



SOLCITATION ADDENDUM

Issuing Agency:	North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Solicitation Number:	24-RQ244000-NM
Solicitation Description:	E-Rate Category 1 Internet Service Access
Solicitation Opening Date and Time:	February 20, 2026, at 10:00 AM ET
Addendum Number:	3
Addendum Date:	January 23, 2026
Purchasing Agent:	Nicole Mathis

FAILURE TO RETURN THIS ADDENDUM SHALL SUBJECT YOUR RESPONSE TO REJECTION AND IT SHALL NOT BE EVALUATION FURTHER.

- The following are questions received about the Solicitation and the State's response to those questions:

Question #	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
1	Section 3.4	From the language in the RFP, our understanding is that your primary concern is less around bandwidth and more around whether that bandwidth connects to a Tier 1 backbone. Is our understanding correct?	<p>Bandwidth capacity remains a key consideration of this RFP and will be evaluated based on each proposal's ability to meet current and projected needs. References to Tier 1 backbone connectivity are intended to describe desired network characteristics such as reliability, performance, redundancy, and scalability, not to establish a requirement for direct Tier 1 backbone access.</p> <p>Proposals are not required to connect directly to a Tier 1 backbone.</p>
2	Section 3.4	Is there a specific application that you are using that is driving the need for multiple Tier 1 peers?	<p>No. There is no specific application driving the reference to multiple Tier 1 peers. There are thousands of applications used across K-12 schools. In addition to learning applications, VoIP and other infrastructure related applications will also be on this network.</p> <p>The references are intended to describe desired network characteristics such as resiliency, path diversity, and performance across a broad range of uses, not to establish a required application or network design.</p>

SOLICITATION NUMBER: 24-RQ244000-NM
ADDENDUM NUMBER: 3

Question #	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
3	General	Are we correct in understanding that you are looking for one circuit-per-site, with no additional need for circuit diversity and redundancy?	The RFP contemplates one primary circuit per site; however, proposals may include circuit diversity or where available and cost effective. Such options are not mandatory but may be considered as part of the overall evaluation of reliability, resiliency, and value.
4	Attachment B – Cost Template: General	You have separated “charter and residential” from “District”. Is there a difference in required service levels between those groupings?	<p>No. There is no difference in required service levels between those groupings.</p> <p>The separation is for administrative and reporting purposes only. All participating sites, regardless of grouping, are subject to the same service requirements, performance expectations, and evaluation criteria.</p>
5	Attachment B – Cost Template: General	For the “charter and residential schools” are the speeds requested symmetrical or broadband?	The State is not requiring that all proposed solutions provide symmetric Internet access. However, the vast majority of participants on the network currently receive symmetric service. Vendors may propose asymmetric Internet access solutions where appropriate. Any Vendor proposing an asymmetric solution must clearly identify that the service offered is asymmetric and must explicitly describe both the proposed download and upload bandwidth speeds within its response. Such information will be considered as part of the overall evaluation to ensure the proposed service meets the State’s requirements.
6	Attachment B – Cost Template: Instructions	The cost spreadsheet references “Managed Firewall and Content Filtering”. There is no mention of this in the solicitation document, and there are no tabs for this in the cost spreadsheet. Should these be added?	No. The intent of this solicitation is only to procure eligible internet service for North Carolina Public School Units (PSU). Addendum 2 “24-RQ244000-NM E-RATE Category One Addendum 2 1.9.26.pdf (302.08 KB)” has been issued containing the revised cost sheet titled “ <u>Revised AttachmentB 24 RQ22400 NM 1 9 26.xlsx (209.28 KB)</u> ”. This cost sheet replaces Attachment B posted on 12.19.2025 in its entirety. Vendors are advised to use only the revised cost sheet posted on 01.09.26 for their submission.
7	ATTACHMENT B: COST TEMPLATE; Tab: Internet - District	In reviewing one of the DPI's current applications, i.e., 251027906, service tiers include 3,000 and 4,000. Are these two service tiers being eliminated in this RFP?	Addendum 2 “24-RQ244000-NM E-RATE Category One Addendum 2 1.9.26.pdf (302.08 KB)” has been issued containing the revised cost sheet titled “ <u>Revised AttachmentB 24 RQ22400 NM 1 9 26.xlsx (209.28 KB)</u> ”. This cost sheet replaces Attachment B posted on 12.19.2025 in its entirety. Vendors are advised to use only the revised cost sheet posted on 01.09.26 for their submission.

SOLICITATION NUMBER: 24-RQ244000-NM
ADDENDUM NUMBER: 3

Question #	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
8	ATTACHMENT B: COST TEMPLATE; Tab: Internet - Charter & Residential	<p>This tab only includes a subset of operating Independent Public Schools (charter schools, lab schools, and regional schools). Please confirm the list is correct. Given that the DPI wants to account for "...PSUs joining mid-year", would a list inclusive of all Independent Public Schools facilitate mid-year additions, versus providing a "...a clear methodology for determining pricing for these new circuits", which may vary based on the location of the new PSU?</p>	<p>The list in the cost template reflects the Independent Public Schools operating at the time the RFP was developed and is provided for evaluation purposes only.</p> <p>For mid-year additions, vendors should provide a clear and consistent methodology for pricing new circuits rather than pricing all possible Independent Public Schools in advance.</p>
9	ATTACHMENT B: COST TEMPLATE; Tab: Internet - Charter & Residential	<p>Service tiers in this tab jump from 2,000 to 30,000. If this is not correct, please provide an updated Cost Template with the correct service tiers or communicate the correct tiers.</p>	<p>Addendum 2 "24-RQ244000-NM E-RATE Category One Addendum 2 1.9.26.pdf (302.08 KB)" has been issued containing the revised cost sheet titled "Revised AttachmentB 24 RQ22400 NM 1 9 26.xlsx (209.28 KB)". This cost sheet replaces Attachment B posted on 12.19.2025 in its entirety. Vendors are advised to use only the revised cost sheet posted on 01.09.26 for their submission.</p> <p>The bandwidth tiers shown in the cost template represent the requested tiers for evaluation under this RFP.</p>
10	ATTACHMENT B: COST TEMPLATE; Tabs: Internet - District / Internet - Charter & Residential	<p>If there are changes to the Cost Template, should the bandwidth increment for District and Charter & Residential schools be uniform across overlapping ranges? For example, if both categories require service between 1,000 Mbps and 10,000 Mbps, should the bid include identical tiers (e.g., 1,000, 2,000, 5,000, 7,500, and 10,000 Mbps) for both PSU types?</p>	<p>Addendum 2 "24-RQ244000-NM E-RATE Category One Addendum 2 1.9.26.pdf (302.08 KB)" has been issued containing the revised cost sheet titled "Revised AttachmentB 24 RQ22400 NM 1 9 26.xlsx (209.28 KB)". This cost sheet replaces Attachment B posted on 12.19.2025 in its entirety. Vendors are advised to use only the revised cost sheet posted on 01.09.26 for their submission.</p> <p>The bandwidth tiers shown in the cost template is based on an assessment of the existing usage pattern and anticipated demand for the next school year. Vendors are encouraged to propose scalable solutions capable of supporting present needs and growth</p>

SOLICITATION NUMBER: 24-RQ244000-NM
ADDENDUM NUMBER: 3

Question #	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
11	Page 13, Section 3.4, 3	From the language in the RFP, our understanding is that your primary concern is less around bandwidth and more around whether that bandwidth connects to a Tier 1 backbone. Is our understanding correct?	See response to question # 1
12	Page 13, Section 3.4, 3	Is there a specific application that you are using that is driving the need for multiple Tier 1 peers?	See response to question # 2
13	General	Are we correct in understanding that you are looking for one circuit-per-site, with no additional need for circuit diversity and redundancy?	See response to question # 3
14	Attachment B – Cost Template: General	You have separated “charter and residential” from “District”. Is there a difference in required service levels between those groupings?	See response to question # 4
15	Attachment B – Cost Template: General	For the “charter and residential schools” are the speeds requested symmetrical or broadband?	See response to question # 5
16	Attachment B – Cost Template: Instructions	The cost spreadsheet references “Managed Firewall and Content Filtering”. There is no mention of this in the solicitation document, and there are no tabs for this in the cost spreadsheet. Should these be added?	See response to question # 6
17	2 – Section 2.8	The RFP Lite refers to “Paragraph #31 of the attached Department of Information Technology Terms and Conditions” as such will “Paragraph #33 also apply?	The reference to Paragraph #31 in RFP section 2.8 should read “Paragraph 33”. All Terms and Conditions contained in this solicitation are material, mandatory, and applicable to this procurement whether referenced explicitly or not.

SOLICITATION NUMBER: 24-RQ244000-NM
ADDENDUM NUMBER: 3

Question #	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
18	2 – Section 2.9.1	The RFP Lite references a requirement that Resellers must submit a letter from upstream or underlying providers within 30 days of the bid opening. Should Vendors understand this requirement to mean that if Vendor makes use of a “last mile provider” for circuit transport connectivity to one or more locations identified in the RFP Lite as part of the Vendor’s solution, the Vendor must obtain such a letter from the “last mile” provider to be provided to the State?	Yes. If a Vendor relies on an upstream, underlying, or last-mile provider to deliver service, the Vendor must obtain and submit a letter from that provider within 30 days of bid opening.
19	7 – All Sub Sections	If a Vendor is proposing a non-SAAS Service as defined in the SAAS Terms and Conditions, Rev.22-April-2025, will this section of the bid apply to the Vendors submission if accepted.	No. If a Vendor is proposing a non-SaaS service, the SaaS Terms and conditions do not apply.
20	1 – Section 1.0	Will the NCDPI issue a Form 470 to accompany this E-Rate solicitation	FCC Form 470 was posted on January 5, 2026, for referenced solicitation.
21	internet Service Specification, Section 3.5, bullet #5, page 14	Is the 25ms latency level referenced in the question referring to one-way-delay or round-trip-time? Given that many service providers have (inter) national networks, does the phrasing in the RFP "any point on your network" mean "any point within the service providers North Carolina	The 25 ms latency requirement refers to round-trip latency (RTT) unless otherwise explicitly stated. The phrase “any point on your network” refers to the service provider’s network infrastructure used to deliver service within North Carolina, including in-state and regionally relevant backbone, aggregation, and interconnection points supporting the services proposed under this RFP. It does not refer to the provider’s entire national or international network.

SOLICITATION NUMBER: 24-RQ244000-NM
ADDENDUM NUMBER: 3

Question #	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
		network? Please elaborate if needed.	
22	Requirements specific to this RFP Lite Section 3.4, bullet# 3 page 13	"Do all Internet - District customers own & operate their own BGP Autonomous system?"	Districts do not generally own & operate their own BGB Autonomous system. However, there may be limited instances where this does occur.
23	internet service specification, Section 3.5 Bullet #18, page 15	Will all Internet - District customers peer over eBGP with the Service Provider in order to announce customer-owned/leased IPv4 & IPv6 prefixes?	No. Internet–District customers are not required to own or operate their own BGP Autonomous System. Districts may utilize provider-managed BGP, static routing, or other routing approaches as appropriate. Proposers should describe the routing options they support and any requirements associated with those options.
24	internet service specifications, Section 3.5 Bullet #14, 15, page 15	Will all Internet - District customers use the bidding service provider as a single-homed ISP? Will any of the Internet-District customers use the Service Provider as a secondary or alternate in a Dual/Multi-Homed ISP configuration?"	No. Internet–District customers may be single-homed or may operate in dual or multi-homed ISP configurations, depending on district network design and operational requirements. Proposers should describe their ability to support service as a primary or secondary Internet service provider, including any routing, redundancy, and failover considerations associated with each configuration.
25	2, Section 2.8	The RFP Lite refers to “Paragraph #31 of the attached Department of Information Technology Terms and Conditions” as such will “Paragraph #33 also apply?"	See response to question # 17
26	2, Section 2.9.1	The RFP Lite references a requirement that Resellers must submit a letter from upstream or underlying providers within 30 days of the bid opening. Should Vendors understand this requirement to mean that if Vendor makes use of a “last mile provider” for circuit transport connectivity to one or more locations identified in the RFP Lite as part of the Vendor’s solution, the	See response to question # 18

SOLICITATION NUMBER: 24-RQ244000-NM
ADDENDUM NUMBER: 3

Question #	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
		Vendor must obtain such a letter from the "last mile" provider to be provided to the State?	
27	7, All Sub Sections	If a Vendor is proposing a non-SAAS Service as defined in the SAAS Terms and Conditions, Rev.22-April-2025, will this section of the bid apply to the Vendors submission if accepted.	<p>The solicitation is governed by the Terms and Conditions attached with this RFP. All requested exceptions must be clearly identified and submitted with the proposal. Failure to identify exceptions shall be deemed acceptance of the terms as written.</p> <p>Any errata or exceptions to the State's requirements and specifications may be presented on a separate page labeled "Exceptions to Requirements and Specifications". Include references to the corresponding requirements and specifications of the Solicitation. Any deviations shall be explained in detail. The Vendor shall not construe this paragraph as inviting deviation or implying that any deviation will be acceptable. Offers of alternative or non-equivalent goods or services may be rejected if not found substantially conforming; and if offered, must be supported by independent documentary verification that the offer substantially conforms to the specified goods or services specification. If a vendor materially deviates from RFP requirements or specifications, its offer may be determined to be non-responsive by the State. Offers conditioned upon acceptance of Vendor Errata or Exceptions may be determined to be non-responsive by the State.</p>
28	1, Section 1.0	Will the NCDPI issue a Form 470 to accompany this E-Rate solicitation	See response to question # 20
29	2, Section 2.3	RFP Lite 2.3 Offers must be submitted via the Ariba Sourcing Module with the Execution Page signed and dated by an official authorized to bind the Vendor's firm.Ariba Submit Offer section 5.1 – upload a Signed and Completed version of the solicitation document found in Section 3 of the Sourcing Event.Is the requirement to attach a signed and completed first page of the RFP Lite Solicitation only as an acceptable file?	No, the entire executed bid and Attachments A-D shall be submitted with your response.

**SOLICITATION NUMBER: 24-RQ244000-NM
ADDENDUM NUMBER: 3**

Question #	Document Section	Vendor Question	State's Response
		If no, please confirm specific requirement.	
30	2, Section 2.17	Is an Alternate Bid required to submit different pricing options for same service or is a Vendor able to submit two (2) Attachment B – Cost Template files with primary bid?	No, See Section 2.17 Alternate Bids in the posted RFP Lite in its entirety for instructions on submitting alternate bids.

Check **ONLY ONE** of the following options and return one properly executed copy of this Addendum prior to the Solicitation opening time and date.

- A response was submitted prior to this Addendum. An updated response has been submitted to address the changes resulting from this Addendum.
- A response was submitted prior to this Addendum. **NO CHANGES have resulted** from this Addendum.
- A response was **not** submitted prior to this Addendum. **ANY CHANGES resulting** from this Addendum are included in our response.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME

Authorized Signature

Date

Printed Name

Title