



NORTHWEST ARCTIC BOROUGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ambler · Buckland · Deering · Kiana · Kivalina · Kobuk · Kotzebue · Noatak · Noorvik · Selawik · Shungnak
PO Box 51 · Kotzebue, Alaska 99752 · Phone (907) 442-1800

January 4, 2022

NWABSD RFP - WAN AND INTERNET SERVICE 2022-2023

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

1. Question: Will the school district please confirm that the offerors are to provide their own Service Level Agreement (SLA) for their service, regardless of underlying technology, and that the SLA metrics listed in the RFP are only an example.

Answer: Vendors must provide their own Service Level Agreement (SLA) for their service, regardless of underlying technology. The SLA metrics listed in the RFP are the service levels desired at the District. Vendors are encouraged to provide their best solution that come as close to the requested service levels as possible if unable to meet or exceed the service levels specified.

2. Question: With the response times for restoral is there going to be space available to store critical on site sparing for maintenance activities and technical support.

Answer: The District is unable to commit to providing space without knowing the size and scope of hardware requiring storage. Any requirements for storage of equipment must be detailed in the response.

3. Question: Can Northwest Arctic Borough School District inform us the estimated length of the service overlap at the old school in Kivalina after the new Kivalina school opens?

Answer: The District does not have an estimate on the overlap at this point in time.

4. Question: Can the district please provide additional insight into the underlying traffic pattern for the "WAN" service from all Kotzebue and entities back to the District Office (at prescribed data rate of 3/3Mbps). For example, can you provide the Applications you are using across the WAN such as student information systems, district financials or like hosted at the District Office and used by all locations?

Answer: The District has provided requirements for service levels needed to support education. The District declines to provide additional information as to how the service will be used.

5. Question: If offerors can provide additional upstream (the 4 in 25/4 requirements), would that be provided greater points in the evaluation?

Answer: Vendors are encouraged to provide options to increase the levels of service to the extent that additional bandwidth needs arise. Please see the revised WAN scoring descriptor.

MISSION: To provide a learning environment that inspires and challenges students and employees to excel
VISION: To graduate all students with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for a successful future

6. Question: Does the District currently utilize Office365?

Answer: Yes, the District does utilize Office365.

7. Question: Satellite systems, as it relates to the orbital slot, have varying end-to-end latency, GEO ~600ms and LEO ~<=75ms. LEO latency is much less and closer to the NWABSD specified latency of 25ms than the GEO latency. Our recommendation is not to assign 1 point for satellite based systems, however, weight awarded points based on the latency of the offered system at each site. Will the district adopt our suggestion?

Score	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Latency, ms	25	66	107	148	189	230	271	312	353	394	435	476	517	558	600
Circuit	Terrestrial	LEO													GEO

Answer: No, the district will not adopt the suggestion. The one point for assignment is solely for responses that are unable to provide any portion of the proposed solution via fiber or terrestrial means.

8. Question: Re: The RFP states “Each circuit must be clearly marked to reflect the mode of delivery (satellite, low orbiting satellite, leased lit fiber, terrestrial, etc.)”. Can NWABSD clarify if the evaluation is conducted at each circuit level at each district entity or it would be an aggregated evaluation of all circuits across the entities?

Answer: The evaluation will be conducted in aggregate across all entities.

9. Will you allow in-person or virtual presentation of our proposal?

Answer: No. To ensure the most fair and open competitive bidding process vendors should include any supplemental information within the RFP response.

10. Question” Was there a clerical error in the descriptions under evaluation criteria #3 and #9? The descriptions are very similar.

Answer: Yes. Please see Addendum #2.