

E-Rate Mini-Bid Evaluation Form – Category 2: Wireless Infrastructure Funding Year 2017 - 2018

Introduction: Union Academy plans to utilize Federal E-Rate funding to invest in new wireless infrastructure.

Project Information:

- Union Academy’s current wireless infrastructure consists of Extreme/Enterasys controllers and access points.
- In order to participate in the program, we understand we will be completely removing our current infrastructure and replacing all equipment with a new company and vendor.
- Our current wireless infrastructure is currently at its capacity. In addition, approximately ⅔ of our current access points are past the manufacturer’s end of life cycle. We have evaluated the cost out of pocket to expand the current system’s capacity along with expand for future growth. We feel it is a better financial decision to introduce an entirely new system at the current time.
- In addition to the points above, we are planning an expansion of two building additions and a brand new building. In the process, we will be adding hundreds of students and hundreds of devices to our ecosystem.
- After an evaluation of current and future Technology Department staffing plans, we feel a managed wireless solution is not only our top option but our only option. Without a guarantee of additional staffing, a managed wireless solution would allow us to better align and utilize our current staff in the most reliable way. This is in turn best for staff and ultimately students. Due to this point, we will not be including any non-managed vendors from our mini-bid process.

Identified Vendors:

Vendor ID	Vendor Name	Product Brand Offered
V1	ENA Services	Aerohive
V2	Korcett Holdings	Ruckus/Dell

Evaluation Criteria:

Criteria	V1	V2
Cost of Recurring Service (25 Points)	20	15
Cost of Physical Equipment (20 Points)	18	15
Pricing vs. Availability of Features (15 Points)	15	15
Presence in North Carolina, experience in K–12 school setting (15 Points)	15	10
Satisfaction and customer service during bidding process (15 Points)	15	10
Warranty of purchased physical equipment (10 Points)	10	10
TOTAL (100 Points)	93	75

Evaluation Notes:

- Cost of recurring service ranked higher as the costs are recurring each year. Also factored in is the possible use of school funds for those costs in the future. V1 was based on access point count, V2 on student count.
- V1 received higher points for the bidding process. They volunteered detailed background, references, and came onsite twice to evaluate our campus and discuss their proposal. V2 admitted to having a lower presence in both K-12 education and North Carolina. They also expressed a reliance on subcontractors, a negative to us.
- V1’s access point model was priced slightly lower than V2s while providing additional antenna capacity. V2’s model contained the newest Wave 2 standard, however, we valued increased capacity over the newest standard.
- V2’s proposal did not include descriptions or a breakdown of how quantities and charges were determined.
- Both V1 and V2’s equipment is covered by a limited lifetime warranty.