTAH STANDARD INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TERMS AND CONDITIONS, Section 26 ¿Copyright¿. The requirement that all Deliverables prepared for the State of Utah as required by this contract shall be deemed a work made for hire appears to be overly broad. The word ¿Deliverables¿ is not defined in Attachment A. Can ¿Deliverables¿ be defined to mean a work product(s) first created by the contractor pursuant to this Attachment A and a detailed design specification furnished by the State of Utah when the contractor and the State of Utah agree within a Statement of Work that the work product will contain no pre-existing intellectual property of the contractor or any third party and is meant to be a work made for hire such that all rights, title and interest in the work product shall be exclusively owned by the State of Utah ? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:04:42 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Any exceptions to the terms and conditions that apply to this RFP, must be clearly identified in the vendor's response. Exceptions will be reviewed on a case by case basis. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:25:40 PM MDT)**

**Question 103**

Regarding 3.1.4 Delivery and paragraph 8 of WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions:

Comment: At the time of delivery the product is entirely out of the contractors¿ and shippers¿ control and solely in the control of the customer.

Request for change: Please modify this requirement to require the customer to notify the shipper at the time of delivery and the contractor within two business days of any external physical damage and/or missing packages. **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:18:53 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Any modifications to the WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions will be done on a state level in the individual state's participating addendums. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 104**

Regarding 3.1.4 Delivery and paragraph 8 of WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions:

Comment: At the time of delivery the product is entirely out of the contractors' and shippers' control and solely in the control of the customer.

Request for change: Please modify this requirement to require the customer to notify the shipper at the time of delivery and the contractor within two business days of any external physical damage and/or missing packages. **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:19:06 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Any modifications to the WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions will be done on a state level in the individual state's participating addendums. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 105**

Regarding 3.1.4 Delivery and paragraph 8 of WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions:

Comment: At the time of delivery the product is entirely out of the contractors' and shippers' control and solely in the control of the customer.

Request for change: Please modify this requirement to require the customer to notify the shipper at the time of delivery and the contractor within two business days of any external physical damage and/or missing packages. **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:19:21 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Any modifications to the WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions will be done on a state level in the individual state's participating addendums. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 106**

Regarding 3.1.4 Delivery and paragraph 8 of WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions:

Comment: At the time of delivery the product is entirely out of the contractors' and shippers' control and solely in the control of the customer.

Request for change: Please modify this requirement to require the customer to notify the shipper at the time of delivery and the contractor within two business days of any external physical damage and/or missing packages. **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:20:03 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Any modifications to the WSCA-NASPO Master Agreement Terms and Conditions will be done on a state level in the individual state's participating addendums. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

#### **Question 107**

RFP product scoring methodology ; The points assigned to each Offeror's cost proposal will be based on the highest discount percentage. The Offeror with the highest discount percentage will receive 100% of the price points.;

How does the state plan to create equity between varying discounts from different vendors for similar configurations? For example under the current evaluation criteria, one company may have a higher discount than another, but that company may also have a higher net price.

**(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:26:36 PM MDT)**

#### **Answer**

- Offerers products will also be scored by breadth and depth of offering and overall capabilities compliance. Varying pricing approaches have impact, but this is a multiple award contract. Getting 100% of the points for cost does not eliminate a vendor who gets a lower percentage. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

#### **Question 108**

RFP product scoring methodology ; The points assigned to each Offeror's cost proposal will be based on the highest discount percentage. The Offeror with the highest discount percentage will receive 100% of the price points.;

How does the state plan to create equity between varying discounts from different vendors for similar configurations? For example under the current evaluation criteria, one company may have a higher discount than another, but that company may also have a higher net price.

**(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:27:27 PM MDT)**

#### **Answer**

- Offerers products will also be scored by breadth and depth of offering and overall capabilities compliance. Varying pricing approaches have impact, but this is a multiple award contract. Getting 100% of the points for cost does not eliminate a vendor who gets a lower percentage. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

#### **Question 109**

RFP product scoring methodology ; The points assigned to each Offeror's cost proposal will be based on the highest discount percentage. The Offeror with the highest discount percentage will receive 100% of the price points.;

How does the state plan to create equity between varying discounts from different vendors for

similar configurations? For example under the current evaluation criteria, one company may have a higher discount than another, but that company may also have a higher net price.

**(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:27:42 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Offerers products will also be scored by breadth and depth of offering and overall capabilities compliance. Varying pricing approaches have impact, but this is a multiple award contract. Getting 100% of the points for cost does not eliminate a vendor who gets a lower percentage. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 110**

RFP product scoring methodology ¿The points assigned to each Offeror¿s cost proposal will be based on the highest discount percentage. The Offeror with the highest discount percentage will receive 100% of the price points.¿

How does the state plan to create equity between varying discounts from different vendors for similar configurations? For example under the current evaluation criteria, one company may have a higher discount than another, but that company may also have a higher net price.

**(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:27:54 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Offerers products will also be scored by breadth and depth of offering and overall capabilities compliance. Varying pricing approaches have impact, but this is a multiple award contract. Getting 100% of the points for cost does not eliminate a vendor who gets a lower percentage. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 111**

Regarding the Evaluation Table:

The RFP requires responders to provide a percentage of discount for various categories. How will multiple discounts for multiple product and labor categories be taken into consideration in the evaluation process? How will it be determined that the categories are comparable?

**(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:29:17 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Product category discounts will be compared equitably. Service/labor categories will be compared based upon response time offerings and off site versus onsite rates. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 112**

The State¿s response to Question number 6 dated July 12, 2013 allows manufacturers to utilize designated partners to offer integrated managed and hosted services. If prices submitted

must be a discount from the manufacturer's list price how will the price of the partner's products and/or services be priced and evaluated? (Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:30:55 PM MDT)

#### Answer

- Services from designated partners must be quoted by the manufacturer and be consistently applied for government customers. (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)

#### Question 113

The State's response to Question number 8 dated July 15, 2013 allows consideration for hosted solutions. Hosted and cloud solutions are often not products/services that are on a commercial price list but are priced according to the needs of the customer, i.e., private cloud versus public cloud, purchased/leased equipment, etc. How will hosted/cloud solutions be priced and evaluated? (Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:31:57 PM MDT)

#### Answer

- Cloud based offerings should be priced based upon prices for the services components offered. Configurations needed can impact price, but there is no baseline of requirements in this area. Pricing for final delivered solutions will be dependent on a detailed quote from the provider. (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)

#### Question 114

The State's response to Question 19 dated July 19, 2013 requires products be actual planned products with established pricing. The individual products that would be used in a cloud offering would be on an established price list but the actual configurations and services required for a cloud offering may not be on an established price list. Would the State clarify its response and elaborate on how to price cloud services and the evaluation process? (Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:32:56 PM MDT)

#### Answer

- Cloud based offerings should be priced based upon prices for the services components offered. Configurations needed can impact price, but there is no baseline of requirements in this area. Pricing for final delivered solutions will be dependent on a detailed quote from the provider. (Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)

#### Question 115

The State's response to Question 25 concerning Section 5.3.1.1, Maintenance Services gives the responders the flexibility to offer maintenance as a product option or as an overall discount against a maintenance price list. How will the two pricing methods be evaluated? Will responders be allowed to offer various maintenance offerings, i.e. different levels for response times, repair times, availability, on-site, etc. and if so, how will they be evaluated?

**(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:34:42 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- These services will be evaluated based upon discount levels from published MSRP listings. Services will also be evaluated based upon breadth, depth, and capabilities offered. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 116**

The first paragraph following the evaluation table on page 32 states "Services will be based on lowest proposal price. What services will be evaluated? Also how will hosted or managed services or cloud-based services be evaluated?" **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:35:48 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- These services will be evaluated based upon discount levels from published MSRP listings. Services will also be evaluated based upon breadth, depth, and capabilities offered. **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 117**

The second paragraph following the evaluation table on page 32 states points will be assigned to each Offeror's cost proposal based on the highest discount percentage. The actual price that would be paid by the customer is affected not only by the discount percentage but by the initial price list of the product. For example, assuming products are comparable: Company 1's product is priced at \$100 with a 10% discount resulting in a purchase price of \$90. Company 2's product is priced at \$110 with a 15% discount resulting in a purchase price of \$93.50. In this example, Company 2 by providing the higher percentage of discount would receive a higher evaluation than Company 1, providing the lower percentage discount, even though the purchase price from Company 2 is higher. How will this be taken into consideration in the evaluation process? Also, how will it be determined that the products are comparable? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:37:25 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- This is a multiple award contract. That level of pricing detail is secondary to breadth, depth, and capabilities compliance for the category or subcategory. (see notes on 107 - 110 and others on pricing) **(Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT)**

**Question 118**

With regard to the statement that Proposal documents must be Arial font size 10: does this include All Headings, Titles, etc. or just refer to the body of text? That is, can we set Arial Font Size 10 for the body of text and use Arial font sizes larger than 10 for Headings, Titles, etc.? **(Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:38:39 PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT**)

**Question 119**

Regarding the Statement: The preferred method of submitting your original ¿master¿ proposal packet is electronically in Microsoft Word and Excel through BidSync, (www.bidsync.com), or you may mail or drop off your hard copies to the address noted in Section 1.6 of this RFP on or before the due date and time. The original ¿master¿ proposal packet shall include a separate document or sealed envelope labeled ¿SOLICITATION # JP14001 Cost Schedule¿ that contains the pricing document.

Is Bidsync¿s submission MANDATORY or suggested as the method to place an offer?  
(**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:39:53 PM MDT**)

**Answer**

- It is the preferred method. Hard copy is acceptable but closing times still apply and any offers coming in late will not be accepted. (**Answered: Jul 30, 2013 2:00:05 PM MDT**)

**Question 120**

With regard to the Request for Proposal Form:

The Bidsync form requires a digital signature based on the Bidsync Account. How are we to provide the Hardcopy version of this? And if we are to provide a separate hardcopy (wet signature), does it need to be the same person signing this as uploading to the Bidsync site, and does this signature need to be binding? (**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 5:41:02 PM MDT**)

**Answer**

- When submitting the hardcopy proposal response, vendors must include a wet signature on the RFP vendor information form. The wet signature must be from a company employee who has the authority to bind the company to a contractual obligation. The person who signs the RFP vendor information form in the RFP response is not required to be the one to upload the documents in BidSync, however, the electronic signature must be from someone authorized to bind the company to a contractual obligation. (**Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT**)

**Question 121**

WSCA-NASPO/State of Utah has published specific dates for the Bid (Release, Webinar, Q & A and Submission), as well as identified key phases of Bid Review, (Vendor Selection, Best and Final), however no dates or targeted timelines have been identified after the proposals have been submitted. Can WSCA-NASPO/State of Utah share the proposed timeline and targeted dates for the entire bid process, including the award date? (**Submitted: Jul 25, 2013 6:17:12**)

**PM MDT)**

**Answer**

- No, not at this time. The evaluation time needed could vary based upon how vendors respond. Contracts will be awarded well before the current contracts expire. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)**

**Question 122**

Page 28 of 45 ; Page 36

Section 5.3.1.3

As a manufacturer we have part numbers that indicate services are being performed by our employees and we have part numbers that indicate services are being performed by our partners. If our partner is quoting a service that the partner will perform, are they required to use the manufacturer part number? Or are they permitted to use their part number that provides the service but does not appear on the manufacturers price/parts list? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 8:06:52 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Use whatever part number makes it easiest for you to describe and provided the service to government customers, at the correct pricing and service levels. Keep in mind that all WSCA-NASPO contracts will be audited and an audit trail is necessary. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)**

**Question 123**

Page 39 of 45 page 47

Attachment B Reference Form

The reference form has contact information and a ;fill in the blank; due date. Is the contact information for teutsler@utah.gov and dgundersen@utah.gov current and up to date? I ask because this current document listed Jennifer Porter as the Contract Administrator, not Debbie Gundersen. Also for the ;fill in the blank; due date, it has a year of 2011. What is the date you would like our partners to return this form by? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 8:07:30 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Please refer to Addendum # 3 Attachment B - Reference Form Revised 7-29-13. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)**

**Question 124**

1.15.Can you provide more specific detail and what reporting characteristics will be required? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 8:27:02 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- WSCA-NASPO requires total sales dollars by State by Quarter, to be reported within 30 days after the end of each quarter. The State of Utah requires total sales dollars by customer by quarter, to be reported within 30 days after the end of each quarter. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)

#### **Question 125**

Under Section 3, 3.1 are we able to make edits to the Mandatory Requirements (M) language, assuming we provide a valid explanation for our adjustments? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 8:27:26 AM MDT)

#### **Answer**

- No, mandatory requirements should not be edited. Any vendor who felt there was an issue with a requirement should have identified the concern in the Q&A portion of the RFP process. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)

#### **Question 126**

5.1.2 Can we wait until the RFP response deadline of 8/30 to summarize/submit any exceptions to the contract terms or are those exceptions due at the question deadline of 7/26 11 am MST? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 8:27:49 AM MDT)

#### **Answer**

- Exceptions to the contract terms and conditions are due at the time of RFP submission and must be clearly noted in the RFP response. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)

#### **Question 127**

Sections 5.3.0.8.1 Content Delivery System, and 5.3.0.8.2 Physical Security, contained in the Unified Communications section, are not normally considered to be part of a Unified Communications system. Will bids for Section 5.3.0 be disqualified if they do not provide a response to these, or other sub-sections? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:02:57 AM MDT)

#### **Answer**

- No, bids will not be disqualified if these items are not included. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)

#### **Question 128**

How many oral presentations will be made, and where will these presentations be located? For instance, will presentations be made in Utah, or in each of the reviewer states; locations (e.g., Utah, Alaska, California, Nevada, and New Jersey)?

[Reference: Page 8 of 45, Section 1 (General), Subsection 1.18 - Discussions with Respondents

(Oral Presentation) ;

; Oral presentations will be made at the Respondents expense. ;] (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:22:15 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Oral presentations, if required, will be made in Utah at the expense of the offeror. If required, it is likely that only one oral presentation, per vendor, would be made. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)

**Question 129**

Does the vendor benefit (score higher overall) by positioning as many products in as many categories as possible (as broadly as possible) to score extra points, even though some categories might not be a strong fit? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:23:23 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Evaluation will not benefit a vendor by packing a category with products. Responses should address the category appropriately with products that demonstrate breadth, depth, and overall capabilities compliance. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)

**Question 130**

Does the vendor benefit (score high in specific categories) by only positioning products that are a very strong fit in a fewer categories (score only applies to those categories that are relevant)? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:24:05 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Vendor responses should address the category appropriately with products that demonstrate breadth, depth, and overall capabilities compliance. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)

**Question 131**

Does the vendor benefit from a higher overall score to make the list with a broader array of product category coverage, or can vendors make the list who have a smaller niche focus but are very strong in those product categories and still make the list? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:24:36 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Evaluation will not benefit a vendor by packing a category with products. Responses should address the category appropriately with products that demonstrate breadth, depth, and overall capabilities compliance. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)

AM MDT)

**Question 132**

Does a proposed product have to be on the price list at the time of submission? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:25:08 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, although a given product number may ship at a later date, but it must be an established product with provisional pricing at minimum. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)**

**Question 133**

Can a vendor respond with a product that is on the roadmap? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:25:24 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, although a given product number may ship at a later date, but it must be an established product with provisional pricing at minimum. Please refer to Question # 19. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)**

**Question 134**

The solicitation states that one hard copy and one electronic version to each evaluator listed however only one physical address was listed (for Jennifer Porter in Utah). Should all physical copies be sent there or will the rest of the addresses be provided? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:25:49 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Please refer to Question # 33. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)**

**Question 135**

Is there a desired format for the pricing structure of the cost schedule? The solicitation lists general product categories and then provides a space for a general discount. Should vendors list out each individual product component including list price with a discount or is there a preference for general discounts as the solicitation seems to indicate? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:26:07 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- There is a preference, from an evaluation perspective, for general discounts by product categories and sub parts, but this does not preclude a vendor from offering detailed calculated pricing for all items that support the category proposal. **(Answered:**

**Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)**

**Question 136**

8. Where can the following be found:
- o The State of Utah Standard Terms and Conditions
  - o The WSCA-NASPO Terms and Conditions. **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:26:33 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Both documents are included as part of the RFP solicitation packet. Each were uploaded into BidSync. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)**

**Question 137**

Section 5.2.9.1 Access Points: This section calls for support of a 802.11ac, an ultra-high-speed standard that will be supported by the upcoming AP1250. It is not supported by any current AP in our lineup, nor will any of them be able to support it with a software upgrade. The current management systems will support the new AP1250 when it is released, so the wireless infrastructures now in use will seamlessly accept new 802.11ac capable devices when they arrive. Will they accept Access Points the do not support 802.11ac if they are part of a product family and management control system that will shortly be joined by products that support 802.11ac? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:44:16 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- That is understood, the ability to seamlessly incorporate 802.11ac is the larger issue. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)**

**Question 138**

Will contract holders be able to consider discount levels to be a "minimum required discount" during the life of the contract, yet be able to provide even deeper discounts based on specific quantity, total volume, etc.? Historically WSCA contracts have allowed this which has resulted in significant savings for participating entities. **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:59:32 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Discounts offered should reflect best and most competitive discounts offered to WSCA-NASPO. member states and their authorized users. If a vendor wishes to offer a deeper discount for larger procurements over specified unit or dollar levels they may indicate that possibility. Awards will be made on stated discounts for normal business volumes aggregated by all participating government organizations. "Big Buy" discounts are assumed to be available for all vendors. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 11:37:08 AM MDT)**

**Question 139**

5.2.3.1 ¿ Dynamic Load Balancing ¿ Will the Load Balancers be used strictly internally or will there be use cases where external connections will be coming through the Load Balancers and additional features like Application Layer Security/Firewall will be desired as well for the Load Balancing solution? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 9:59:58 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Load balancers will be used in a variety of scenarios including external connections. Application Layer security can be a desirable feature and will be needed by some organizations. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:25:39 PM MDT)

**Question 140**

5.2.3.2 ¿ WAN Acceleration ¿ Will there be any use cases of the WAN Acceleration done with internal private site to site connections or will it be used only for connectivity to branch office remote sites over a secure tunnel? Is it intended that the WAN Accelerators setup the secure tunnels and manage them or will that be expected to be done on the edge firewalls being used to establish secure tunnels to remote sites? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:00:20 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Most commonly on secure tunnels to remote sites. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:25:39 PM MDT)

**Question 141**

5.2.3.3 ¿ High Availability and Redundancy ¿ With regards to the reference of ¿Limits any disruption to network uptime should an appliance face unforeseen performance issues.¿ Are we to interpret that as no downtime even for the failing over from one cluster node to the next is acceptable, meaning an Active/Active architecture is required? Although Active/Active usually is able to provide higher over SLAs when it comes to needing to failover resources it comes at a cost of additional complexity and higher risk of downtime due to that complexity. Would an Active/Passive solution be considered acceptable with ¿minimal¿ downtime when the primary node has to fail over to the secondary, which typically can occur with only a small outage and limited dropped packets? Please let us know if there is a preference or if both options are suitable. (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:00:39 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- While Active/Active is desirable, the additional complexity required is generally not desirable. Active/Passive is likely to be the more commonly used option. Vendors should quote both options if available. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:25:39 PM MDT)

**Question 142**

5.2.5.1 ¿ Branch Routers ¿ Is there any preference as to whether the Branch Routers are

expected to handle all routing, security and WAN acceleration on a single device or whether it is preferred to take the best of breed approach and potentially have a Firewall on the edge handling the security and routing and a WAN accelerator sitting inside it on the Branch side handling the WAN optimization? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:01:09 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Both approaches will be used by government organizations so there is no explicit preference. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:25:39 PM MDT)**

**Question 143**

5.2.5.2 ¿ Network Edge Routers ¿ Will there be any expectation of the Network Edge Routers to handle security, like GEO blocking, or will they be expected to simply do the edge routing and run EBGP for example? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:01:27 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Unknown, this could vary by organization. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:25:39 PM MDT)**

**Question 144**

5.2.5.3 ¿ Core Routers ¿ Are there any specific requirements at the core? For example the interfaces on the Campus LAN ¿ Core Switches are requiring 100Gbps support, is it safe to assume that the Core Routers will connect to some of the Core Switches at the 100Gbps speed or will the higher speed of 100Gbps be intended for switch to switch connectivity? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:02:25 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- Yes, however this will vary by organization. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:25:39 PM MDT)**

**Question 145**

Are there 11 or 12 Categories for this rfp? Page 4 lists 12 categories but further in the documents Category 3 ¿ Network Management and Automation is rolled under Category 2 Networking Software.

Page 18 and page 42 list Network Management and Automation as a sub item of Networking Software.

5.2.2 NETWORKING SOFTWARE

5.2.2.1 Network Management and Automation

Please clarify. **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:09:43 AM MDT)**

**Answer**

- There are 11 Categories for products and services. Section 1.2 of the RFP inadvertently identified 12 Categories; Network Management and Automation should have been deleted and is not a valid category in this RFP. Section 5.2 of the RFP correctly identifies the 11 Categories and the product/service offerings. See Addendum #2. **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:31:49 PM MDT)**

#### **Question 146**

Certain requested features are proprietary (or limited in usage) and will limit participation by industry leading network switch manufacturers.

These features included items like:

- o VPLS (virtual private LAN services)
- o Role based ACLs

Will you consider alternatives for Layer 2 campus switches that don't specifically offer these features? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:18:34 AM MDT)**

#### **Answer**

- Yes **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:31:49 PM MDT)**

#### **Question 147**

Certain requested features are proprietary (or limited in usage) and will limit participation by industry leading networking companies.

These features included items like:

- o Dynamic Trunking Protocol
- o PVRST+ (Per VLAN Rapid Spanning tree)

Will you consider alternatives for campus distribution switches that don't specifically offer these features? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:19:32 AM MDT)**

#### **Answer**

- Yes **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:31:49 PM MDT)**

#### **Question 148**

If we can fulfill 5.2.5.1 and 5.2.5.2, but not 5.2.5.3 (as an example), are we still able to provide a response for that section? **(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:19:55 AM MDT)**

#### **Answer**

- Yes **(Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:31:49 PM MDT)**

**Question 149**

4) What is meant by a Netflow equivalent? Would S-Flow support be sufficient?  
(Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:20:12 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Potentially (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:31:49 PM MDT)

**Question 150**

5) Since the ¿Plug and play fabric formation¿ on Data Center switches is a Cisco exclusive feature, would it be acceptable for the switch vendor to offer a powerful management tool to be used for providing automated fabric deployment and management? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:22:44 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Yes (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:31:49 PM MDT)

**Question 151**

5.2.8.5 and 5.2.8.6 refer to SDN (Software Defined Networking). Most effort in this area today is using open-source offerings. I believe Cisco has its own SDN Controller, but most other manufacturers are leaning towards open source to avoid lock-out from proprietary solutions. Will support for these open source offerings suffice in these categories? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:31:33 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Yes, but clearly address what is supported. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:31:49 PM MDT)

**Question 152**

Can the order placement and invoicing be structured such that the end user will place, issue, and send the order directly to one of the manufacturer¿s approved reseller/distributors as well as be invoiced by the same reseller/distributor, with the understanding that the quarterly reporting and payment of the WSCA fee would still be the responsibility of the manufacturer? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:45:12 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Yes, please refer to Question # 75. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:31:49 PM MDT)

**Question 153**

1. In section 1.7 under the proposal submission guidelines, it asks for five additional copies to be sent to the listed contacts in addition to the electronic copy posted on BidSync. For these

contacts, will they need both an electronic and hard copy as stated and, if so, can you provide the mailing addresses? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 10:51:01 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Please refer to Question # 33. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:31:49 PM MDT)

**Question 154**

If we do not offer encryption on email from 5.2.6.7, but meet all other requirements, will this be acceptable? (Submitted: Jul 26, 2013 11:00:59 AM MDT)

**Answer**

- Yes. (Answered: Jul 31, 2013 1:31:49 PM MDT)