

Standard 3: Teaching and Assessing for Learning  
Standard 5: Using Results for Continuous Improvement

**Erate Response Evaluations for FY2023 - 2024  
USAC Form 470 and DeKalb County School District (DCSD)  
Requirements**

**Executive Summary and Supporting Document**

## **Category 2 – Fiber Cabling**

---

### **Executive Summary**

#### **Purpose**

This evaluation requests funding from Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC), which manages the contribution of revenue to and distribution of Erate funding from the Universal Service Fund. The funding (Category 2) is provided for internal connections needed for broadband connectivity to eligible schools and libraries. DeKalb County School District (DCSD) is eligible for these services.

#### **Background and Process**

The evaluation team was made up of five staff people in the Division of Information Technology and the district's Erate business partner, EFG Group. There were three representing Network Services and one representing the Project Management Office, and two representatives from EFG Group.

The solicitation was written, published for two weeks, and evaluated during December 2022 through February and will be submitted to the Board of Education for approval in March 2023. The bidding process was facilitated by the district's business partner, EFG Group. On February 10, 2023, the deadline for receiving responses, four vendors responded to the solicitation, deemed responsive, and were evaluated.

## Evaluation Summary

Based on a careful evaluation of how well each of the 2 possible choices could meet the 4 major criteria considered, Integrated Communication Networks (ICN), Inc. is the best choice.

The two choices considered were:

Integrated Communication Networks (ICN), Inc.  
AiOS Group

The criteria and weighted points used to evaluate the options were (in order of importance):

Price – 35 points  
Ability to Execute – 30 points  
Product/Service Features – 25 points  
Local Preference – 10 points

*Ability to Execute* was based on three factors given 10 points each.

- Experience with the district.
- Compatibility with existing infrastructure and/or managed under existing interface
- Experience with educational institutions

*Product/Services Features* were evaluated on two factors:

- Comparable product(s) to the district's existing product(s) - 12 points
- Services – 13 points

## Decision Table

Category 2: Fiber Cabling" was evaluated by means of a decision table.

	Price	Ability to Execute	Product/Service Features	Local Preference	Summary
Integrated Communication Networks (ICN), Inc.	35.00	30.00	25.00	10.00	10.00
AiOS Group	17.00	15.00	22.00	5.00	5.90

*Decision Table for Category 2: Fiber Cabling*

About *Price*, there was exceptionally large disparity between the two respondent's price quoted:

ICN	AiOS
\$1,948,997.40	\$2,491,600.00

For compatibility with existing infrastructure under *Ability to Execute* and correct and comparable product(s) under *Product/Service Features*, AiOS Group proposed/quoted multi-mode fiber rather than single-mode fiber. For *Local Preference*, AiOS Group is in Macon and ICN is in the Atlanta area.

## Comparisons among Choices

Relative strengths of the various choices in each of the factors is illustrated in the following graph:



## Integrated Communication Networks (ICN), Inc. versus AiOS Group

Integrated Communication Networks (ICN), Inc. was considered a better choice than AiOS Group in four of the four criteria considered. Of these, the critical factor was *Price*.

## Conclusion

After a careful evaluation of each option, Integrated Communication Networks (ICN), Inc. is the best choice.