**Clarification Questions**

**Is this project purely to replace Cisco for Cisco, or would you be open to receive offers from another manufacturer for a complete refresh, if we could meet your requirements?**

Hart is happy to consider proposals and designs incorporating any manufacture as long as they comply with National Security standards

**Would you be willing to entertain a bid using Commscope’s Ruckus and Brocade fully managed Wi-Fi and switching environment?**

Please see answer outline above

**I notice that the existing cabling is not sufficient to support 5GbE interfaces so some cable replacement will be required. Also the backhaul is only 500Mbs, probably on a 1GbE interface, do you require a 2Gbps connection on a 10GbE interface to allow future expansion or will you retain the 500Mbps connectivity at this time?**

Hart is happy to consider, where appropriate, additional cabling. Any costs would need to be fully outlined within the proposal.

Hart will be retaining the 500Mbps connectivity for the next three years as this provides a connection into the Hampshire Private Service Network (HPSN2.1)

**Are you, or will you be, engaged with a current partner?**

No

**If so, has that partner conducted either a full wireless survey or desktop / heatmap survey?**

**If so can you share the output?** We haven’t had a full survey done but we did have a light touch desktop survey done last year.

**How many cabs / IDF’s are there?**

One on each floor and one in the server room

I**s each itemised, if so can you share the output?**

Not sure what is meant here

**In terms of Wi-Fi generations best value currently is still 802.11ac(W2) however, 802.11ax is a growing segment with major the mobile & chipset manufacturers supporting .ax**

**Will there be an appetite for .ax?**

Hart is happy for suppliers to provide proposals that future proof any solution but we are mindful that the future use and occupancy of the offices is currently unclear so any proposal needs to be affordable in light of the current covid crisis

**Does Hart have a preference as to a particular partner?**

No Hart does not have a preferred partner. We are looking for suppliers to provide a best in breed solution

**"HDC202002 - RFQ - Appendix B -WIFI\_Switch Requirements.xlsx" WF06 states "Full compliance with UK security standards". Please can the DC elaborate on which compliancy they use as a frame of reference for these standards e.g. as Cyber Essentials**

I would particularly reference standards published by NCSC and the Cabinet Office. Hart is required to meet PSN requirements on a annual basis. We would be expecting any solution to ensure that these requirements are still met

**With regard to WF16 (use current cabling), the standards mentioned in WF14 (1000BASE-SX, 10000BASE-LX) and WF18 (connect switches by Fibre optic), please can the DC confirm the nature of existing structured cabling and fibre infrastructure?**

Hart current uses Cat5e cabling

**Can you confirm that WF16 and WF19 are the same requirement, worded differently**

Yes

**Appendix 3 indicates areas of outdoor coverage are required. Is this expected to be via leakage of internal access points, or do the DC foresee external wireless access points within the deployment?**

Sorry if the document gave this impression. Hart is only looking for internal coverage

**A requirement is to have integration with Harts AD, to what level? Is the idea to have clients associate with an AP/wired connection through 802.1x/LDAP. Or is integration wanted to an extent where administrators accessing the cloud management portal authenticate with AD credentials. What is the process currently and are you happy with it?**

The idea was to ensure that any system that required the details of Hart’s staff was able to take these from our current AD rather than require them to be re-entered. This could be but not limited to users and administrators etc. We were assuming that any office SSID that provided access to on-premise resources would require a level of authentication.

**A drawback I have hit before with government agencies is Meraki’s European data centre is in Germany. ONLY management traffic is sent to the cloud controller not end user data. Meraki is not blacklisted by any government agency i.e NCSC. More details are located here on a meraki white paper -** [**https://meraki.cisco.com/lib/pdf/meraki\_datasheet\_cloud\_management.pdf**](https://eur02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fmeraki.cisco.com%2Flib%2Fpdf%2Fmeraki_datasheet_cloud_management.pdf&data=04%7C01%7CAlistair.Trigg%40hart.gov.uk%7Cfe49cc0c9d3548270afc08d87469898d%7C437487d01c5f47b6bd4ea482ae3b011e%7C0%7C1%7C637387343947232525%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=yEPUXo6XaUJHu4kCgYmRQbhzbUpR5mohdBUPj1qM%2BsQ%3D&reserved=0)**. Would this be acceptable to your IT contact at first glance?**

Yes that will be fine

**Can redundant links in the form of LACP/Port channel bundles be made upstream from the core switch to ensure HA from the core switch onwards, I just want to make sure any design take this into account. Is this already in place? I want to make sure if we spec you a new core switch we want to make sure we can have 2 connections to the firewall out to the internet so we can fail over in case of link failure. What I was asking is does your IT contact know if there is a spare port on the firewall so we can have two links going to the core. If you can provide the spec of the firewall that would be even better, although I understand this may be out of scope**.

I can confirm that there are two connections from the core switch to the firewall so the firewall does have a spare port that could be utilised.

**Can we visit the site for an inspection of the existing cable routing, switch locations and supporting infrastructure?**

Site visits will be offered to successful bidders but aren’t available at this stage

**Do you have false ceilings (we assume so based on photos we have seen)?**

Yes

**Are you going to update your Virgin 500Mbps line to support multi gigabit connectivity? If not, this will act as a bottle neck for high speed internet access.**

We don’t have any plans at the moment to upgrade but the line is flexible enough for us to increase capacity if needed

**Are you open to a Commscope Ruckus/Brocade access point and switching solution that meets your requirements rather than a Cisco Meraki solution?**

Hart is happy to consider any hardware supplier. We are not wedded to any particular make or model of device

**Do you have more detailed floor drawings that we can access?**

Sorry these are the best we have.

**Do you need coverage on the third floor of the building or is this unused/sublet?**

At this stage we don’t need coverage for the 3rd floor because of its use. We would want any solution to be able to flexible in case our requirements change at a later date

**The server stack isn’t mentioned, is that because it is out of scope? Can you confirm what sort of uplinks to the core stack is required please?**

Currently Hart has Cat5e cables in place

**Detail of the core stack requirements appear to be missing? Number of ports required etc. Also, can you confirm what routing protocol support is required please?**

The current core switches are Cisco 3550 48 port and Cisco 3850 24 port. Don’t currently have the routing protocol used. Will need to check

**We could do with knowing the type of fibre in the building for up-linking the user stacks (is it om3,20 om4 LC presentation etc please?)**

Hart doesn’t currently have fibre uplinks but would welcome their implementation to be costed into any proposals.

**For the 1st floor cabinet – we understand there are 4 x 48port switches – can you confirm how many ports are currently in use across all switches please?**

Hart is moving to a significantly reduced head count for on premise staff. Max of 50 in the building so the majority of the floor ports will be freed up

**WF04 mentions access to all devices via CLI/telnet/ssh is essential – we are likely to propose a solution based on Meraki, which will support monitoring and interrogation of devices but not via CLI – will this be an issue? Will your IT Team be expecting to manage the devices yourselves, or would you want us to do so on your behalf?**

Hart currently outsources the bulk of its IT service to Capita. I would expect IT to support the devices but have the support of a 3rd party support/maintenance contract

**WF12 mentions minimum of 5Gb/s – we assume this relates to Access Point connectivity, which means APs and switches need to support ‘multigigabit’ – do you know how many APs may be required per switch please? Even if you can confirm more/less than 16 this will be really useful to help avoid over/under-specifying the design/solution.**

How many APs per switch - we would expect potential suppliers to make a judgement call from the information and the floor plans that have been provided.

**Can you please confirm you have available 10G SFP+ ports on the existing Core switch. It is assumed the core does not form part of this replacement procurement**

The core switch currently has a 20 free ports. The decision around the core switches is up to the supplier and their recommendations

**Does the Authority intend to purchase the title for the hardware upon which the solution will be based or does the Authority intend for such hardware to be provided as part of a managed service?**

The Authority plans to purchase the hardware. Hart has its IT service outsourced to Capita and they provide support. The Authority does have 3rd party support and maintenance contracts in place to support this Capita contract**.**