

## Exhibit 2

The cost of the eligible goods and services must be the most heavily weighed. Vendors are rated on how well they met each factor. The entries for all factors are totaled for each vendor. The winning bidder is the one with the highest number of total points.

### FUNDING YEAR 2021: BID EVALUATION MATRIX

DATE OF EVALUATION: JANUARY 27, 2021

SERVICE TYPE: WIRELESS ACCESS POINTS

#### Bid 2021-20

Evaluation Factors	Total Points Available	Vendor 1 <u>Skyline Technical Solutions</u>	Vendor 2 <u>CDWG</u>	Vendor 3 <u>Bell Techlogix</u>	Vendor 4 <u>Infrastructure Solutions Int, LLC</u>
Cost of goods	50	32.71	50	37.19	43.38
Technical Criteria (alignment to Section III, Technical Requirements)	30	28.33	16.67	16.67	5
Ease of Installation/Configuration	20	18	10.67	10.67	3.33
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>79.04</b>	<b>77.34</b>	<b>64.53</b>	<b>51.71</b>
<b>Cost</b>		<b>\$146,832.00</b>	<b>\$109,102.80</b>	<b>\$137,058.10</b>	<b>\$123,550.00</b>

Winning Bidder: Skyline Technical Solutions

#### Evaluation Factors:

**Infrastructure Solutions Int, LLC:** The Ruckus product proposed by Infrastructure Solutions Int, does not meet many of our requirements, specifically with regards to dual 5 GHz radios and overall bandwidth. It is not equivalent to the Mist AP43 or Extreme 410C. Additionally, as we currently have no established Ruckus configuration this would require building out a completely new configuration.

**Bell Techlogix and CDWG:** These two vendors proposed the same solution from Extreme Networks and therefore their technical/installation scores are identical, and they are differentiated only by price. Based on our experience with both the Mist and Extreme/Aerohive products in our environment we have seen increased latency and lower throughput from Aerohive/Extreme products than comparable Mist products. Additionally, the LED on the 410C does not provide information on devices being connected to the AP vs. the device being ready to accept connections which was listed as one of our requirements. These factors, especially our experience with latency and throughput from Extreme/Aerohive products including the 410C is the basis of their lower technical score. With regards to ease of configuration, while we have an established on-premises Extreme CloudIQ controller we have seen issues with the overall performance of the on-premises controller responsiveness etc. Furthermore, in our experience Extreme CloudIQ does not provide an easy way to configure an SSID on only a few access points within a site. Lastly since the merger with Extreme we have found the responsiveness of sales engineers and technical support to be slower, and less understanding of our needs than we would like. These factors contributed to the lower Installation/Configuration score for the Extreme Networks solution.

**Skyline:** The Mist solution proposed by Skyline meets all our requirements and, in our experience, has the best performance of any of the quoted products. While not an explicit requirement currently Mist does not allow for defining a security policy based on different pre-shared keys being used on the same SSID, which is the primary reason they had their technical score reduced from the maximum allowable score. Regarding configuration and installation, we already have the framework of a configuration built in Mist however it will need to be extended to schools where it does not currently exist, which is the primary reason they did not receive full points in this category.