

Organization Name:	ACTUAL SCHOOL		
Prepared by:	NAME REMOVED	Title:	Network Administrator
Signature:		Date:	2/4/2015

Description of Service:	Local Phone Service								
-------------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Service Provider	E-Rate Eligible Costs	Other Costs - Not Eligible	Price-Erate	Price-Other Costs	Prior Experience	Personnel Qualifications	Responsiveness	Technical Merit	Total Points
<i>Points Possible for Each Bid</i>			<b>30.000</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>
1 Vendor 1	115,824.00		15.692	5.000	20	10	15	20	85.692
2 Vendor 2	60,582.00	Unknown	30.000	0.000	10	10	15	15	80.000
3									0.000
4									0.000
5									0.000
6									0.000
7									0.000
8									0.000
9									0.000
10									0.000

**EVALUATION RATIONALE (Attach additional pages as necessary)**  
Vendor 2's bid was in MRC. The extended yearly cost is used above.  
We will be greatly reducing the number of POTS lines used in the near future, changing the price from Vendor 1 to much closer to the cost of Vendor 2.  
The not eligible cost would include significant time spent in a transition and unknown amount needed for repair of POTS cable plant that is being depreciated.

### E-RATE 2015-16 BID EVALUATION GRID

Organization Name:	ACTUAL SCHOOL		
Prepared by:	NAME REMOVED	Title:	Network Administrator
Signature:		Date:	2/4/2015

Description of Service:		Long Distance							
Service Provider	E-Rate Eligible Costs	Other Costs - Not Eligible	Price-Erate	Price-Other Costs	Prior Experience	Personnel Qualifications	Responsiveness	Technical Merit	Total Points
<i>Points Possible for Each Bid</i>			<b>30.000</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>
1 Vendor 1	46,983.36		12.873	5.000	20	10	15	20	82.873
2 Vendor 2	20,160.00		30.000	0.000	10	10	15	15	80.000
3									0.000
4									0.000
5									0.000
6									0.000
7									0.000
8									0.000
9									0.000
10									0.000

**EVALUATION RATIONALE (Attach additional pages as necessary)**

Vendor 2's bid was in MRC. The extended yearly cost is used above.

The not eligible cost would include significant time spent in a transition and unknown amount needed for repair of POTS cable plant that is being depreciated.

I can't have Vendor 2 LD on Vendor 1 PRI's, right?

## E-RATE 2015-16 BID EVALUATION GRID

Organization Name:	ACTUAL SCHOOL		
Prepared by:	REMOVED NAME	Title:	Network Administrator
Signature:		Date:	2/4/2015

Description of Service:		PRI							
Service Provider	E-Rate Eligible Costs	Other Costs - Not Eligible	Price-Erate	Price-Other Costs	Prior Experience	Personnel Qualifications	Responsiveness	Technical Merit	Total Points
<i>Points Possible for Each Bid</i>			<b>30.000</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>
1 Vendor 1	50,000.00		11.520	5.000	20	10	15	20	81.520
2 Vendor 2	19,200.00	6,000.00	30.000	0.000	10	10	15	15	80.000
3									0.000
4									0.000
5									0.000
6									0.000
7									0.000
8									0.000
9									0.000
10									0.000

**EVALUATION RATIONALE (Attach additional pages as necessary)**  
 Vendor 2's bid was in MRC. The extended yearly cost is used above.  
 We will be reducing the number of PRI used in the near future, changing the price from Vendor 1 much closer to the cost of Vendor 2.  
 The not eligible cost would include the yearly cost of our DID blocks

Organization Name:	ACTUAL SCHOOL		
Prepared by:	NAME REMOVED	Title:	Network Administrator
Signature:		Date:	2/4/2015

Description of Service:		Internet Access							
Service Provider	E-Rate Eligible Costs	Other Costs - Not Eligible	Price-Erate	Price-Other Costs	Prior Experience	Personnel Qualifications	Responsiveness	Technical Merit	Total Points
<i>Points Possible for Each Bid</i>			<b>30.000</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>
1 Existing Services	165,930.00		7.594	0.000	20	10	15	20	72.594
2 VENDOR 1	93,300.00		13.505	0.000	0	0	0	0	13.505
3 VENDOR 2	42,000.00		30.000	0.000	20	10	15	20	95.000
4 VENDOR 3	75,000.00		16.800	0.000	15	10	15	20	76.800
5									0.000
6									0.000
7									0.000
8									0.000
9									0.000
10									0.000

**EVALUATION RATIONALE (Attach additional pages as necessary)**  
 Vendor 2 is current provider. Existing services includes old connection for cut-over purposes. Vendor 2 has good service and lowest cost.  
 I have not heard of Vendor 3 and have no knowledge of any categories for them except for price.  
 Vendor 1's bid was in MRC. The extended yearly cost is used above.

Organization Name:	ACTUAL SCHOOL		
Prepared by:	NAME REMOVED	Title:	Network Administrator
		Date:	2/4/2015

Description of Service:	Category 2								
-------------------------	------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Service Provider	E-Rate Eligible Costs	Other Costs - Not Eligible	Price-Erate	Price-Other Costs	Prior Experience	Personnel Qualifications	Responsiveness	Technical Merit	Total Points
<b>Points Possible for Each Bid</b>			<b>30.000</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100</b>
1 VENDOR 1	\$1,118,578.50		20.741		20	10	15	20	85.741
2 VENDOR 2	773,330.65		30.000		0	0	0	10	40.000
3 VENDOR 3	1,860,870.64		12.467		20	10	15	20	77.467
4									0.000
5									0.000
6									0.000
7									0.000
8									0.000
9									0.000
10									0.000

**EVALUATION RATIONALE (Attach additional pages as necessary)**

I rate Vendor 2 low because of prior experience with them where they were non-responsive. They also bid Brand X switches and Brand Y APs, which can not be managed by my NMS. I corrected the quantity of switches for Garfield and Prairie View for Vendor 3's bid. Vendor 3's bid did not include SFPs. Adjusting for Vendor 1's bid for this, the hardware prices per ABCD switch and PQWT AP were still significantly cheaper. All of Vendor 1's bids were over the pre-discount budgeted amount, meaning the district would incur significant cost outside of erate funding.