REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL # 2027-029
Data Transport Services for Networkmaine
RESPONSE ADDENDUM #1
November 18, 2026

CLARIFICATION

Appendix D, Rider F, Item 3 now reads as:

Service Level: The University will develop service level agreements (SLA) with Contractors to ensure satisfactory performance of Carrier Ethernet circuits. These SLAs will outline standards for reliability and availability as well as remedies should performance fail to meet acceptable standards.

a. Reliability: Carrier Ethernet circuits are expected to operate error free 99.95% of the time.

b. Availability: Carrier Ethernet circuits are expected to be available 99.95% of the time.

c. Dark Fiber: The reliability and availability levels in this Item 3 do not apply to dark fiber service. For dark fiber, the Contractor is responsible for maintenance and repair of the fiber, and the response and outage requirements in Item 5 apply. A repaired strand must meet the maximum attenuation required for acceptance: end-to-end loss of no more than 0.5 dB per kilometer, inclusive of all splices, plus 0.5 dB for each connector termination in the path.

QUESTIONS

1. **Can a company supplying only installation, testing, or field services participate as a disclosed subcontractor? Would that subcontractor require its own SPIN and FCC registration number if the primary provider contracts with and bills the University?**

ANSWER:

Yes. A firm providing only installation, testing, or field services may participate as a disclosed subcontractor to the Respondent. Such a subcontractor is not required to hold its own SPIN or FCC Registration Number, provided the Respondent holds the contract with the University, is the service provider of record for E-Rate purposes, and performs all invoicing. The SPIN and FCC Registration Number requirements in Appendix I apply to the Respondent.

Respondents using subcontractors are reminded of the following requirements:

- Subcontracted services must be disclosed in the response (Section 1.1.3), and each subcontractor must be listed with the information requested in Appendix G, Question 2, and Appendix K, Question 2.
- The Respondent's debarment certification extends to its subcontractors (Section 1.3.3 and Appendix B).
- Respondents must disclose whether any subcontractor has been "red-lighted" by the FCC during the two years prior to issuance of this RFP (Appendix I, E-Rate Question 3).

- The Contractor may not subcontract any part of the Contract without the University's prior written consent (Appendix D, Section 12) and must notify the University before adding subcontractors, who must follow the same security terms as the Contractor (Appendix D, Section 25).
- The Contractor is responsible for its subcontractors' compliance with FCC document retention and audit requirements and must include the corresponding record-keeping and audit provisions in its subcontractor agreements (Appendix D, Rider A, Performance Terms and Conditions, Section 6.b).
- The Contractor remains fully responsible for all services, including indemnification for the acts or omissions of its subcontractors (Appendix D, Section 16).

Respondents are responsible for confirming their own and their subcontractors' compliance with all applicable E-Rate program rules.

2. **Is a public interested-vendor list available to support teaming discussions, and are any additional subcontractor qualification documents required with the primary provider's response?**

ANSWER:

Interested-vendor list. As an open solicitation, the University is unable to provide a list of vendors who have viewed the RFP.

Subcontractor documents. No separate qualification documents are required from subcontractors. The Respondent provides subcontractor information within its own response:

- a list of subcontractors with name, address, phone number, contact person, and a brief description of organizational capacity and qualifications (Appendix G, Question 2).
- identification of subcontractors, underlying carriers, and other third parties used to provide or support the service, and the security requirements in place for them (Appendix K, Question 2).
- any third-party vendors involved in implementation (Appendix I, Implementation Question 6); and
- disclosure of any subcontractor "red-lighted" by the FCC in the prior two years (Appendix I, E-Rate Question 3).

The Respondent's signature on Appendix B certifies debarment status for the subcontractors named in its proposal.

3. **Service type: Is the intent E-Line (EPL/EVPL) for tags 2 and 3 and E-LAN for tags 10 and 11, as shown in Figure 2 (p. 57)?**

ANSWER:

Yes. As shown in Figure 2, the intent is:

- Tags 2 and 3: point-to-point E-Line services from each site to the Orono PoP (tag 2) and the Portland PoP (tag 3), delivered at the PoP tagged with the Site ID.
- Tags 10 and 11: multipoint E-LAN services connecting all sites in a district with the Orono PoP (tag 10) and the Portland PoP (tag 11), delivered at the PoP tagged with the District Bridge ID.

4. **UNI architecture and service separation: If the requested E-Line services (EPL/EVPL) and E-LAN service (ENS) cannot be delivered over a single UNI, will the University accept separate physical UNIs or demarcation ports for the respective services at each affected site and PoP? If so, may each UNI have its own handoff and bandwidth profile?**

ANSWER:

The University expects all of a site's EVCs to be delivered on a single UNI at each end site. Sites with a District Bridge ID in Appendix C, Exhibits I and II receive four EVCs (tags 2, 3, 10 and 11). Sites without a District Bridge ID, such as libraries other than members of the Portland Public Library System, receive two EVCs (tags 2 and 3) (Appendix J, Carrier Ethernet Service, Item 6). Respondents who require a separate physical UNI or demarcation port to deliver these services for technical reasons must describe it in their response for University review. At University PoPs, Respondents may propose more than one aggregation circuit (Appendix J, Carrier Ethernet Service, Item 7).

The handoff for each UNI is coordinated with the University (Appendix J, Carrier Ethernet Service, Item 4). The contracted bandwidth applies to the site as a whole and is shared by the site's EVCs, whether they are delivered on one UNI or more.

The University is also interested in Respondents' flexibility to distribute a site's EVCs across more than one UNI at the University's request, where the site's local topology calls for it. Respondents may describe this capability, and any associated cost, in their response to Appendix J, Carrier Ethernet Service, Item 11.

5. **VLAN handling: Should we expect tag preservation, translation, or QinQ at the UNI and at the PoP handoff? Appendix J says the District Bridge ID is the "translated VLAN ID" for VLANs 10 and 11.**

ANSWER:

Respondents should expect VLAN translation between the site UNI and the PoP handoff, as shown in Figure 2:

Tag at site UNI	Service	Tag delivered at PoP
2	E-Line, site to Orono PoP	Site ID
3	E-Line, site to Portland PoP	Site ID
10	E-LAN, district sites and Orono PoP	District Bridge ID
11	E-LAN, district sites and Portland PoP	District Bridge ID

Site UNI. All frames delivered to the University's CPE must carry a single 802.1Q tag. Tags 2 and 3 are used at every site, and tags 10 and 11 at sites with E-LAN service. Untagged or double-tagged delivery at the site UNI is not acceptable.

PoP handoff. The University prefers the single-tagged design shown in Figure 2, in which the Respondent bridges each district's sites within its network and delivers the E-LAN tagged with the District Bridge ID.

QinQ. Respondents who require a double-tagged (QinQ) handoff at the PoP for technical reasons must describe it in their response for University review. This is only an option for aggregation points.

6. **Service parameters:**
   - **What MTU is required, including jumbo frames?**
   - **Which Layer 2 control protocols (STP, LACP, LLDP, and CDP) must pass transparently?**
   - **Is a CoS or QoS profile required?**

ANSWER:

MTU. Each EVC must carry a 1500-byte MTU. With the Ethernet header, FCS, and a VLAN tag, that is a frame size of 1522 bytes. Support for 9000-byte jumbo frames is preferred.

Layer 2 control and other protocols. The University is implementing a managed Layer 3 boundary as the CPE at every UNI and does not support direct Layer 2 LAN bridging across the service. Transparent passage of STP is not required.

Each EVC must transparently carry traffic exchanged between the University's devices, including:

- CDP and BOOTP/DHCP; and
- routing protocols such as RIP, OSPF, IS-IS, BGP, and EIGRP.

Transparent passage of LLDP is preferred where the Respondent's platform supports it but is not required.

The Respondent's network must not peer with, filter, alter, or discard the required protocols, including their broadcast and multicast frames. Respondents must describe how these protocols are carried on each EVC, state whether LLDP can be passed transparently, and identify any limitations and any broadcast or multicast rate limiting applied to the service.

Where LACP is needed, for example on aggregation links, it will operate locally between the University's CPE and the Respondent's UNI and will be coordinated between the University and the Contractor.

QoS/CoS. No CoS or QoS profile is required. The University expects a single class of service, with all traffic within the contracted bandwidth treated equally.

7. **Bandwidth profile: The RFP asks for "non-blocked / zero packet drop" at full contracted speed and allows up to 5:1 oversubscription on aggregation circuits. Does the University expect CIR equal to contracted bandwidth, with burst allowed? Does the 5:1 ratio apply only to the aggregation circuits?**

ANSWER:

CIR. Yes. The University expects a committed information rate equal to the contracted bandwidth at each site.

Burst. Burst above the contracted bandwidth is not required at the site. Traffic dropped by a site-level rate limiter or policer because it exceeds the contracted bandwidth is not a violation of the zero packet drop requirement.

Where zero packet drop applies. The non-blocked, zero packet drop requirement (Appendix D, Rider F, Item 1.f; Appendix J, Carrier Ethernet Service, Item 5) applies to the site access circuits and the Respondent's backbone. Traffic within each site's contracted bandwidth must be carried from the site UNI to the aggregation circuit serving the University PoP without loss, with all sites transmitting simultaneously at full contracted speed.

5 to 1 ratio and aggregation circuits. The 5 to 1 oversubscription ratio applies only to the aggregation circuits delivered to University PoPs. It is calculated for each aggregation circuit as the sum of the contracted bandwidth of the sites configured on that circuit, divided by the circuit's capacity (Appendix J, Carrier Ethernet Service, Item 8). For example, 50 sites at 1 Gbps on one aggregation circuit require at least 10 Gbps of aggregation capacity. The ratio sets the minimum capacity of each aggregation circuit. Frame loss on an aggregation circuit still counts toward the reliability level in the response to the SLA definition question.

8. **Bandwidth above 1 Gbps: Sites over 1 Gbps receive a 10 Gbps handoff. Is a rate-limited EVC on a 10G UNI acceptable, and which bandwidth tiers should Table 3 and Table 6 price?**

ANSWER:

Rate limiting on a 10 Gbps UNI. Yes. For sites with a contracted bandwidth greater than 1 Gbps, the Respondent will provide a 10 Gbps Ethernet handoff (Appendix D, Rider F, Carrier Ethernet Service General Requirements, Item 1.e; Appendix J, Carrier Ethernet Service, Item 4), and the service may be rate limited to the contracted bandwidth on that UNI. The contracted bandwidth applies to the site as a whole and is shared by the site's EVCs; it is not a separate limit on each EVC.

Bandwidth tiers. Respondents should price each bandwidth level listed in Exhibit I, Table 3 and Exhibit II, Table 6: 1,000 Mbps, 2,000 Mbps, 5,000 Mbps, 10,000 Mbps, and 25,000 Mbps. Respondents may also propose bandwidth levels in addition to those listed (Appendix C, Instructions for Table 3 and Table 6).

Sites below 1 Gbps. The minimum bandwidth for any school or library is 1 Gbps (Appendix D, Rider F, Item 1.e). Where a Respondent cannot deliver 1 Gbps to a specific site, it may propose 100 Mbps for that site in Table 1 or Table 4, identify the site, and explain why 1 Gbps cannot be delivered. The handoff remains 1 Gbps Ethernet, rate limited to 100 Mbps. Respondents using this option should also price the 100 Mbps level in Table 3 or Table 6.

Sites above 10 Gbps. The 10 Gbps Ethernet handoff in Rider F, Item 1.e and Appendix J, Carrier Ethernet Service, Item 4 applies to sites with contracted bandwidth greater than 1 Gbps and up to 10 Gbps. For the 25,000 Mbps level, Respondents must state the handoff proposed (for example, 25 Gbps or 100 Gbps Ethernet). Rider F, Item 1.e is amended accordingly.

9. **Diversity: With a single UNI per site carrying both Orono and Portland EVCs, is last-mile physical diversity expected or optional? Is physical path diversity required between aggregation circuits to Orono and Portland?**

ANSWER:

Last mile. Physical diversity is not expected or required on the access connection to a site.

Aggregation circuits. Physical path diversity between the aggregation circuits serving the Orono and Portland PoPs is not required. The University prefers designs in which the paths to the two PoPs do not share common points of failure.

10. **Other PoPs: Exhibit A lists 29 PoPs, but Orono and Portland are preferred. What review criteria apply to a proposal that uses another PoP?**

ANSWER:

Orono and Portland are the University's strongly preferred PoPs for Carrier Ethernet service, and the University expects the large majority of Carrier Ethernet sites to be delivered there. Delivery of Carrier Ethernet service to another PoP is intended as an exception, for example where a

Respondent's service territory does not extend to Orono or Portland, such as for Respondents serving island locations.

The other PoPs listed in Exhibit A are intended mainly for dark fiber service, which may terminate at any listed PoP. The Old Town PoP is available for RSU 34 schools only.

A Carrier Ethernet proposal that delivers service to a PoP other than Orono or Portland is subject to University review and acceptance (Appendix J, Carrier Ethernet Service, Item 7). The Respondent must identify the PoP proposed for each affected site and explain why Orono or Portland is not proposed. In its review the University will consider:

- whether the University has sufficient capacity at and from the proposed PoP to carry the sites' traffic;
- the space, environmental, and electrical power requirements of the Respondent's equipment at the PoP (Appendix J, University Points of Presence, Item 1); and
- whether the service meets the same requirements that apply at Orono and Portland.

For dark fiber proposals, the University will consider the fiber distance from each site to the proposed PoP, as reported in Appendix C, Tables 2 and 5, along with the space and power requirements described above.

All proposals will be scored under the evaluation criteria in Section 2.1.

11. Medium: Fiber is preferred. Will the University consider non-fiber media, such as Ethernet over HFC or fixed wireless, for individual sites if they meet the 1 Gbps requirement? How would that be scored?

ANSWER:

Non-fiber media. Yes. Respondents may propose any data transport medium capable of carrying the required bandwidth, although fiber is preferred (Section 1.1.3). Whatever the medium, the service must meet all requirements of the RFP, including dedicated access to the full contracted bandwidth. Access technologies in which the site shares capacity with other subscribers, such as Ethernet over HFC, do not meet this requirement.

Fixed wireless. Consistent with the University's preference for fiber (Section 1.1.3), the University expects fixed wireless access to a site to be the exception. Where proposed, fixed wireless must be a dedicated point-to-point link, in licensed or FCC-registered spectrum, that meets the requirements above, including the reliability and availability levels in Appendix D, Rider F, Item 3.

Scoring. There is no separate scoring category for transport medium. Proposals are scored under the criteria in Section 2.1, and preference will be given to service delivered over fiber (Appendix D, Rider F, Service Requirements).

12. **Additional EVCs: What volume of additional EVCs should we assume, and are the Community College System and Maine Maritime Academy expected to use the same tag scheme?**

ANSWER:

Volume of additional EVCs. The University has not estimated a volume of additional EVCs, and none is guaranteed. Respondents should not build an assumed volume into their site pricing.

Maine Maritime Academy. Maine Maritime Academy is listed in Appendix C, Exhibit I, Table 1 (Site ID 1112, District Bridge ID 1846) and is to be proposed and provisioned under the same tag scheme as every other listed site.

Community College System. No Community College System sites are included in Exhibits I or II. Any sites added under the contract would follow the same tag scheme, with Site IDs and District Bridge IDs assigned by the University.

13. **Dark Fiber Commercial model: Is the expected model a lease with a monthly recurring charge (MRC) and no IRU? Who owns the fiber termination equipment?**

ANSWER:

Commercial model. Yes. The University is seeking a dark fiber lease priced as a monthly recurring charge, with any one-time non-recurring charges listed separately (Appendix C, Tables 2 and 5). The University is not seeking an IRU. The Contractor retains ownership of the fiber and remains responsible for its maintenance and repair, including the response and outage requirements in Appendix D, Rider F, Item 5.

Equipment. The Contractor retains ownership of its fiber, and any demarcation enclosures installed to deliver the connection. As a dark fiber service, the University provides and owns the electronics used to establish connectivity and that equipment is not in scope for dark fiber responses.

14. **Fiber specification: What fiber type and acceptance testing are required, including OTDR, maximum attenuation, and splice-loss thresholds?**

ANSWER:

Fiber type. Standard single-mode fiber meeting ITU-T G.652 (G.652.D preferred) or a compatible standard such as G.657.A, with SC/UPC connectors at both demarcation points.

Acceptance testing. For each strand, the Contractor must provide the fiber distance and the measured end-to-end loss between the two demarcation points at 1310 nm and 1550 nm. OTDR traces may be provided but are not required.

Maximum attenuation. Measured end-to-end loss must not exceed 0.5 dB per kilometer, inclusive of all splices, plus 0.5 dB for each connector termination in the path.

Splice loss. The University is not setting a separate per-splice threshold.

15. **Distance pricing: Is distance measured as route distance or point-to-point distance, and is it measured to the nearest PoP or to a specified PoP?**

ANSWER:

Distance. Distance is the route distance of the fiber between the demarcation point at the site and the demarcation point at the University PoP, not the straight-line distance.

PoP. Distance is measured to the PoP the Respondent proposes for the site, which need not be the nearest.

16. **SLA: How should the 99.95% reliability and availability targets be measured on dark fiber, which has no active equipment?**

ANSWER:

The 99.95% reliability and availability levels in Appendix D, Rider F, Item 3 apply only to Carrier Ethernet circuits. They do not apply to dark fiber. The University is updating the language of Rider F, Item 3 to reflect this.

17. **Fiber breaks and growth: What redundancy or restoration is expected for multiple fiber breaks, and how are sites added to the initial topology?**

ANSWER:

Multiple fiber breaks. The University does not require redundant strands or diverse routes for dark fiber. The response and outage requirements in Appendix D, Rider F, Item 5 apply to every break. Respondents describe their capacity for addressing multiple fiber breaks in response to Appendix J, Dark Fiber Service, Item 6.

Adding sites. Sites may be added during the term by amendment (Appendix D, Section 2.B). Respondents describe how they would accommodate added sites in response to Appendix J, Dark Fiber Service, Item 5.

18. **SLA definition: Can you share the draft SLA that Rider F says the University will develop? "Error-free 99.95%" needs a defined metric, such as frame loss, delay, or delay variation, and a measurement method.**

ANSWER:

Draft SLA. The University has not prepared a separate draft SLA. The minimum requirements are those in Appendix D, Rider F, which the Respondent incorporates into its proposed SLA. Respondents propose their service levels, monitoring and reporting methods, and financial remedies in response to Appendix J, General Technical, Question 9 and Appendix I, Support Question 5. The final SLA will be completed with the awarded Contractor(s) on that basis and included in Rider F of the contract.

Metrics. For Carrier Ethernet circuits, the levels in Rider F, Item 3 are to be read as follows:

- **Availability (99.95%).** The percentage of time in each contract year (July 1 through June 30) that an EVC is able to pass traffic between the site UNI and the University PoP handoff at the contracted bandwidth. Availability is measured separately for each of a site's EVCs. The availability of one PoP path does not offset an outage on the other.
- **Reliability, or "error free" (99.95%).** The percentage of measurement intervals in each contract year (July 1 through June 30) in which an EVC carries traffic within the contracted bandwidth with a frame loss ratio of no more than 0.1%. Respondents should state the measurement interval they propose. The University prefers shorter intervals. The University prefers services that commit to a frame loss ratio of no more than 0.01%. Traffic dropped by a rate limiter because it exceeds the contracted bandwidth is not counted, consistent with the response to the bandwidth profile question.

The frame loss threshold defines when an interval counts against the reliability level. It does not change the requirement for non-blocked, zero packet drop transmission in Rider F, Item 1.f.

The University is not setting targets for frame delay or delay variation. Respondents should state the frame loss, delay, and delay variation performance of their proposed service.

Measurement. Respondents should describe how they will measure and report these metrics, including the measurement interval and any use of Ethernet OAM performance monitoring (Appendix J, General Technical, Question 4). The University also monitors each site from its own equipment and may rely on its own measurements.

Exclusions. Planned outages under Rider F, Item 5.b and Force Majeure Events (Appendix D, Section 26) are excluded. Emergency maintenance, including work by the Contractor's subcontractors or underlying carriers, is not excluded. Outages caused by the University or the participating site, such as loss of site power, are excluded.

19. **Maintenance windows: Planned work is limited to hours outside core service hours (5:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. weekdays and 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. weekends). Do emergency or carrier-initiated maintenance events follow the same 72-hour notification rule?**

ANSWER:

Carrier-initiated maintenance. Yes. Maintenance scheduled by the Contractor, its subcontractors, or underlying carriers is a planned outage under Appendix D, Rider F, Item 5.b and requires 72 hours' notice.

Emergency maintenance. No. The 72-hour notice requirement does not apply to work needed urgently to prevent or correct a service-affecting condition. The Contractor must notify the University's Network Operations Center as soon as possible.

20. **OAM and monitoring: Does the University expect its NOC to have SNMP, NETCONF, or portal access to the demarcation device? Should the demarcation device support 802.3ah, 802.1ag CFM, or Y.1731 with MEPs?**

ANSWER:

No, the University does not expect NOC access to the demarcation device, and no specific OAM standard is required. Respondents should still describe their Ethernet OAM support (Appendix J, General Technical, Question 4) and any monitoring or alarming they can provide to the University (Appendix I, Support Question 2).

21. **OAM and monitoring: Does the University expect its NOC to have SNMP, NETCONF, or portal access to the demarcation device? Should the demarcation device support 802.3ah, 802.1ag CFM, or Y.1731 with MEPs?**

ANSWER:

No, the University does not expect NOC access to the demarcation device, and no specific OAM standard is required. Respondents should still describe their Ethernet OAM support (Appendix J, General Technical, Question 4) and any monitoring or alarming they can provide to the University (Appendix I, Support Question 2).

22. **Site access: Who provides site surveys, power, and space or rack access at sites and PoPs, and are letters of agency available?**

ANSWER:

Space and power. Respondents must state whether they require space on University property or at participating sites (Appendix J, General Technical, Question 3) and must provide the

dimensional, environmental, and electrical power requirements of equipment at the participating sites and PoPs (Appendix J, University Points of Presence, Item 1; Carrier Ethernet Service, Item 2). The University will provide space and power at its PoPs, and the participating site will provide space and power at the site, based on the requirements stated in the response.

Site surveys. Site surveys are the Respondent's responsibility and cost. Surveys before award are not required. After award, where the Contractor determines that a survey is necessary, the University will identify a local contact at the participating site, and the Contractor will arrange access with that contact. At PoPs, the University will arrange access directly.

Letters of agency. Letters of agency are not available.

23. **Net neutrality statutes: The cited Maine statutes are keyed to broadband internet access service. Does the University want a commitment only for transport, or also for any internet service the respondent provides?**

ANSWER:

Transport services. The cited statutes are keyed to broadband Internet access service, not to the transport services requested in this RFP. The University nonetheless considers their principles applicable to transport. Respondents must state their commitment to adhere to the substantive requirements of these statutes as they apply to the requested transport services.

Broadband Internet access service. Respondents must also confirm that they will comply with these statutes directly with respect to any broadband Internet access service they provide to the University or its customers. Internet service is not required under this RFP (Section 1.1.3), and this confirmation does not ask Respondents to offer it. It applies to any such service a Respondent provides.

24. **Traffic inspection: Section 25 says the Contractor will not inspect, copy, or store traffic. Does flow telemetry, such as NetFlow or sFlow, or DDoS mitigation count as inspection?**

ANSWER:

Yes. Transport services are intended to be Layer-2 services and aggregate through University control points where upstream DDoS mitigations are already applied. Interface-level counters, such as utilization and error statistics, are not considered inspection.

25. **AI disclosure: What counts as an "AI tool" under Section 25 and Appendix K, such as AIOps or analytics platforms?**

ANSWER:

Regarding Appendix D, Section 25 and Appendix K, Question 6, an AI tool is any software or service that uses machine learning or generative AI to run, monitor, manage, or troubleshoot the services. This includes AIOps platforms, analytics that use machine learning for anomaly detection or prediction, and AI assistants used by support or engineering staff, whether built by the Respondent or procured from a third party. It also includes AI features embedded in third-party products the Respondent uses to deliver the service, not only standalone tools. Conventional threshold-based monitoring and scripted automation are not AI tools.

Use of AI tools is not prohibited, but it must be disclosed. Respondents should describe how such tools are used and whether any University data or network traffic is processed by them (Appendix K, Question 6). In their response, Respondents are expected to disclose any current or planned use of University data or network traffic for model training or analytics. Disclosure in a response is not approval. Under the contract, University data may not be used to train AI tools without the University's written approval (Appendix D, Section 25).

26. Security evidence: Is a SOC 2 Type II report alone sufficient for Appendix K, which is pass/fail?

ANSWER:

No, a current SOC 2 Type II report *alone* does not satisfy Appendix K completely. To pass, a Respondent must also answer all Appendix K questions and agree to the Security and Use of AI terms in Appendix D (Section 2.1, Information Technology Security).

27. Subcontractors: Will the University accept off-net or partner last-mile providers under a single Primary Respondent? What security flow-down requirements apply to them?

ANSWER:

Off-net providers. Yes, Respondents may join with other service providers under a single Primary Respondent, who is responsible for all proposed items and coordinates all contractual and invoicing issues (Section 1.1.3). The subcontractor requirements listed in the response to Question 1 apply.

The Respondent should identify which sites are served off-net. The Respondent is responsible for engaging with its partner for all installation, troubleshooting, and other tasks related to service delivery. The University will work only with the Respondent as its single point of contact.

Security flow-down. Partner service providers and subcontractors must follow the same security terms as the Respondent (Appendix D, Section 25).