

PRODUCT LINE	PARTIAL CISCO/DELL	PARTIAL CISCO/DELL	JUNIPER	ALCATEL LUCENT	ARUBA	CISCO	CISCO	CISCO	CISCO
FULL/PARTIAL BID	partial bid	partial bid	full bid	full bid	partial bid	partial bid	full bid	full bid	full bid
TOTAL PRICING	\$ 3,776,794.83	\$ 3,991,685.00	\$ 4,356,319.46	\$ 5,063,241.13	\$ 6,148,787.72	\$ 6,895,842.87	\$ 6,912,865.12	\$ 7,330,724.39	7335.278.00
Price Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

MANDATORY BID REQUIREMENTS	Connection	CDWG	Tek Hut	DICE	CounterTrade	New Tech Solutions	ANM	Presidio	Sentenial
Gold Cert or Alternate Equivalent	Cisco Gold, EMC Gold	Aruba Platinum	*Select Level Partner	*ALE Accredited Spec	HP Authoration Letter	*Premier Cert Partner	Cisco Gold	Cisco Gold	Cisco Gold
Completed and signed Bid Certification Page	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Offeror proof of current E-Rate form 473	Yes	Yes	UTL	UTL	UTL		Yes	Yes	Yes
Offeror valid Service Provider Identification (SPIN)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Qualification of Service Provider/Offeror Gold reseller	Yes	Yes	?	unclear	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
QUALIFIED RESPONSE	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES
OTHER REQUIREMENTS									
Years in Business	35	19	16	7	30	Lower than Gold	23	20	34
Litigations, Judgements, Liens	No	No	No	No	No	- Disqualified -	No	No	No
Bankruptcy	No	No	No	No	No		No	No	No
Alternate Part # and Discounted Price	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		- NA -	- NA -	- NA -
Specifications	nos specs given on alternate	no specs given on alternate			No				
Warranty Terms and Conditions	Limited Warranty	Lifetime Replace and OS	Lifetime - Replace	1 year	Lifetime Replace		5 Years after EOS	5 Years after EOS	5 Years after EOS
Attached Specifications on Alternative Models	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		- NA -	- NA -	- NA -
Attached Training Description Sheet	UTL	UTL	Yes	UTL	Yes		- NA -	- NA -	- NA -
Attached Training Hours Est to Train team to implement	UTL	UTL	Yes	Yes	Detailed		- NA -	- NA -	- NA -
Attached Implementation Plan - Hours to Configure	UTL	UTL	Yes	Yes	Detailed		- NA -	- NA -	- NA -
Attached Implementation Plan - Hours to Install	UTL	UTL	Yes	Yes	Detailed		- NA -	- NA -	- NA -
Attached Implementation Plan - Hours for additional items	UTL	UTL	Yes	Yes	Detailed		- NA -	- NA -	- NA -
QUALIFIED RESPONSE	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES

RANKING OF QUALIFIED RESPONSES	1	2	3
LOWEST PRICE OF QUALIFIED RESPONSES	\$ 6,912,865.12		

INDEX

UTL = Unable To Locate in bid response

gold colored cell = missing information or not compatible with Cisco

* equivalent certification

LOWEST PRICE OF QUALIFIED RESPONSES = AWARD



Funding Commitment Decision Letter

Funding Year 2018

Contact Information:

Brett Miller
Jefferson County School District R-1
1829 Denver West Drive, Building 27
Golden, CO 80401
bmiller@jeffco.k12.co.us

FCC Form 471: 181025955**BEN:** 145710**Wave:** 16**Application Nickname:** Switch gear 2018-2019

Totals

Total Committed	\$0.00
------------------------	---------------

What is in this letter?

Thank you for submitting your application for Funding Year 2018 Schools and Libraries Program (E-rate) funding. Attached to this letter, you will find the funding statuses for the FCC Form(s) 471, Services Ordered and Certification Form, that you submitted and referenced above.

The Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) is providing this information to both the applicant(s) and the service provider(s) so that all parties are aware of the post-commitment changes related to their funding requests and can work together to complete the funding process for these requests.

Next Steps

1. Work with your service provider(s) to determine if your bills will be discounted or if you will request reimbursement from USAC after paying the full cost for the services you receive.
2. Review the [Children's Internet Protection Act \(CIPA\)](#) requirements and file the [FCC Form 486](#) (Service Confirmation and CIPA Certification Form). **The deadline to submit this form is 120 days from the date of this letter or from the service start date (whichever is later).**



BEN Name: Jefferson County School District R-1
BEN: 145710

FCC Form 471: 181025955
Wave: 16

3. Invoice USAC

- **If you (the applicant) are invoicing USAC:** You must pay your service provider(s) the full cost for the services you receive and file the [FCC Form 472](#), the Billed Entity Applicant Reimbursement (BEAR) Form, to invoice USAC for reimbursement of the discounted amount.
- **If your service provider(s) is invoicing USAC:** The service provider(s) must provide services, bill the applicant for the non-discounted share, and file the [FCC Form 474](#), the Service Provider Invoice (SPI) form, to invoice USAC for reimbursement for the discounted portion of costs. Every funding year, service providers must file an [FCC Form 473](#), the Service Provider Annual Certification Form, to be able to submit invoices and to receive disbursements.
- **To receive an invoice deadline extension, the applicant or service provider** must request an extension on or before the last date to invoice. **If you anticipate, for any reason, that invoices cannot be filed on time**, USAC will grant a one-time, 120-day invoice deadline extension if timely requested.

How to Appeal or Request a Waiver of a Decision

You can appeal or request a waiver of a decision in this letter **within 60 calendar days** of the date of this letter. Failure to meet this deadline will result in an automatic dismissal of your appeal or waiver request.

Note: The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) will not accept appeals of USAC decisions that have not first been appealed to USAC. However, if you are seeking a waiver of E-rate program rules, you must submit your request to the FCC and not to USAC. USAC is not able to waive the E-rate program rules.

- **To submit your appeal to USAC**, visit the Appeals section in the [E-rate Productivity Center \(EPC\)](#) and provide the required information. USAC will reply to your appeal submissions to confirm receipt. Visit USAC's [website](#) for additional information on submitting an appeal to USAC, including step-by-step instructions.
- **To request a waiver of the FCC's rules**, please submit it to the FCC in proceeding number CC Docket No. 02-6 using the [Electronic Comment Filing System](#) (ECFS). Include your contact information, a statement that your filing is a waiver request, identifying information, the FCC rule(s) for which you are seeking a waiver, a full description of the relevant facts that you believe support your waiver request and any related relief, and any supporting documentation.

For appeals to USAC or to the FCC, be sure to keep a copy of your entire appeal, including any correspondence and documentation, and provide a copy to the affected service provider(s).



Obligation to Pay Non-Discount Portion

Applicants are required to pay the non-discount portion of the cost of the eligible products and/or services to their service providers. Service providers are required to bill applicants for the non-discount portion of costs for the eligible products and/or services. The FCC stated that requiring applicants to pay the non-discounted share of costs ensures efficiency and accountability in the program. If using the BEAR invoicing method, the applicant must pay the service provider in full (the non-discount plus discount portion) **before** seeking reimbursement from USAC. If using the SPI invoicing method, the service provider must first bill the applicant **before** invoicing USAC.

Notice on Rules and Funds Availability

The applicants' receipt of funding commitments is contingent on their compliance with all statutory, regulatory, and procedural requirements of the Schools and Libraries Program and the FCC's rules. Applicants who have received funding commitments continue to be subject to audits and other reviews that USAC and/or the FCC may undertake to assure that committed funds are being used in accordance with such requirements. USAC may be required to reduce or cancel funding commitments that were not issued in accordance with such requirements, whether due to action or inaction of USAC, the applicant, or the service provider. USAC, and other appropriate authorities (including but not limited to the FCC), may pursue enforcement actions and other means of recourse to collect improperly disbursed funds.



BEN Name: Jefferson County School District R-1
BEN: 145710

FCC Form 471: 181025955
Wave: 16

Funding Commitment Decision Overview

Funding Year 2018

Application Comments for FCC Form 471: #181025955

The applicant did not submit any RAL corrections.

Funding Commitment Decision Overview

Funding Request Number (FRN)	Service Provider Name	Amount Requested	Amount Committed	Status
1899047674	Advanced Network Management, Inc.	\$610,705.63	\$0.00	Denied



BEN Name: Jefferson County School District R-1
BEN: 145710

FCC Form 471: 181025955
Wave: 16

FRN 1899047674	Service Type Internal Connections	Status Denied
--------------------------	---	-------------------------

Dollars Committed			
Monthly Cost		One-time Cost	
Months of Service	12		
Total Eligible Recurring Charges	\$0.00	Total Eligible One Time Charges	\$135,192.00
Total Pre-discount Charges		\$135,192.00	
Discount Rate		50.00%	
Committed Amount		\$0.00	

Dates	
Service Start Date	7/1/2018
Contract Expiration Date	6/30/2019
Contract Award Date	3/28/2017
Service Delivery Deadline	9/30/2019
Expiration Date (All Extensions)	6/30/2022

Service Provider and Contract Information	
Service Provider	Advanced Network Management, Inc.
SPIN (498ID)	143028101
Contract Number	
Account Number	
Establishing FCC Form 470	170063496

Consultant Information	
Consultant Name	
Consultant's Employer	
CRN	

Funding Commitment Decision Comments

DR1: The winning vendor was not selected in accordance with the vendor evaluation process described in the vendor selection documentation provided by you during the Selective Review. You did not adhere to your own criteria in the vendor selection process - Stage 1 - Mandatory Bid Requirements (Binary). Therefore, this FRN is denied. <><><><> MR1: The FRN was modified from \$1,221,411.25 to \$135,192.00 to match the applicant documentation. <><><><> MR2: The Contract Expiration Date was changed from 6/30/2022 to 6/30/2019 to agree



BEN Name: Jefferson County School District R-1

BEN: 145710

FCC Form 471: 181025955

Wave: 16

with the documentation provided during the review of the FCC Form 471. <><><><><> MR3: 93794 Fletcher Miller Special ES has been removed from the FRN as a recipients of service at the request of the applicant.



Switch Bid eRate Response

Jefferson County School District R-1 respectfully disagrees with your assertion that we did not consider other products. The accompanying 24235 Bid Tab final Excel sheet compares the capabilities and specifications of all proposals, including the alternate products, which were presented as part of the bid process.

The review committee used a multi-stage binary scoring matrix which followed the process outlined on the **USAC Step 2 Selection Service Providers** web page
<https://www.usac.org/sl/applicants/step02/evaluation.aspx>

Bid Disqualification Factors

You can set out specific requirements and disqualify bids that do not meet those requirements as long as you clearly identify the disqualification reasons on your FCC Form 470 and/or your RFP.

Disqualification reasons should be determined prior to any substantive bid evaluation.

Disqualification reasons cannot be scored on a range, but rather are binary - i.e., the service provider either meets the standard or does not meet the standard.

The following items are examples of bid disqualification reasons:

- Service provider must register with the state procurement office
- Service provider must have a Service Provider Identification Number (SPIN), also known as the [service provider's 498 ID](#)
- Service provider must have a CORES ID
- Service provider must be bonded

If an applicant specifies these four bid disqualification reasons on its FCC Form 470 and/or RFP, bids from service providers that do not meet all four requirements can be disqualified and not evaluated further. The remaining bids must then be evaluated with the price of the eligible products and services as the factor that is weighted most heavily in the bid evaluation.

Jeffco's Selection Committee's Process

Proposals received from nine companies: CDWG, Connection, CounterTrade, DICE, Presidio, Sentenial (Sentinel), Tek Hut, ANM, New Tech Solutions
Switch Responses Ranked - Excel Sheet

Stage 1 - **Mandatory Bid Requirements (Binary)**

- Respondents evaluated based on:
 - Complete and Signed Bid Certification Page
 - Proof of eRate form 473

- SPIN number
- Cisco Gold Reseller or equivalent

Missing required information in Stage 1 - Disqualified based on Binary review.

- CounterTrade (HP) - Unable to locate Form 473 in proposal
- DICE (ALE) - Unable to locate Form 473 in proposal and Gold Reseller equivalence unclear
- Tek Hut (Juniper) - Unable to locate Form 473 in proposal
- New Tech Solutions (Cisco) - Their rating lower than Gold Reseller

Stage 1- Round 2 - remaining companies: CDWG (Cisco/Dell), Connection (Cisco/Dell), Presidio (Cisco), Sentenial (Sentinel) (Cisco), ANM (Cisco)

Evaluated if the following documents were provided in their proposal not on the quality of the information in the documents.

- Litigations, Judgments, Liens
- Bankruptcy
- Alternate Part # and Discounted Price
- Specifications
- Quality
- Design
- Utility
- Support/Service (which includes repairs, replacement parts)
- Compatibility and ease of use with existing infrastructure
- "Plug and Play" capability
- Warranty Terms and Conditions
- Attached Specifications on Alternative Models
- Attached Training Description Sheet
- Attached Training Hours Est to Train team to implement

- Attached Implementation Plan - Hours to Configure
- Attached Implementation Plan - Hours to Install
- Attached Implementation Plan - Hours for additional items

Disqualified in this review and considered non-responsive because they were missing required documentation. CDWG - training and implementation plan were missing from proposal
Connection - training and implementation plan were missing from proposal.

Stage 2 - **Presidio (Cisco), Sentenial (Sentinel) (Cisco) and ANM (Cisco) remaining proposals**

Reviewed pricing of the three remaining companies that provided responsive bids.

On tab "Specs compared" we did carefully examine the specifications of alternate products even though these products were eliminated in previous rounds of review due to not providing required documents or not providing responsive bids. The technical specifications of all alternates provided were reviewed to determine compatibility with existing network architecture. Upon review it was determined that the alternates provided were not compatible with our existing network architecture.

Since the alternates were not competitive with our existing network structure, the "Cisco pricing" tab shows pricing for all vendors that submitted Cisco equipment pricing. Even though some of these vendors were eliminated in previous review due to not providing required documentation or being deemed non-responsive, the pricing was still reviewed to determine competitiveness of remaining proposals.

The Alternate vs ANM tab was added two weeks to a month after award to ANM was made. At this time, the District began the process of re-architecting our entire network design to accommodate higher bandwidth requirements for digital learning. The purpose of this document was to review pricing of alternates that currently were not compatible with our network architecture, to determine possible cost savings by network redesign.