

**Town of New Shoreham
Community Anchor Institution Fiber Network Project RFP
Q&A**

March 23, 2018

Question: Are both the electronic copy AND hard copy are due by 4pm April 2nd, or just the electronic copy?

Answer: Both are due at the same time.

Question: Section 1.4 - Can the vendor provide, own and manage the network equipment? This will allow us to provide SLAs on service. Otherwise, having the hardware in the towns name will impact our ability to provide an SLA. Since hardware troubleshooting or part replacement would most likely require working with the town.

Answer: Ideally, the Town would own the equipment, and the vendor would provide and manage it on the Town's behalf. In this model there would be one SLA for transport and internet and a separate SLA for managing hardware and troubleshooting. The SLA can include assumptions with respect to the Town's responsibilities. If this is not suitable for the vendor, then they may propose an alternative, with explanation as to why it is not suitable.

Question: Section 1.7.1 - The 10 or 40 Gb lit ethernet service would be provided to the vendor via the towns connection over the subsea strands correct?

Answer: Correct

Question: Section 1.7.1.2 How much Internet do you want to each location? Section 9.5.3.1.4 asks for rates for 100mbps, 200mbps, 500mbps, 1gbps and 2gbps for the Municipal Network. Section 9.5.3.2.4 states the School, Library and Medical Center would negotiate independently. We typically break out transport and internet as two separate items. Internet services would be used to access any additional resources on the commodity internet. Should we provide pricing for internet and transport services at the requested rates? Currently, transport for the school and library is included in an annual bid process. Service is then awarded by RIDE and paid by them as well. Is this the plan moving forward?

Answer: For 9.5.3.1.4 please provide separate pricing for transport and internet for the specified bandwidths (100M, 200M, 500M, 1G, 2G) on the strands of fiber that feed the Municipal Network. CIRs for the strands of fiber that feed the IRU network were not listed as the winning vendor will control this value based on the bandwidth requested by the School, Library, and Medical Center. The plan is to continue receiving services via RIDE.

Question: Section 1.7.2.5.3 - How much for the IRU \$1.00?

Answer: The amount would be negotiated; however the Town would like to understand what the vendor is willing and or able to bring to the table.

Question: Section 1.7.2.1 Ownership - Can the vendor provide, own and manage the network equipment?

Answer: Ideally, the Town would own the equipment, and the vendor would provide and manage it on the Town's behalf. If this is not suitable for the vendor, then they may propose an alternative, with explanation as to why it is not suitable.

Question: Section 1.7.1.3 A 10-year IRU – Does the IRU provide an exclusive right to provide services to IRU network entities? Does the IRU terminate if Medical Center, School and Library obtain internet and transport service from another provider? Current network design shows a single transport purchase and a single internet purchase. Would the entities be purchasing services together or independently?

Answer: Current network design requests a transport and internet purchase for the municipal network but purposely leaves out that request for the IRU network since these specifications will be determined by the winning vendor and in turn the services requested by the School, Library, and Medical Center.

Question: Section 3.1 - RFP Process Timetable - Would you consider moving the due date 1 -2 weeks?

Answer: A 1-week extension was granted; refer to Addendum 1, March 28, 2018.

Question: Section 4.5 - If teaming with another vendor should the proposals be submitted as a combined effort? Single executive statement, single project manager, single performance bond, single insurance? Or should they be separate proposals? Or should it be a single proposal but both vendors should respond in full?

Answer: If there are distinct advantages to the teaming approach, then these should be called out in a single Executive Summary and the proposals should be submitted together. The vendor relationship can be whatever will deliver the best outcome. For example, there can be multiple sub-project managers, as long as there is a primary point of contact for the overall engagement. With regard to insurance, each respondent or each member of a responding team should demonstrate compliance with the requirements. Proof of insurance can be produced within the same timeframe as the performance bond.

Question: Section 4.15 – What proof of concept? What are you looking for?

Answer: We won't know until we review the proposals.

Question: Section 4.23 - See question 4.5 - If proposals are separate which vendor(s) are responsible for obtaining a performance bond and insurance?

Answer: See response to Section 4.5 above.

Question: Section 8.3 - Can insurance be provided once selected? Would all vendors in a proposal be responsible for the insurance?

Answer: See response to Section 4.5. above

Question: Section 9.4.5.2 - This would only be used for VPN or would this be placed inline for firewall / NAT functionality as well? Currently looks like only VPN service is being provided.

Answer: In the current design this would only be used for VPN with potential future use (with NAT and firewall functionality) to protect a server that provides network monitoring and alerts. If it is your intent to provide Internet/transport and to manage the network trunking a management VLAN would also be acceptable. The VPN was added so the winning vendor for town network management doesn't have to be the same vendor that is providing internet and transport.

Question: Section 9.5 - Is it possible to redesign the network to best utilize both local funding for transport by building circuits back to 235 Promenade per the RIDE transport RFP and by leverage vendor managed core services such a Content Filtering and Firewall Services. Additionally, currently the Block Island free library's transport service to 235 Promenade connects them as a member of Ocean State Library's (OSL) network where they utilize their internet subscription with us and use OSL resources. The current network design does not utilize existing funding sources or current shared resources. Per USAC –

CIPA compliance requires content filtering in order to take advantage of E-Rate funds. If redesign is able to occur what parts of the current proposal must stay in the redesigned network?

Answer: Redesign of the IRU network is acceptable and expected. To the extent possible we would like to keep the same physical equipment and would request that the two strands of fiber that feed the IRU Network be physically terminated in a location that allows for access to multiple vendors and then transported to 235 Promenade via layer 2 Point-to-point connection or similar.

Question: Section 9.5.4.1 - Is this Network availability for the service provider network or the network to be installed on the island? The current municipal and iru network design offers no redundant fiber paths and no hardware or optical redundancy.

Answer: Network availability here would be to the demarc point at or nearby the new Dillon's Corner substation.

Question: Section 9.5.4.2 - Availability would be subject to ferry schedules as we would not have an on-island resource. Is this reasonable / acceptable?

Answer: Response time here would be for issues that occur at or before the demarc on the mainland side of the network. Section 10.2.2 discusses a desire to work with a vendor to create an acceptable SLA bearing in mind the challenges of accessing the Island. This vendor (possibly the same vendor) will provide management and emergency response for the network equipment.

Question: Do you have any detailed specs for the prefabricated telecom building? Overall building dimensions, R56 rated?

Answer: The minimum building dimensions should be 8'x8' with an interior height of 8'. It should be R56 rated.

Question: Reading through the RFP the fiber route looks to be primarily underground. Are we running through existing conduits, or do we need to excavate/directional drill?

Answer: The majority of the fiber network on the Island will be Aerial although the lateral between the telecommunications building at 10 Beach Ave and the Police Department building would ideally be underground. Excavation/directional drill may be required for the 10 Beach Ave lateral.

March 21, 2018

Question: Paragraph 9.1.1 – The size of the building is not specified.

Answer: Minimum of 8'x8' with an interior height of 8'

Question: Paragraph 9.2.1 – We do not recommend using ADSS cable for this application due to the difficulty of implementing a Fiber To The Premise (FTTP) with this type of cabling system. We would recommend a strand and cable overlap solution for this project. We would also recommend using 6.6M Extra High Strength (EHS) Class C steel support strand and 0.045" Type 316 Lashing Wire for this coastal application.

Answer: A strand and cable overlap solution is acceptable. Please provide a detailed description in your proposal of the advantages associated with using this solution on the CAI Fiber project.

Question: Paragraph 9.2.5.1 – Please provide more detail for this attachment. J-Hook at the pole is indicates that you plan to use standard SST Drop cable for this application. We would recommend strand and cable throughout the CAI Network.

Answer: Alternate attachments are acceptable; please describe how each lateral will be attached to the destination facility in your proposal.

Question: Paragraph 9.2.7 – Do we need to construct a new underground conduit for this attachment to 10 Beach Avenue? Please provide more details for this site.

Answer: The prefabricated telecommunications building will most likely be located in the rear left corner of the parking area behind the Police Department building. Ideally, the attachment to the Police building would be via underground conduit.

Question: Paragraph 9.3.1 – Please clarify “nearby”. Do you have a planned location? Is it on private property or the Route 108 R.O.W.? Is the contractor responsible for permitting the building location? What is the distance to Communications manhole 9024?

Answer: The contractor is responsible for permitting a building, however the Town is responsible for negotiating easements to secure a location. An alternative to the fabricated building may be an existing equipment enclosure within 50’ of Pole 6.

Question: Is this project subject to prevailing wages?

Answer: Yes

Question: Is the contractor required to hold a valid Rhode Island Telecommunications License?

Answer: This requirement should be confirmed with the RI Department of Labor and Training.