

**SBCCOG RFP - SMART-Net Intercity Network
Final RFP Questions, Responses (Composite)
August 06, 2018**

- Q01.** *Will the SBCCOG be the customer of record?*
- A. SBCCOG will execute the master contract with the awarded Proposer.
See "Section 7.2 Written Agreement (Revised)" in RFP Addendum 1.
- Q01-A.** *Is it possible the cities could form a consortium (through the SBCCOG or other entity) such that they would be the customer of record, as opposed to the provider entering into separate contracts with each city?*
- A. The intention is for a single master contract with the awarded Proposer executed by SBCCOG. (See also Q02.)
See "Section 7.2 Written Agreement (Revised)" in RFP Addendum 1.
- Q02.** *Will individual cities sign contracts?*
- A. It is expected that each participating member city will piggy-back on the executed master contract between SBCCOG and the awarded Proposer.
See "Section 7.2 Written Agreement (Revised)" in RFP Addendum 1.
- Q03.** *If a city wants to opt into the network and they are required to go to RFP, will this RFP serve?*
- A. Yes, SBCCOG expects that this RFP serves as the competitive solicitation for similar services for each of the member cities. SBCCOG is in process of confirming with each city. (Several cities have affirmed; none has yet disagreed.)
- Q04.** *Is there a copy of the contract to be executed?*
- A. SBCCOG expects that the awarded Proposer's contract will be the basis for the master agreement.
See "Section 7.2 Written Agreement (Revised)" in RFP Addendum 1.
- Q04-A.** *Section 7.2 requires the provider to enter into the standard SBCCOG written contract, unmodified. Can you please provide said contract, so providers can review?*
- A. SBCCOG expects that the awarded Proposer's contract will be the basis for the master agreement.
See "Section 7.2 Written Agreement (Revised)" in RFP Addendum 1.
- Q05.** *Who is ultimately financially responsible for the contract. Is there a sample contract which SBCCOG is proposing for this P3 relationship that we can review?*
- A. SBCCOG expects that the awarded Proposer's contract will be the basis for the master agreement.
See "Section 7.2 Written Agreement (Revised)" in RFP Addendum 1.
(See also Q05-A.)
- Q05-A.** *Is the entire project funded by Los Angeles County Supervisor Mark Ridley Thomas and the South Bay Workforce Investment Board or is only a portion funded?*
- A. This RFP and provider selection process is funded by South Bay Workforce Investment Board (SBWIB) and Los Angeles County Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas. Funding for the implementation project will be provided by the member cities, and possible grant funding, which will be sought by the SBCCOG from sources currently unidentified.
- Q06.** *Through the duration of the contract, what governance model does SBCCOG envision in terms of advocacy and contract governance on behalf of member cities?*
- A. SBCCOG will participate in oversight of the performance of contract obligations for all parties, including awarded Proposer, in conjunction with the member cities.

**SBCCOG RFP - SMART-Net Intercity Network
Final RFP Questions, Responses (Composite)
August 06, 2018**

- Q07.** *While there are letters of support from the cities, will the cities be willing to commit to a specific dollar amount over a term in the final resulting agreement? What in the agreement will bind them to participate in this project?*
- A. No. A minimum committed purchase amount is not expected prior to contract award. Final opt-out decisions by each member city will be made prior to contract award.
- Q08.** *Will the SBCCOG consider bidder contract documentation that modifies the language provided for "Service Cancellation" (Section 2.12) or for "Termination for Convenience" (Section 7.7)?*
- A. SBCCOG expects that the awarded Proposer's contract will be the basis for the master agreement. See "Section 7.2 Written Agreement (Revised)" in RFP Addendum 1.
- Q09.** *There is termination for convenience clause in the RFP. This is an obstacle for the buildout. Does it apply on a city-by-city basis?*
- A. Termination for Convenience is contract-wide at the discretion of the SBCCOG, and not for each member city. Member cities may request termination of service at building sites as outlined in RFP Section 2.12.
- If Proposer has issues with any conditions, this information must be clearly stated in proposal response. SBCCOG has the right but not the obligation to address the concern. See "Section 7.2 Written Agreement (Revised)" in RFP Addendum 1.
- Q10.** *What is the timeline for the project? Is there a deadline for completion of the project?*
- A. Timelines for provision of services will be set as part of contract negotiations with selected Proposer prior to a contract award. Phase 1 includes initial implementation at City Halls and data centers, as outlined in Attachment A. Phase 2 includes secondary implementation at other city buildings, also as outlined in Attachment A.
- Q11.** *Can you clarify the duration of the administrative and referral fees?*
- A. Administrative fees are fully described in RFP Section 3.4 and continue while services to a building are provided. Referral fees are fully described in Section 3.5 and continue only for the first year of service.
- Q12.** *Will billing go to each city?*
- A. Yes. Once services are ordered and installed, billing will be directly to each city.
- Q13.** *Given substantial capital cost up front, will payment be spread among participating members or will it be one entity?*
- A. SBCCOG will be the contract holder. All payment obligations rest with the member city requesting services.
- Q14.** *Will the SBCCOG manage the payment of all invoices for all segments awarded or will payment issues fall to individual member cities for nodes in their respective Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites?*
- A. As specified in RFP Section 2.10, awarded Proposer will invoice each member city directly for services. Member cities will make payments directly back to Proposer. SBCCOG has no role in invoicing for services, nor in ensuring payment.
- Q15.** *In section 2.7 you talk about enabling public wi-fi...and pole attachments. Do you want to see possible connections to our network in the RFP (sic), or would that be addressed separately?*

**SBCCOG RFP - SMART-Net Intercity Network
Final RFP Questions, Responses (Composite)
August 06, 2018**

- A. Possible connection points will be decided separately by individual cities. Proposer may choose to submit a table or map of its connections in its proposal response; this may help the evaluation.
- Q16.** *Do the locations need to be diverse or are single points of entry acceptable?*
- A. The network must have diverse paths and be resilient. There will only be a single point of network entry to each building, as denoted in RFP Attachment B.
- Q17.** *Are you open to a proposal for middle mile network, or do we need to respond to everything?*
- A. Proposer must to respond to everything requested in the RFP.
- Q18.** *Is it possible that multiple vendors will be selected?*
- A. A single vendor is strongly preferred. SBCCOG retains the option of awarding multiple contracts to ensure complete coverage and provision of services. SBCCOG encourages team participation under a single primary Proposer.
- Q19.** *On the pricing sheet, for Phase 1 it asks for MRC and NRC. Is there one MRC and NRC for all locations, or can that be broken down by location?*
- A. Proposer should provide blended average cost to connect the set of buildings listed in Attachment A. SBCCOG will calculate connection costs by city.
- Q20.** *If it is more expensive to bring in one city like El Segundo compared to another, then won't the cities opt out, making the greater cost for the entire regional network higher?*
- A. The pricing template requires expected average costs to connect to each site. City costs will be based on number of sites to be connected.
- Q21.** *For the two internet POPs, where will they come back to? Do we need connect to one or both?*
- A. Proposer must provide access to both POPs for each member city.
- Q22.** *Is there a need for private connectivity upgrades to city's network? Is this a requirement of the RFP?*
- A. Please address all requirements of the RFP. If Proposer chooses to offer additional services, please describe them, and they will be given appropriate consideration.
- Q23.** *Are there any cities we don't know about who may opt in at the last minute?*
- A. No.
- Q24.** *Is there any intention that cities will want to connect privately without other cities?*
- A. That is not currently intended.
- Q25.** *Will Emergency Services be involved?*
- A. That is not currently planned. There is no obligation for CJIS compliance, per RFP Section 2.8.
- Q26.** *Are all baseline services included?*
- A. Yes. Please respond to all requirements, including transport.
- Q27.** *Would you be willing to accept a proposal just for transport services?*
- A. No. Please respond to all requirements.
- Q28.** *What's the designation difference between Phase 1 and Phase 2?*

**SBCCOG RFP - SMART-Net Intercity Network
Final RFP Questions, Responses (Composite)
August 06, 2018**

- A. Phase 1 includes initial implementation at City Halls and data centers, as outlined in RFP Attachment A. Phase 2 includes secondary implementation at other city buildings, also as outlined in Attachment A. Timelines for provision of services will be set as part of contract negotiations prior to an award.
- Q29.** *Data center and city hall POPs: Are those required to play an active role in topology (router or switch)?*
- A. SBCCOG and each city need connectivity over diverse dual routes. Proposer should describe its proposed solution clearly and completely.
- Q30.** *Scale of bandwidth is fairly low. What is the scale for speeds?*
- A. Pricing is required for 1, 2, 10, and 100 Gbps services. Proposer can provide optional higher bandwidth services; please include speeds and prices.
- Q31.** *What is the requirement of the vendor in smart city initiatives? What is the probability that we'll have rights to that business?*
- A. Proposer should submit pricing for connecting smart city poles, as outlined in RFP Section 3.2. Having an existing relationship with each city is an advantage; however, this contract should not be assumed to be an exclusive contract for smart city devices.
- Q32.** *Are the member cities looking for internet access speeds to be directly provided to each city or are they open to it being shared?*
- A. As part of this contract, cities expect dedicated bandwidth at minimum denoted speeds.
- Q33.** *Can the IP address spaces be shared?*
- A. Pricing for IP must be provided. Cities do not typically share IP address spaces; however, if Proposer offers shared IP address space, response should describe how that will behave operationally across cities.
- Q34.** *Can you clarify the 12-month opt out for a city? This would be a high capital project; can we get a commitment to ensure we cover costs?*
- A. No commitment is made at this time on minimum billings under the contract. Covering its costs is a risk borne by the Proposer.
- Q35.** *Will there be support from the cities on accelerating permits, pole permits, etc.?*
- A. Proposer shall be responsible for securing all permits with cities as required. There will be no waivers of fees or acceleration of service levels on permit approvals.
- Q36.** *Will there be one primary point of contact once the project is awarded? Who would that be?*
- A. There will be a primary contract administrator designated at SBCCOG, for which contact information will be provided in the final contract. For each city, there will be a primary point of contact named to coordinate services.
- Q37.** *Would SBCCOG look at hybrid options?*
- A. Proposer should fully respond to all requirements. If a hybrid is offered additionally, it may be considered.
- Q38.** *Will this be designed to support federal reimbursement by e-rate?*

SBCCOG RFP - SMART-Net Intercity Network
Final RFP Questions, Responses (Composite)
August 06, 2018

- A. No schools or libraries are planned at this time, so no e-rate funding for construction will be available. Schools or libraries may be added, but that will be after a contract is awarded.
- Q39.** *Do all member city data-centers (both primary and secondary) need to be connected directly to the ring or can they be connected back to and sub-tended from the pertinent City Hall node? Can those connections to member data-centers be made via a single lateral entry?*
- A. Yes, connections to member city data centers may be made via single lateral entry at the point denoted in RFP Attachment B.
- Q40.** *Are the IP POP nodes able to be connected to the backbone ring by way of a single lateral connection or must each IP POP node have a diverse lateral path connected to the ring?*
- A. The requirement is for diverse paths to the internet, and therefore the requirement for connection to two POPs. Each IP POP mode may have diverse connections at the Proposer's design, which should be denoted in the submitted KMZ and PDF files identifying the proposed routes.
- Q41.** *Given there are several robust and carrier-neutral IP POP's separate to that from One Wilshire (624 S. Grand, LA, CA 90017), can other nodes (i.e., 600 W 7th, 818 W 7th, 900 N. Alameda, etc.) be used in lieu of One Wilshire? If not, will the SBCCOG isolate where in One Wilshire the fiber needs to be terminated (colo provider, floor, suite, cabinet, ports, etc.)?*
- a. There are multiple carrier-neutral data-centers within the geographic area of the SBCCOG – is there a reason why both IP POP's cannot be located within the SBCCOG "territory"?*
- b. Is there a preference of the SBCCOG for the second IP POP location to be within the "geography" of the SBCCOG (i.e., El Segundo, Torrance)?*
- A. The requirement is for two geographically-diverse internet POPs. As stated in RFP Section 2.3, the two POPs are simply suggestions. Proposer may specify two different POPs. There is no requirement that the POPs be either outside or inside the SBCCOG service area.
- Q42.** *Entry Route & Cost Issues: The RFP included general requirements pursuant to the entry paths needed for each Phase 1 node. More specific information will be needed to adequately determine how to specifically route fiber from the ROW to the building termination point.*
- a. Will the SBCCOG coordinate site visits to allow bidders to review anticipated entry path issues and routing needs into Phase 1 nodes?*
- b. If not, will the SBCCOG or its members provide an available path to the awardee for fiber entry from the ROW to each building entry point and from the point of entry at the building to the termination location (rack mount or wall panel, etc.) within each building? Or, should bidders assume "no path" will be provided thus requiring new "in-building" construction to the desired termination points? Please elaborate.*
- A. No, it is not anticipated that site visits will be scheduled prior to submission of proposals. Qualified and responsive Proposers may be offered that opportunity prior to contract award. SBCCOG understands that each building denoted in Attachment A has sufficient rack space for electronics. Proposers should ensure they include physical and electrical specifications for recommended electronics to be installed.
- Q43.** *Is it acceptable for Phase 2 sites to be connected back to a "parent" city node (i.e., City Hall or city data-center) or would a Phase 2 building need to be interconnected directly into a backbone ring? a. If the former, are there any limitations as to how many nodes may be "daisy-chained" before being connected to the ring?*

**SBCCOG RFP - SMART-Net Intercity Network
Final RFP Questions, Responses (Composite)
August 06, 2018**

- A. The requirement is to provide dedicated bandwidth at the denoted speeds. The Proposer has some design discretion here as to recommended connections, subject to the condition that the committed, dedicated bandwidth is provided to all sites as specified. Proposer should describe and denote its solution.
- Q44.** *Should bidders assume only Phase 1 sites will be awarded at this time and that Phase 2 locations are possibly but not necessarily being awarded concurrently? If Phase 2 sites are likely to be awarded as part of this RFP, then network design considerations become much more complicated in that designing for 20 sites is far different than designing a network for 55 locations. For example, Carson shows ten (10) Phase 2 sites that could potentially materially impact the costs of routing and fiber allocation needed to adequately interconnect both Phase 1 & Phase 2 nodes. In that scenario, would “daisy-chaining” be acceptable to all ten nodes? Would you please elaborate on this issue of “definitive award” versus “possible award”?*
- A. It is anticipated that all 55 Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites will be committed as part of the contract award.
- Q45.** *Various member cities have existing, in-development, or planned fiber networks. The integration of these networks into the overall system provided could save a substantial sum of money both regarding NRC and MRC. Will the SBCCOG provide bidders maps of these systems or, minimally, will it provide “member city” contacts so that this avenue can be explored?
a. Or, should bidders assume no member fiber will be available/provided as part of the bidding process?*
- A. As stated in RFP Section 2.3, no offer of use of existing or planned fiber, or conduit, is made as part of the solicitation. Consequently, no maps of member city fiber will be shared. As also stated in Section 2.3, Proposers are encouraged to directly contact member cities for possible use of their existing assets.
- Q46.** *Is the SBCCOG open to accepting alternative network proposals that include “Dark Fiber” solutions that integrate all Phase 1 nodes in the manner contemplated by the RFP (connected by a backbone ring) that would allow for member cities to manage their own bandwidth needs?*
- A. SBCCOG anticipates the winning proposal shall provide a complete lit turnkey solution, independent of whether Proposer uses any third party’s dark fiber. Service levels for requested changes in bandwidth, measured from the time of request, should be specified.
- Q47.** *The stated bandwidth thresholds needed by the SBCCOG vary tremendously creating a system design challenge for a dedicated network solution. Is the SBCCOG willing to accept a network that meets the minimum levels stated (up to 10Gb) that may not have 100Gb available until a majority of the COG members need it?*
- A. As noted in the bandwidth requirements in RFP Attachment A, there is no site seeking 100 Gbps service at this time. While Proposer need not offer 100 Gbps at this time, Proposer is required to specify (future) costs for those services. In that instance, Proposer must also specify required notice to provide upgrades to 100 Gbps service.
- Q48.** *Is a bidder required to offer 10 Gbps AND 100 Gbps of capacity at Phase 2 sites (i.e., many of which are parks)? Or is it the intent of the SBCCOG that the network includes some scalability to reach those capacities in the future? Please elaborate.*
- A. As noted in the bandwidth requirements in RFP Attachment A, there is no site seeking 100 Gbps service at this time. While Proposer need not offer 100 Gbps at this time, Proposer is required to

**SBCCOG RFP - SMART-Net Intercity Network
Final RFP Questions, Responses (Composite)
August 06, 2018**

specify (future) costs for those services. In that instance, Proposer must also specify required notice to provide upgrades to 100 Gbps service.

- Q49.** *Is the need for “/27” based on all SBCCOG member or for each member?*
- A. It is currently anticipated that /27 should be sufficient for all members, in aggregate. Final counts of IP addresses will be provided prior to contract award. (See also Q64.)
- Q50.** *The reach of a full system solution for the SBCCOG is significant regarding network routing. If individual city members “opt out” from one or more sites, is the SBCCOG accepting of an equitable and proportionate increase in costs for the remaining members that could be the result from a design that must include a ring to all remaining member cities?*
- A. While it is expected that all member cities will participate, final “opt out” decisions will be made prior to contract award. No commitment is made at this time as to any proportionate cost increases in the event a member city opts out.
- Q51.** *If not, would the SBCCOG elaborate on how bidders should reconcile the potential increased network costs across fewer member contributors (or sites) that also impact system-wide equipment design and deployment issues required for the full 55-sites listed?*
- A. While it is expected that all member cities will participate, final “opt out” decisions will be made prior to contract award. No commitment is made at this time as to any proportionate cost increases in the event a member city opts out.
- Q52.** *It is unclear as to whether all Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites will be awarded under this RFP as part of one award covering both Phase 1 and Phase 2 locations. Must a bid include all Phase 1 & Phase 2 nodes or would a bid providing solutions to only Phase 1 nodes be accepted? Alternatively, will a bidder be disqualified if they only bid on Phase 1 sites?*
- A. SBCCOG seeks network and services design to cover all 55 Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites. Initial contract award is anticipated to include all these sites. A Proposer is highly unlikely to be selected if it bids on only Phase 1 sites.
- Q53.** *In the Section 1.2 narrative, it states, “the expected goal is to obtain long-term commitment for revenue streams tied to broadband offerings.” Other than the revenue “commissions” as defined in section 3.4 & 3.5, what other direct revenues streams from the “partner” are anticipated by the SBCCOG? Or, does the “revenue expectation” definition include “intangibles” such as the economic development benefits of new employment & increased property values to homes and businesses, or lower costs resulting in cost savings to member communities, etc.? Please elaborate.*
- A. Fees defined in Sections 3.4 and 3.5 are anticipated to be only based on direct revenue streams based on billings to members. Any increases tied to indirect or other intangible benefits are not included in fee calculations.
- Q54.** *What accommodations to the chosen vendor will be made from a City Planning/Permit perspective in order ‘fast track’ the construction of the network? Any reduction in fees?*
- A. The winning Proposer will be expected to secure its own permits from appropriate member city jurisdictions. SBCCOG encourages Proposer coordination with points of contact for each member city, all of whom will be defined prior to contract execution. SBCCOG anticipates there will be no discounts or waivers of fees.

**SBCCOG RFP - SMART-Net Intercity Network
Final RFP Questions, Responses (Composite)
August 06, 2018**

- Q55.** *In addition to MRC pricing for inter/intra city speeds, is SBCCOG also asking the selected vendor to provide actual Internet connectivity pricing, or just private connectivity to these two Internet regional hubs? If yes, where should we distinguish inter/intra city MRC pricing vs internet MRC pricing?*
- A. Pricing for internet services should be specified at all speed tiers on rows denoted "Lateral Connections – Phase One" and "Lateral Connections – Phase Two". Intra-city MRC should be denoted on row denoted "Intra City – Layer 2 / 3".
- Q56.** *In the Pricing Attachment C, Cell A30, it reads, "Phase 2 buildings (w Internet)". What does the reference to "w internet" mean? (If, "with Internet", please explain further.)*
- A. "w Internet" means "with Internet" and indicates the pricing to be offered by Proposer for full internet services. The following line is for layer 2 transport pricing to a specific city location, from which city-wide internet services will be provided.
- Q57.** *When SBCCOG mentions 'Residential service' as one of the aims of this RFP, what specific services is SBCCOG envisioning?*
- A. There are no requirements for residential service. The final list of buildings included in Attachment B contain no residential buildings of any kind.
- Q58.** *Will SBCCOG allow for additional Q/A period after July 9?*
- A. No additional question and answer period is anticipated.
- Q59.** *Can SBCCOG provide an unlocked version of the Pricing Spreadsheet Attachment C?*
- A. Attachment C is the authoritative pricing offering. Attachment C must be completed and submitted. An additional unprotected spreadsheet has been posted.
- Q60.** *Regarding section 2.3: At the Core Smart-net locations, are any level of diversity expected between locations?*
- A. The requirement is for each Core SMART-Net location to have access to both internet points of presence (POPs) to ensure high availability and resiliency on the network.
- Q61.** *Clarification request: Regarding Section 2.6: What is the expectation that the provider supports the individual cities equipment and internal networks?*
- A. Awarded Proposer ("Provider") is expected to support its equipment installed as customer premises equipment (CPE), as proposed. Provider is not expected to support equipment and internal networks it does not own. Proposer should ensure its plan for equipment is clear in the proposal, both in description of operations and in pricing.
- Q62.** *Is it a requirement that the internet traffic from businesses in phase two to traverse the proposed network in phase 1?*
- A. If awarded Proposer ("Provider") intends on enrolling subscribing businesses during Phase 1, then yes, the proposed network should be used whenever possible.
- Q63.** *Is the intended design to enable cities to be able to commutate (sic) directly with neighboring city on the backbone ring?*
- A. Yes, inter-city communication is a primary objective.
- Q64.** *Is SBCCOG and the member cities looking for internet access that is directly provided to each city with their own unique IP block? Or shared using allocation from the same IP scope?*

**SBCCOG RFP - SMART-Net Intercity Network
Final RFP Questions, Responses (Composite)
August 06, 2018**

- A. SBCCOG is currently looking for pricing for a shared /27 block (both IPv4 and IPv6). Please provide those prices. If Proposer believes separate IP blocks (say, /29) for each member city would be simpler to administer, Proposer should make their arguments for separate blocks in the proposal, along with pricing for a unique IP block for each city; please denote alternate pricing in the unprotected sheet. (See also Q49.)
- Q65.** *Is SBCCOG intending to have City Halls and City Data Center facilities active in the network topology? Potentially through use of switches and/or routers. (Depicted in the attached diagram)*
- A. Yes.
- Q66.** *Is the use of lateral or single fiber paths from South Bay City locations connecting to providers facility (i.e. Collocation, Central Office, and/or Hubs)?*
- A. The question is not clear. As we understand your question to read, yes, presumably each location must connect to awarded Proposer's facilities.
- Q67.** *Will SBCCOG be offering any arranged access to equipment after-hours, weekends, and holidays in the event of reported trouble?*
- A. Each member city will coordinate access to its facilities in the event of a reported problem, given appropriate notice of requested off-hours access.
- Q68.** *Is SBCCOG and the member cities looking for point to point or private Ethernet service? If so, can you provide the A-Location and Z-Location for each of the circuits?*
- A. If the selection is made by the member city or active ethernet service, all core and Phase 2 buildings in the member city should connect back to the primary and/or secondary data centers)
- Q69.** *In Phase 2, is it the intention to build laterals (fiber extension) directly to businesses with the end pointing directly to the nearest SmartPOP?*
- A. That is the intention, unless significant impediments are later shown to exist.
- Q70.** *Is the use of rings required for providers that have existing presence within the South Bay Cities?*
- A. The question is not clear. As we understand your question to read, the Proposer should describe how its existing facilities and services contribute to the overall proposed solution. Proposer should differentiate existing assets from proposed assets in KMZ.
- Q71.** *Can we use any of their buildings as Aggregation Node Locations?*
- a. *If so, are there any preferred buildings to select?*
 - b. *If so, is there power back up at these buildings?*
 - c. *If so, what is the general space availability for our equipment?*
- A. Preliminary analysis shows there is rack space available for equipment in each building. There is not always power backup at each building. If any preference is to be shown for aggregation nodes, those would be toward the member city halls and data centers. Should available rack space or power be shown to be insufficient, each member city will propose remediations.
- Q72.** *Will the individual municipalities be giving any leniency on permitting, access to conduits, etc.*
- A. See responses to Q45 and Q54.
- Q73.** *What is the plan to rapidly turn up customers if there is only one scheduled outage per quarter? Could this be modified or increased to meet turn up demands?*

SBCCOG RFP - SMART-Net Intercity Network
Final RFP Questions, Responses (Composite)
August 06, 2018

A. One scheduled outage is the required service level for sustained operation, post-implementation. To accelerate deployment and turn-up, more frequent scheduled outages will likely be required. During initial turn-up, awarded Proposer (“Provider”) should ensure sufficient lead time on notice for planned outages to all affected member cities, through their respective points of contact, and to SBCCOG.

Q74. *Please confirm that IP transit is only needed at the two data centers (One Wilshire and Equinix) and not at every location.*

A. IP transit may also be required between member cities’ data centers and their respective buildings.

Q75. *Please confirm the correct address on row 47 of Attachment A, Harbor UCLA Medical Center (Gardena). We cannot confirm the cited address.*

A. Please note the correct address for row 47 is 1301 W 182 Street, Gardena, CA, 90248.

FINAL