

## COPY MACHINE LEASES AND MAINTENANCE

## CLARIFICATION 2

| Clarification # | Question   | Response   |
|-----------------|--|--|
| 2.01            | Would the district consider a different vendor for the fleet and print center?   | No. Bidders are welcome to partner or subcontract in submitting a proposal.  |
| 2.02            | Print Center color is based on a Ricoh color device will the District consider other options with a proven track record to produce those documents? Would the District consider alternatives to inline features for equipment such as GBC Punch?   | Please refer to RFP 2.03. Equipment proposed should meet or exceed specifications. GBC Punch is not included in the specifications for Copier 3. |
| 2.03            | Would the district consider alternative plans that have a proven track record, and will reduce cost while improve productivity for the print center?   | Please refer to RFP 2.03. Equipment should meet or exceed specifications.  |
| 2.04            | Will the district consider alternatives to the color unit for the print center like inkjet technology?   | Please refer to RFP 2.03. Equipment should meet or exceed specifications.  |
| 2.05            | The RFP is based on the specifications of a Ricoh Fleet which requires most other manufacturers or vendors to pick equipment that may not be considered comparable to the Ricoh 65 per minute unit; by maybe a 60 page per minute unit. Would the District consider changing the RFP to be in a speed volume for example 60 to 80 page per minute? | Please refer to RFP 2.02. Equipment should meet or exceed specifications. Devices with a speed of more than 60 pages per minute are acceptable.  |

|      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| 2.06 | The specifications of the RFP match the specification to the Ricoh 65 per minute unit would the District consider allowing each manufacturer or vendor to provide a bid of equipment that would meet the district needs but would be based on each manufacturer's specifications for the speed volume. This would give the District more diverse options for the fleet and print center.   | Please refer to RFP 2.02. Equipment should meet or exceed specifications.                                |
| 2.07 | Will the district be considering new equipment only or will the district be looking at remanufacture equipment or used/demo equipment?   | Please refer to RFP 2.02 and 2.03. "All on-site equipment must be 'brand new'."                          |
| 2.08 | Section 2.02 MFD 2 The general specifications (speeds, paper weight ranges and recommended volume ranges) can be met by most manufacturers. The other specifications, such as specific paper drawer configurations and capacities, print resolution, and finishing tray capacities seem specific to a model from a single manufacturer. What amount of variance in these specification is the District willing to allow in order to allow for consideration of other products? | Please refer to Addendum 2.01. Please refer to RFP 2.02. Equipment should meet or exceed specifications. |
| 2.09 | Section 2.02 MFD 1 & MFD 2 (p11 & 12) Access- Must offer at least three different levels or roles of admin user with the ability to set a unique password for each. Please explain further about this and the reason three different levels or roles of admin users are needed? Typically there is are two levels of login – one for the user and then one for Admin or Mgmt login.  | Please see Addendum 2.11.  |

|      |  |   |
|------|--|---|
| 2.10 | RFP 2.02 It states that during this contract (2) additional MFDs will be added. Can the District estimate approximately when these (2) new units will added to the contract (approximate/planned date)? We realize this date is not guaranteed.  | 2020  |
| 2.11 | Section 2.03 Graphics Center Digital Copiers Minimum Specifications<br>The general specifications (speeds, paper weight ranges and recommended volume ranges) can be met by most manufacturers. Minor specifications such as paper drawer configuration, Print Resolution (DPI), screen size, and finishing tray capacities can only be met by a specific model from a single manufacturer. What amount of variance in these specification is the District willing to allow in order to allow for open competition from the major manufacturers? | Please refer to Addendum 2.02 and 2.03. Please refer to RFP 2.02. Equipment should meet or exceed specifications. |
| 2.12 | Section 2.03 Graphics Center Digital Copiers Minimum Specifications<br>In the Graphics Center for Copiers 1 & 2, is the 4,000,000 BW volume the total annual between the (2) Copiers or the annual volume for each device?   | 4,000,000 each. Please see Addendum 2.04.   |
| 2.13 | Section 2.04 Delivery, Installation & Training Services (p17). States that (5) of the MFD 1 devices are under a separate contract. Are these in addition to the original (76) units or are they a part of the (76) MFDs?   | These machines are included in the 76+.   |

|             |  |                                       |
|-------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| <p>2.14</p> | <p>Section 2.05 Maintenance of MFDs and Digital Copiers (p19) The RFP states that (2) dedicated technicians (working 40 hour weeks?) dedicated exclusively to Northshore School District (NSSD) are required. As to the RFP's uptime and response time requirements, can the District explain further details around this requirement? As an industry "rule of thumb," most mfrs/dealers provide sufficient numbers of technicians to support accounts based on the quantity of MFDs and the volumes they produce to meet the customers' minimum required response times and uptime requirements. From the data shared in the RFP, the District would most likely not require 100% dedicated technicians to support its specific number of devices or volumes. Requiring (2) full-time technicians assigned to ONLY support NSSD will add a premium cost to proposals. Does the District definitely want (2) technicians dedicated to only support the District equipment?</p> | <p>Please refer to Addendum 2.06.</p> |
| <p>2.15</p> | <p>Section 2.05 Maintenance of MFDs and Digital Copiers (p19) The RFP states that each District MFD &amp; Copier will be visited at least once per month based on machine usage. Is a visit to each copier required monthly or how does the machine usage factor into the monthly visit requirement? Can the District please expand on this requirement (reasons)?</p>   | <p>Please refer to Addendum 2.06.</p> |
| <p>2.16</p> | <p>Section 2.06 Optional Products and Services, Option 3 (p21)<br/>Job Ticket as a Dynamic Data Form: please specify the intent of this question.</p>  | <p>Please refer to Addendum 2.07.</p> |

|      |  |                                |
|------|--|--------------------------------|
| 2.17 | Section 2.06 Optional Products and Services, Option 3 (p21) Paper Attribute Cost Differential: is the intent of this question to present customers with cost options for different quantities or types of media?   | Yes.                           |
| 2.18 | Section 2.06 Optional Products and Services, Option 3 (p21) Does "Black Box" mean we are providing server hardware and software as a package?  | Please see Addendum 2.12.      |
| 2.19 | Section 2.06 Optional Products and Services, Option 3 (p 22) Generate Invoices: Will the District be doing work for non-school entities that require unique invoices. Or will simple, complete reporting be sufficient?  | No. Simple is sufficient.      |
| 2.20 | Section 2.06 Optional Products and Services, Option 3 (p20) Customizable for delivering options to organizations and users: Is the intent simply filtering products and services based on Active Directory groups and users? Or are you desiring unique sites for different organizations? | Please refer to Addendum 2.08. |
| 2.21 | Section 3.01 Content, item C.f.i, (p24) The RFP states "Provide response to Evaluation Criteria 3.02F...", however there is no 3.02F in the RFP. Please clarify.   | Please see Addendum 2.09.      |
| 2.22 | Section 3.02 Evaluation Criteria, item D.c. (p26) The RFP states "Provide an overview of the proposed products and services for Option 1". Is this supposed to be Option 3 instead?  | Please see Addendum 2.10.      |

|      |  |                                |
|------|--|--------------------------------|
| 2.23 | Section 3.02 Evaluation Criteria, item D.d. (p26) The RFP states "Provide an overview of the proposed products and services for Option 2". Is this supposed to be Option 4 instead?  | Please see Addendum 2.10.      |
| 2.24 | One other minor thing, when putting in Rates per click the cell does not go out far enough.<br>(example: \$.006 shows up as \$.00)<br>It does calculate the right pricing but the rate does not appear in the cell.  | Please see Addendum 2.05.      |
| 2.25 | In Option 4 - NSD is requesting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide a printing interface for ChromeOS-based devices;</li> <li>· Provide a printing interface for iOS-based devices</li> <li>· Provide a printing interface for Android-based devices</li> </ul> <p>How many of the 76+ devices does NSD want to provide a printing interface for the above devices?</p>        | Please see Addendum 2.13.      |
| 2.26 | In Option 4 - NSD is requesting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide a printing interface for ChromeOS-based devices;</li> <li>· Provide a printing interface for iOS-based devices</li> <li>· Provide a printing interface for Android-based devices</li> </ul> <p>Does NSD want to provide the capability for students, faculty, and staff, or does NSD want to limit it?</p> | All. Please see Addendum 2.13. |
| 2.27 | Does each school host their own print server or centrally hosted at district?  | Please see Addendum 2.13.      |
| 2.28 | Does the District have a central data center running SQL or Oracle?  | Please see Addendum 2.15.      |
| 2.29 | Do all users (staff, faculty and students) have an account in Active Directory?  | Please see Addendum 2.14.      |
| 2.30 | We'd like to request an extension of the bid due date by 1 week?   | No.                            |