



Argo Community High School District 217

Telephone System RFP – RFP Addendum

RFP Title: ACHS D217 – Telephone System Replacement

Addendum Number: Addendum #2

Date Issued: Monday, November 10, 2025

Original Proposal Due Date: December 3, 2025, at 2:00 PM (CST)

Revised Proposal Due Date: N/A

Instructions for Vendors

This Addendum is issued by Argo Community High School District 217 to provide clarifications and/or modifications to the original Request for Proposal (RFP). All vendors must review this Addendum carefully. Any information contained herein is considered part of the official RFP and is binding on all bidders.

Vendors must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum by completing the acknowledgment section at the end of this document and including it with their final proposal submission.

Failure to do so may result in disqualification from the evaluation process.

Purpose of Addendum

This Addendum provides clarifications, modifications, or responses to vendor questions received regarding the above-referenced Request for Proposal (RFP).

All provisions of the original RFP remain in effect unless specifically modified by this Addendum.



Section 1 – Questions and Responses

Question #	RFP Section / Page Reference	Vendor Question	District Response
1	Section 3	Would the District prefer a fully cloud-hosted Microsoft Teams Phone deployment using Operator Connect, or a hybrid configuration using Direct Routing with our SBCaaS for local carrier or on-premises integrations?	This topic was previously addressed in Addendum #1 (Question 1 / Section 3.1 clarification). The District will consider on-premises, hybrid-hosted, or fully cloud-hosted solutions provided they satisfy all stated requirements for call survivability during Internet/WAN outages, E911 compliance (Kari's Law and RAY BAUM'S Act), and integration with Microsoft 365, Teams, and InformaCast. Vendors should refer to Addendum #1 for details and may submit a follow-up inquiry only if further clarification is required regarding specific deployment models.
2	Section 3	Would the District be open to using our native PSTN replacement and EMS (Emergency Management Service) capabilities to replace the existing SIP/PSTN service? This approach provides full U.S. coverage, Dynamic E911, and dedicated EMS cellular backup, while reducing reliance on legacy carrier trunks and consolidating all services under a single SLA and billing model.	The District will consider proposals that include integrated PSTN replacement and Emergency Management Service (EMS) capabilities, provided the solution maintains full compliance with all RFP requirements, including Dynamic E911, cellular backup, and call survivability. However, the District reserves the right to maintain or migrate its own SIP trunking and carrier services as needed to preserve flexibility and control of existing telephone number blocks and routing. Vendors offering bundled PSTN or EMS services should clearly outline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The carrier of record and porting implications. • Any limitations on number portability or service migration. • Pricing and SLA differences compared to using third-party SIP carriers. Such solutions will be evaluated alongside other compliant proposals, not as alternates.
3	Section 3	Can you confirm how many analog, elevator, alarm, or emergency lines require conversion or integration? This will allow us to determine the	This topic was addressed in Addendum #1, Question 2, where the District noted that approximately 15 analog/POTS lines are expected to remain in service. These include elevator emergency phones, alarm systems, and other critical analog devices. Vendors should refer to that response for the baseline quantity and may design their solution to accommodate a similar



		number of cellular or PSTN replacement gateways required under our GSM/Cellular EMS solution.	number of analog integrations using cellular, FXS, or PSTN gateway methods as appropriate. If further clarification is required regarding a specific subsystem (e.g., elevator or alarm), vendors may submit a follow-up question before the inquiry deadline.
4	Section 3	Are you seeking a fully managed service post-deployment (including monitoring, change management, and reporting), or would you prefer a one-time implementation followed by standard Microsoft support	The District’s expectation is for a turnkey implementation with comprehensive setup, configuration, and documentation, followed by a knowledge transfer to the District’s IT Department for ongoing administration. After project completion, the District will manage routine monitoring, configuration changes, and reporting internally, utilizing standard vendor and Microsoft support resources as needed. Vendors may, however, include optional proposals for post-deployment managed services (e.g., monitoring, patching, performance reporting) if offered as a clearly itemized and separately priced option. Such services will not be considered part of the base requirement but may be evaluated as an optional enhancement for long-term support considerations.
5	Section 3	Do you anticipate the users being trained during the March 23-27th timeframe? And do you require on-site training, or is high quality virtual with documentation sufficient?	The District anticipates that system installation, configuration, and training will occur prior to or during the implementation week of March 23–27, 2026 (Spring Break), when classes are not in session. Comprehensive training and documentation must be provided for all user groups, including administrative, office, and classroom staff. High-quality virtual training supported by detailed written and/or recorded materials is acceptable; however, vendors may also propose on-site sessions for administrative and technical staff if such delivery is advantageous for user adoption. Following initial implementation, the District’s Technology Department will utilize a train-the-trainer model to provide continued training and support internally.
6	Section 2	Beyond Kari’s Law and RAY BAUM’S Act, are there any additional local or district compliance	The District operates under all applicable federal and State of Illinois emergency communications requirements, including full compliance with Kari’s Law and the RAY BAUM’S Act. At this time,



		<p>requirements for emergency calling, location reporting, or system auditing that should be incorporated into the proposal?</p>	<p>there are no additional local or district-specific mandates beyond these regulations.</p> <p>However, proposals should incorporate best-practice features that enhance safety and accountability, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dynamic dispatchable location reporting for all 911 calls. • Automatic on-site and administrative notifications when a 911 call is placed. • Detailed audit logging of emergency call activity for compliance verification and post-incident review. <p>Vendors must ensure that all proposed systems can accommodate future regulatory updates or local enhancements without requiring major hardware replacement.</p>
7	Section 2	<p>Could you provide an approximate # of users who need receptionist functionality, and share if there are any 100% remote users?</p>	<p>The District requires approximately seven (7) users with receptionist or multi-line call handling functionality. These users are distributed across four office areas within the building and handle front-desk, student services, and administrative calls.</p> <p>There are no fully remote receptionists at this time. However, the District is interested in understanding how proposed systems could support remote or hybrid receptionist functionality in the future, should that capability be desired.</p>
8	Section 3	<p>Would wireless DECT devices in classrooms with multicast be of interest for the safety use case</p>	<p>The District prefers hardwired classroom phones wherever network connectivity is available, as all classrooms are currently equipped with network wiring that supports PoE+ for voice devices.</p> <p>Wireless DECT or similar solutions may be proposed only for a small number of specific locations where network wiring is not available or practical to install.</p> <p>In such cases, devices must fully support multicast paging and emergency alert integration to ensure consistency with safety and communication systems across the campus.</p>
9	Section 3	<p>We see reference to building infrastructure in</p>	<p>The District acknowledges that multiple architectural paths can meet the specified integration requirements with Microsoft 365 and</p>



		<p>VMware but requiring tight integration into M365. For full transparency, there are a few different architecture paths and need to be carefully planned so that we are developing the correct solution. Can this be discussed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are providers that have a softphone app that sits in Teams, but doesn't integrate with M365 to the level that is being requested in the RFP • There are on-prem infrastructure that can be its own direct routing and light up Teams as a softphone • We can be a cloud native solution, but with multiple integrations for BCP scenarios 	<p>Teams, including on-premises, hybrid, and cloud-native configurations.</p> <p>The RFP intentionally allows vendors flexibility to propose any architecture—physical, virtual, or cloud-hosted—that satisfies all functional and security requirements, including:</p> <p>Seamless Outlook and Teams integration for presence, contact lookup, and click-to-dial.</p> <p>Single sign-on (SSO) via Azure AD / Entra.</p> <p>Local call survivability and E911 compliance during Internet/WAN outages.</p> <p>The District welcomes proposed design narratives explaining how each solution achieves these outcomes. However, detailed architecture discussions or design workshops will occur only after vendor selection during the implementation planning phase.</p>
10	Section 3	<p>Do conference phones need to have one touch to join calendar integration? There are a few different ways to do this but cannot have the shared device license assigned to the conference phone</p>	<p>While one-touch-to-join meeting capability is preferred for conference room devices, it is not a mandatory requirement provided that the proposed solution offers a reliable, simple method to join scheduled meetings (e.g., entering a meeting ID or using a softkey).</p> <p>The District understands that Microsoft licensing limitations may prevent assigning a shared device or meeting room license directly to a conference phone. Vendors should describe how their proposed solution enables calendar or meeting integration functionality without requiring additional Microsoft licensing beyond standard user entitlements.</p>



			All conference phones must still meet the functional requirements specified in Section 3.5, including high-quality audio, full-duplex operation, and integration with the District's VoIP and paging environment.
--	--	--	---

Section 2 – Changes to the RFP (if applicable)

Change / Clarification: Not Applicable

Acknowledgment of Addendum

This Addendum must be acknowledged and included with the vendor's proposal submission.

Addendum No. _____

Acknowledged By (Printed Name) _____

Signature _____

Company _____

Date _____

Issued By:

Nick Simov, Director of Technology
Argo Community High School District 217
Email: nsimov@argohs.net