



METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DISTRICT
LAWRENCE TOWNSHIP

Dr. Shawn A. Smith
Superintendent

Lawrence Education & Community Center
6501 Sunnyside Road
Indianapolis, IN 46236
(317) 423-8200

March 14, 2018

RE: Request for Proposals (RFP) for Internet Filtering Solution

Dear Sir or Madam,

The Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township (MSDLT, the District) desires to gather information and subsequently procure an Internet Filtering Solution.

I cordially invite you to respond to MSDLT's attached request for proposals (RFP) for an Internet Filtering Solution. Please feel free to contact us with questions.

Sincerely,

Michael S Bottorff
Chief Technology Officer
Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township



METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DISTRICT OF LAWRENCE TOWNSHIP RFP FOR INTERNET FILTERING SOLUTION

REQUESTING: **Proposal** (1 original and one electronic; delivered as described in sections 1.4 and 4.2)

Issue Date: March 14, 2019

Bid opening: April 8, 2019 at 12:00 pm local time (EST)

Procurement Time Frame: Request for Proposals Issued: March 14, 2019
Request for Proposals Response Date: April 8, 2019
Award and Contract Execution: April 22, 2019 (tentative)

Requested Services: Internet Filtering Solution

Enclosures: 1.0 Purpose and Background
2.0 Scope of Procurement
3.0 Evaluation Criteria and Vendor Selection
4.0 Proposal Format and Content

Response Documents: Mailing Label
Response Cover Page
Vendor Response Forms
Detailed Pricing Forms
Reference Form
Service Invoice/Order Form
Proposed Service Level Agreement
Additional Documentation

QUESTIONS: Vendors may submit any questions concerning this solicitation in writing until 5:00 pm on Monday, March 25, 2019. Vendors should send inquiries via email to Scott Davis, Network Administrator. The District will post written answers to questions, in the form of amendments to the RFP, on the official web site for this solicitation. Contact with anyone other than the Network Administrator for matters pertaining to this solicitation during the solicitation process is prohibited. The bidder is responsible for reviewing all amendments and related documents.

Official site for all RFP documents: <http://www.ltschools.org/services/technologyservices/procurement>.

Contact for this request:

Scott Davis
Network Administrator
317-423-8340
scottdavis@msdl.t.k12.in.us

1.0 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP)

Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township (MSDLT, the District) desires to procure and execute an agreement for an Internet Filtering Solution. MSDLT seeks responses from appropriately qualified and experienced vendors. The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to solicit sealed proposals and establish a contract through fair and competitive negotiations.

MSDLT invites prospective vendors to submit information in fulfillment of requirements described in this RFP. This RFP represents a statement of desired products and services and will assist MSDLT in gathering information regarding services available, whether or not the District is currently aware of this availability, and to identify vendors capable of delivering these services.

This document does not commit the District to award a contract, to pay any costs incurred in the preparation of a response to this RFP, or to make any agreements in relation to the services and/or goods described in this RFP. Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township reserves the right to request clarification, conduct discussions with vendors and/or request additional information.

1.2 General Background

The ninth largest and one of the fastest growing school district in the state, Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township serves approximately 16,000 students and 3000 staff across four Early Learning Centers, eleven Elementary Schools, two Middle Schools, two High Schools, a Center for Innovation and Technology, and an alternative setting high school. MSDLT strives to be the district of destination, a reputation built over the years based on the district's award-winning staff, accomplished administrators, high-achieving students, supportive community, and innovative educational programs. Visit our website at www.LTschools.org.

1.3 Procurement Objectives

MSDLT seeks vendor proposals for an Internet Filtering Solution. Currently, the District utilizes an onsite solution comprised of a series of load-balanced appliances and proxy servers. Please reference Attachment C for diagrams representing the current solution utilized by MSDLT. Note that qualified and interested vendors must submit a request via email to scottdavis@msdl.k12.in.us to receive Attachment C. The District desires to replace the current system with a modern, up to date solution.

1.4 Request Timeline and Important Dates

The anticipated timeline for this RFP is as follows:

Issue Date	March 15, 2019
Pre-proposal Conference	March 21, 2019 8:30 am local time (EST)
Written Questions Deadline	March 25, 2019 5:00 pm local time (EST)
Proposal Response Deadline	April 8, 2019 12:00 pm local time (EST)
Vendor Selection and Contract Award (tentative)	April 22, 2019

MSDLT will conduct a pre-proposal conference on March 21, 2019 at 8:30 am EST. Vendors must ask any questions concerning this RFP during the pre-proposal conference. To register, contact Scott Davis via email no later than 5:00 pm EST on March 19, 2019. Vendors may participate in person or via web conference.

2.0 SCOPE OF PROCUREMENT

Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township seeks to procure Internet service(s). This section describes MSDLT's requirements.

2.1 Length of Contract

MSDLT will consider agreements ranging from three (3) to five (5) years in length.

2.2 Bandwidth

The District has the current capacity of 10 Gbps, with the possibility of scaling up to 20 Gbps by the expiration of this contract. Any proposed solution should immediately support the current 10 Gbps. Provide all extended pricing for any needed equipment or services to scale up to 20 Gbps if needed in the pricing forms.

2.3 Additional Technical Specifications

MSDLT will consider proposals of both cloud-based solutions, on premise solutions, and any hybrid of the two, with the following on premise physical requirements:

- 208V power input (vendors must provide any and all documentation regarding equipment power requirements)
- 1GbE/10GbE SFP/SFP+ connectivity
- If 10GBASE-T native is required, specify in Part 4 – Vendor Response Forms.

Attachment A – Functional and Technical Requirements provides detailed specifications for the system. Vendors must submit all technical documentation regarding the proposed solution.

2.4 Service Level

Vendors must submit a proposed Service Level Agreement (SLA) as part of their response. The proposed SLA will include a description of the all ongoing support services provided, and where applicable, how these services will be measured. At a minimum, the SLA should describe how the vendor will ensure 99.99% service availability (uptime).

Additionally, the SLA should describe trouble-reporting procedures, time to repair outage commitments, and provisions offered in the event of chronic trouble. The services described in the SLA shall be maintained to the specifications of these commitments throughout the term of the contract, and the selected vendor shall remediate any deficiencies at no cost to the school district.

Any proposed hardware should have a minimum warranty period of no less than the minimum contract length. The option to extend the warranty to the maximum contract length should also be documented. **The District retains the right to select all, none or any selected portion of the proposed services.**

3.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND VENDOR SELECTION

3.1 Evaluation Criteria and Process

The District’s selection team will identify a preferred vendor based on a three-phase scoring process. The table below presents the evaluation criteria.

Criteria		
Phase	Weight	Criterion
1: Administrative Screening	Pass/Fail	Minimum Requirements
2: Proposal Evaluation	400	Cost
	300	Technical Architecture
	250	Functionality
	100	Service and Support
	50	Vendor Qualifications
	1,000	Total Points
3. Preferred Vendor Selection	400	Software Demonstration
	300	Cost
	300	Strategic Fit
	1,000	Total Points

MSDLT’s evaluation team will assign vendors a score for each criterion. The District will then combine these component scores into a total score to identify a preferred vendor.

3.1.1 Phase 1: Administrative Screening

During the initial phase, MSDLT’s selection team will evaluate all proposals on a pass/fail basis. The District will review proposals for completeness, adherence to the required response format as described in Section 4.0 of this RFP, and compliance with minimum requirements as listed in Form 2: Minimum Requirements of the Vendor Response Forms (Part 4). Only proposals that pass this administrative screening will advance to Phase 2 of the evaluation process.

3.1.2 Phase 2: Response Evaluation

The District will subsequently evaluate all responses using the following criteria.

- Cost (400 Points)
MSDLT seeks the best value solution. The District will use information provided by vendors in Detailed Pricing Forms (Part 5) to assign a Cost score based on total cost of ownership. See the example below.

EXAMPLE

Vendor A: 3 year agreement @ 19,000 users for \$50,000/year = \$150,000

Vendor B: 3 year agreement @ 19,000 users for \$44,000/year = \$132,000

Vendor C: Redundant 10Gbps hardware solution = \$143,000

The vendor with the lowest total cost will receive the total number of points allotted for Cost (400 points). Vendors with a higher total cost will receive a proportional percentage of the total possible points for Cost, based on their deviation from the lowest total cost. See the example continued below.

EXAMPLE

Vendor A:

$$\frac{\$132,000 \text{ (lowest total cost)}}{\$150,000 \text{ (Vendor A's total cost)}} \times 400 \text{ (total possible points)} = \mathbf{352 \text{ points}}$$

Vendor B:

$$\frac{\$132,000 \text{ (lowest total cost)}}{\$132,000 \text{ (Vendor B's total cost)}} \times 400 \text{ (total possible points)} = \mathbf{400 \text{ points}}$$

Vendor C:

$$\frac{\$132,000 \text{ (lowest total cost)}}{\$143,000 \text{ (Vendor C's total cost)}} \times 400 \text{ (total possible points)} = \mathbf{369 \text{ points}}$$

- Technical Architecture (300 Points)
MSDLT prefers high performing, highly reliable Internet filtering system. Vendor responses should describe why the physical and technological elements of their service represent a best-fit solution. The District will use information provided in Form 7 of Part 4 Vendor Response Forms and Attachment A – Functional and Technical Requirements to assign scores for this criterion.
- Functionality (250 Points)
The District will use information provided in Form 7 of Part 4 Vendor Response Forms and Attachment A – Functional and Technical Requirements to assign scores for this criterion. Scores will be based on meeting minimum requirements specified in Attachment A, and any additional features available in the proposed solution as documented in all Forms in Part 4.
- Service and Support (100 Points)
Scores for this evaluation category will consider Vendor's service approach, including basic and value-added features (e.g., 24x7x365 support, proactive monitoring, hardware warranty), any additional related services and standard contract terms and conditions.
- Vendor Qualifications (50 Points)
The District seeks relationships with vendors that are viable, stable, and committed to the proposed line of service. MSDLT's selection team will evaluate the vendor's revenue and operating history, changes in ownership, available resources, client

base, terminations for default, and current or recent experience with similar organizations.

This District will also base a portion of this criterion's score on vendor references. MSDLT's selection team will consider the similarity of reference clients' demographics, size, scope of services and support history as well as overall client satisfaction. The District may conduct in-depth phone interviews to gather additional information. MSDLT prefers references from similarly situated clients (e.g., large scale, K-12 educational organizations).

MSDLT will use information provided in Forms 3 - 7 of the Vendor Response Forms (Part 4) to assign scores for this criterion.

The District expects to select finalist vendors with the highest evaluation scores based on the above criteria. Only these shortlisted vendors will be invited to continue to Phase 3. Scores from Phase 2 WILL NOT be carried forward to Phase 3 evaluation.

3.1.3 Phase 3: Preferred Vendor Selection

During this final phase, the evaluation team will evaluate finalist vendors based on the Phase 3 criteria identified earlier in this section and described below. MSDLT reserves the right to request additional information from vendors prior to final selection, and to consider information about the vendor other than that submitted in the proposal.

- Software Demonstration (400 Points)
Vendors will demonstrate the requested functionality of their systems during an onsite or online demonstration with MSDLT. The Districts' evaluation committee will consider adherence to the functionality, ease of use, and flexibility to meet MSDLT's needs with minimum software, hardware, and infrastructure customization or tailoring, capability to adapt to changing needs in the future, and the least noticeable impact to end users.
- Cost (300 Points)
Total cost of ownership will be reconsidered in Phase 3 and weighted at 30%. If deemed in the best interest of the District, MSDLT may use a value pricing model to calculate cost scores. This consists of dividing the total normalized three-year cost of ownership by the total number of points earned in the other Phase 3 evaluation criteria (strategic fit and software demonstration) to arrive at a cost-per-point value.
- Strategic Fit (300 Points)
MSDLT's evaluation team will score proposed solutions based on overall best fit with the District's operational goals, internal procedures and practices, and SLAs. The team will consider solution simplicity, as well as compliance with contract terms and conditions and any and all additional findings from MSDLT's due diligence process. The District's due diligence may include client references, and independent evaluations and rankings for the vendor from industry references.

3.2 Competitive Negotiation

Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township reserves the right to request clarification, conduct discussions with vendors, to request revisions and/or waive minor informalities. The District also retains the right to negotiate the final contract terms and conditions with one or more of the most responsive vendors as solely determined by the District. Finally, MSDLT may discard all vendor responses if none meet the stated minimum requirements or if none are deemed in the best interests of the District.

3.3 Best and Final Offer

The District may issue a written request for Best and Final Offers (BAFO). The request shall set forth the date, time, and place for the submission of the BAFO. In this case, if vendors do not submit a notice of withdrawal or a BAFO, MSDLT will construe their immediate previous offer as the Best and Final Offer. The District may incorporate the BAFO process into Phase 3: Preferred Vendor Selection and may include an interview and/or a presentation to the District's evaluation team.

3.4 Award of Contract

Subject to the MSDLT Board of Trustees approval, the District will award a contract to the vendor whose proposal is deemed most advantageous in accordance with the evaluation criteria contained in this RFP.

4.0 PROPOSAL FORMAT AND CONTENT

4.1 General Directions

This RFP contains all the information and forms necessary to complete and submit a formal proposal. All responses and accompanying documentation submitted will become the property of Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township at the time responses are opened.

4.2 Required Response Format

Vendors must submit one original and one electronic copy of the proposal by the due date indicated on the cover page of this RFP. To assist in the evaluation process, all responses must follow the format outlined below. MSDLT may consider responses in any other format non-responsive and may reject them.

4.2.1 Response Cover Page

This form must be completed and signed by a person authorized to make a binding offer for the vendor. MSDLT may consider submissions that lack an originally signed cover page non-responsive and may reject them from further evaluation.

4.2.2 Vendor Response Forms

Vendors must complete the vendor response forms in their entirety and submit them in their native electronic format (Microsoft Word). Instructions for completing these forms are included within the document.

4.2.3 Detailed Pricing Forms

Vendors must complete the detailed pricing proposal forms in their entirety and submit them in their native electronic format (Microsoft Excel). Instructions for completing these forms are included within the document.

4.2.4 Reference Form

Vendors must complete and submit the reference form in its native electronic format (Microsoft Word). Vendors must provide references from at least three (3) organizations for which they have provided similar services.

4.2.5 Functional and Technical Requirements Forms

Vendors must complete the Functional and Technical Requirements (Attachment A) Forms in their entirety and submit them in their native electronic format (Microsoft Word). Instructions for completing these forms are included within the document.

4.2.6 Service Invoice/Order Form

Vendors must submit a completed sample service invoice/order form.

4.2.7 Proposed Service Level Agreement

Vendors must submit a proposed service level agreement. However, vendors do not need to submit a separate document if their service invoice/order form or the proposed services agreement contains a complete list of service level commitments.