Clear Form

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
SCHOOL BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
Procurement Management Services
1450 N.E. 2nd Avenue, Room 650
Miami, FL 33132

Direct All Inquiries To
Procurement Management Services
Buyer's Name: Yusbel Gonzalez
PHONE: (305) 995- 4203
Email: yusbelg@dadeschools.net
TDD PHONE: (305) 995-2400

BID/RFP ADDENDUM

Date: 04/21/2026

Addendum No. 2

BID/RFP No. ITN-25-025-YG BID/RFP TITLE: Web Content Filtering System

This addendum modifies the conditions of the above-referenced BID/RFP as follows:

The deadline for receipt of proposals has been extended to Tuesday May 5, 2026 at 1:00 P.M.

Answers to questions received from prospective proposers are attached.

All other terms and conditions of the ITN will remain the same.

All information, specifications terms, and conditions for the above-referenced BID/RFP, are included on the document posted on the Procurement Management website at http://procurement.dadeschools.net

The attached pages containing clarifications, additional information and requirements constitute an integral part of the referenced bid. If your bid/proposal has not been submitted, substitute the pages marked REVISED and submit your entire bid/proposal package.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum Number _____

PLEASE NOTE: If your firm has forwarded a copy of this bid/proposal to another vendor, it is your responsibility to forward him/her a copy of this addendum.

(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT BELOW)

LEGAL NAME OF BIDDER: _____

MAILING ADDRESS: _____

CITY, STATE ZIP CODE: _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER: _____ E-MAIL _____ FAX # _____

BY: SIGNATURE (Manual): _____
OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

NAME (Typed): _____ TITLE: _____
OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

Invitation to Negotiate (ITN)

ITN-25-025-YG
Web Content Filtering System

ADDENDUM NO. 2

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q1: I'm writing regarding ITN-25-025-YG – Web Content Filtering System. Our team is very interested in submitting a proposal; however, due to the scope of the requirements and the time needed to coordinate internal reviews and supporting documentation, we respectfully request a 45-day extension to the proposal due date.

A1: The District has granted an initial extension via Addendum 1. To ensure all proposers have sufficient time to review the information provided in this addenda, a final extension is granted through this addendum of Tuesday, May 5, 2026 at 1:00 PM.

Q2: Who is the current provider of Content Filtering for Miami-Dade Schools.

A2: A. Our Current Provider is Lightspeed Systems.

Q3: A. What is the difference between this ITN and the one 3 months ago?
B. What assurances do we have that this will not get cancelled? Cancel creates an uncompetitive environment as now everyone knows what others bid and their pricing.

A3: A. This ITN includes refined Scope of Services designed to more accurately reflect the District's current requirements.

B. While the School Board reserves the right to reject all proposals or cancel a solicitation if it is determined to be in the best interest of the District, this re-issuance underscores our immediate and ongoing need for these services. The District is committed to a fair, transparent, and competitive process to reach a final contract award.

Q4: A. How many vendors have Miami-Dade Schools done POC's / Tested onsite/ evaluated prior to this Bid being released?
B. How does this not create a conflict with bidders that did not get this opportunity?

A4: A. Market research and exploratory demonstrations to stay informed of available technologies and industry standards were performed during the project's planning phases, before the release of ITN-24-033-YG (previous ITN). Between the cancellation of ITN-24-033-YG and the release of ITN-25-025-YG, the District has not performed Proof of Concepts (POCs), conducted onsite testing, or evaluated vendor solutions.

B. To ensure a level playing field, the District has developed this ITN with functional requirements that do not favor any specific provider and allows for maximum competition. All proposals will be evaluated based strictly on the criteria set forth in Section 7 of this solicitation. Prior interactions during the market research phase conferred no advantage, do not grant extra points in the scoring process, and all proposers are held to the same submission requirements.

Q5: We respectfully request a two week extension to the submission deadline to ensure we can provide you with a complete and compliant response addressing all requirements.

A5: Please refer to the response provided for question 1 in this addendum.

Q6: Based on the requirements, MDCPS is willing to accept a Hybrid Architecture, where you have inline appliances for BYOD Devices and an Agent base for District owned devices?

A6: Yes, the District is willing to accept a hybrid architecture. Please refer to ITN Page 16, Section 4.3.1, requirement # 5 and # 8.".

Q7: Please confirm and/or explain the 200G egress.

a) Two separate 100G egress at two separate locations
b) Both are active – active
c) Is egress traffic balance 50/50 out of each 100G? in other words half the schools out of one and the other half out of the 2nd egress.
d) Are two inline appliances required?

A7: The District confirms the following regarding internet egress architecture:

a) The District operates two separate 100G internet egress connections, each located at a different site both within the boundaries of M-DCPS.

b) Both egress locations are configured in an active-active architecture.

c) Traffic is distributed across both egress points in a load-balanced manner, effectively supporting a roughly 50/50 distribution of traffic across the two 100G connections.

d) As a result, in-line appliances are required at each internet egress location to ensure enforcement of all inbound and outbound traffic.

Q8: Failover will happen at the circuit level; therefore 2nd appliance must be capable of handling 100G of traffic, correct?

A8: Yes. Each in-line appliance deployed at the respective internet egress locations must be capable of supporting up to 100 Gbps of traffic.

In the event of a failover at the circuit level, the remaining egress location—and its associated in-line appliance—must be able to handle the full traffic load without degradation of performance or functionality.

Q9: Does MDCPS require (is it a must have) failover for the inline appliance?

A9: Yes, the District requires that both internet egress locations remain fully protected at all times. Each location must be equipped with an in-line appliance capable of supporting a minimum of 100 Gbps throughput.

While the specific architecture of the failover mechanisms is left to the proposer's design, the solution must ensure continuous inspection and enforcement of traffic at both sites under normal and failover conditions. Each appliance must be sized to handle the full traffic load of its respective egress point without degradation during a failover event.

Q10: What is the minimum time to repair for the inline appliance?

A10: The District's required Response Time is $\leq$ 2 hours (24x7). However, the District expects the proposed solution to be designed for High Availability (HA) to mitigate any single point of failure due to hardware malfunction. Proposers should specify their guaranteed Mean Time to Repair (MTTR) and describe how their proposed architecture ensures continuous service during a hardware failure.

Q11: References – please clarify is a must have for 3 references from the reseller? Or a combination of reseller / OEM?
a) Must each reference be a minimum of 5 years with the reseller or the OEM?

A11: Per ITN Section 5, c., if the Proposer is an authorized reseller, all three (3) required client reference letters must be for the reseller. While manufacturer references may be included as additional information, the District

will give primary consideration to the reseller's references to verify their specific experience in providing the services described in this ITN.

The requirement to be regularly engaged in the business of providing the services described in this ITN for a minimum of five (5) years applies to the Proposer (the entity submitting the proposal). If a reseller is the Proposer, the reseller must meet the five-year requirement.

Q12: During the call the Optional products was mentioned as NOT part of the evaluation and NOT part of the scoring, correct?

a) Since this bid will also be the vehicle for purchasing those Optional Products, how will they be evaluated?

A12: To clarify and supersede any previous verbal statements during the pre-proposal meeting, "Optional Services," are evaluated as part of the Proposed Approach and Methodology criteria (ITN Page 25, Section 7.3a).

Per the evaluation breakdown on ITN page 25, the Selection Committee may score up to 15 points based on the *"Proposed system's ability to meet and provide the specified requirements, features, and services, including optional services (if offered)"*. While offering optional services is not a mandatory requirement for a responsive proposal, optional services proposed will be evaluated under this criteria (ITN Page 18, Section 4.3.2).

Q13: Can the MDCPS select a solution that does NOT have the Optional Products?

a) If yes, then how will those optional products be purchased in the future?

A13: Yes, the District may select a solution that does not include the optional products at the time of award. If so, the District may purchase the optional products in accordance with the requirements of Board Policy 6320 – Purchasing.

Q14: What is the deadline for having the selected product 100% operational?

A14: The deadline for the selected product to be 100% operational will be in accordance with the detailed deployment plan and timeline provided by the proposer, as required by ITN Section 4.3.1, Requirement 36 (Page 18).