



ADDENDUM

SOLICITATION #: DC164020P

SOLICITATION NAME: EXTENSION SERVICES HOSTED VOIP/SIP

ADDENDUM #: 2

DUE DATE AND TIME: OCTOBER 23, 2013, 2PM (PT)

DATE: 10-4-2013

PROCUREMENT ANALYST: DONNA CAIN

The solicitation named above is hereby modified as follows:

1. Title Page, Proposal Due Date and Time: “October 16, 2013” is deleted and replaced with “October 23, 2013”.

The following questions were received with regard to the solicitation named above. OSU has provided answers below to each question, but the RFP or contract documents have not been modified as a result.

- 1.) Q: We have several potential options for delivering our hosted VoIP service and would like to better understand what options would work best or be preferred for this specific deployment. Is the proposal specifically looking for the hosted VoIP/SIP service to be delivered individually to each location through their ISP (Internet)?
A) YES
- 2.) Q: Would OSU be open to distributing the voice traffic to the individual sites over the Remote Network WAN from a small number of Point-of-Presence locations added to the network?
A: OSU would be willing to consider this depending on the specifics and additional costs and benefits.
- 3.) Q: (Page 3) Item 3.02 b: Can you please clarify the requirements for integration with the main OSU campus Microsoft Exchange Unified Messaging System? Would integrating Cisco Unity Connection voicemail with Microsoft Exchange meet this requirement? This isn't a requirement is it? I thought it was a preferred option.
A: This is a preferred specification , not a requirement. The main OSU campus uses UM as it's voicemail platform. It would be nice to have the option of using this same platform to provide integrated voicemail/email to the outlying offices across the state.
- 4.) Q: (Page 3) Item 3.02 c: Can you expand on the Automatic Call Distribution requirements? What features or functionality is specifically needed?
A: OSU wants to allow staff to be able to log in/out of phones at various offices. For example, one staff person may rotate between two (2) offices and need to login at either location. Also, these two (2) offices could have different incoming numbers so the staff member would need to answer either incoming line no matter which office they were presently located at.
- 5.) Q: (Page 3) Item 4.01 c: Can you please confirm what is meant by “must be peered within Oregon”? Is this referring to ISP peering?
A: Yes, ISP peering.

- 6.) Q: (Appendix B) Can our VoIP proposal assume that the existing 2960 switches provide PoE power for the phone handsets at each location? If this is not true for all sites and all handset locations, please indicate if we should include power supplies or injectors and for what locations or number of phones.
A: *None of the current 2960's offer PoE. Separate Power Adapters will be needed for all handsets.*
- 7.) Q: (Appendix B) The worst case scenario network topology indicates some locations may have phones connected via an Aruba wireless link at 100Mb. Are the packets loss, latency and jitter requirements listed in Appendix A supposed to be applied in these worst case scenarios?
A: *No. If vendor is not able to meet the packet loss, latency and jitter requirements listed in Appendix A for the worst case network topology, OSU will work with the Vendor to determine changes/updates to topology in order to meet those requirements.*
- 8.) Q: (Appendix C) Can you clarify the location for the Eugene extension office? Appendix C lists the location at the intersection of W 10th & Jefferson. The OSU website says the Lane extension office is located at 783 Grant Street.
A: *This office will have a new location in November 2013. The address at that time will be 996 Jefferson St, Eugene OR 97402. That will be the address where we wish service to be provided.*
- 9.) Q: Please provide some clarity of Hosted vs Managed Service relationship (Section 2.01 states "fully administered by the vendor").
A: *Service will be hosted by vendor. The management of the service depends on what management options are available and make sense to administer locally, if possible. We will work with vendor to determine this based on their service management model/options.*
- 10.) Q: You have requested training information; do you plan to have an admin person capable of Moves, Adds, Changes and Deletions?
A: *OSU recognizes that some solutions will provide options that would allow staff to administer their own MAC's where other's will have a customer interface where staff would input request tickets for changes and support. Due to the fact that we don't know exactly what will be proposed, we want to cover all bases and have the vendor describe the environment and provide training if necessary.*
- 11.) Q: Do you want the vendor to perform **all** administrative functions related to the SIP UC System?
A: *This depends on what management functions are available and what would make sense to administer locally. OSU would have to take a look at options available from vendor to make a determination.*
- 12.) Q: Does NERO have connectivity to Oregon Gigapop?
A: *In Eugene, Oregon – YES*
- 13.) Q: If the customer is acceptant of using a 3rd party (NERO, LSN) for access, are they OK with the vendor providing a "best effort" service?
A: *No, best effort does not equal a service contract.*
- 14.) Q: Are we required to use existing WAN connections for connectivity to the Host?
A: *Yes, vendor will use existing WAN unless vendor is able to provide a separate WAN service to any site using this system and roll that into the cost.*
- 15.) Q: What is the length of the contract?
A: *One year contract with a multi-year renewal clause.*
- 16.) Q: Can you provide a definition of "Survivability" as in what happens if a line is cut or an edge device fails. What level of functionality remains/survives? The industry has multiple definitions and your definition is the only one that matters.

A: OSU did not specify survivability in the RFP. OSU understands local survivability can be dependent on local internet connectivity, which may vary between locations. In terms of host survivability, OSU would expect the vendor to follow common business standard backup and security practices. OSU also prefers that vendor have redundant hosting locations for added resiliency (see page 3, 4.02 a).

Entities are not required to return addendums. However, entities are responsible to make themselves aware of, obtain and incorporate any changes made in any addendums issued into their final offer. Failure to do so may, in effect, make the offer non-responsive, which may cause the offer to be rejected.