

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

RFP #928771

Wi-Fi Space Occupancy Assessment

RFP Timeline	
RFP Issue Date:	June 2, 2026
Deadline for Respondent Questions to MSU:	June 19, 2026
RFP Response Due Date:	July 24, 2026, 3:00 pm Eastern
Estimated Contract Award	September 2026

RFP Contact	
Name:	Amber Marr
Unit:	MSU Procurement
Email:	amber.marr@msu.edu
Phone:	517-884-6166

DESCRIPTION: Michigan State University (the “University” or “MSU”) is soliciting proposals through this Request for Proposal (“RFP”) for the purpose of a Wi-Fi Space Occupancy Assessment. The requested services are more thoroughly described under the Scope of Work Section of this RFP. Firms intending to respond to this RFP are referred to herein as a “Respondent” or “Supplier.”

PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. **PROPOSAL PREPARATION.** The University recommends reading all RFP materials prior to preparing a proposal, particularly these Proposal Instructions. Respondents must follow these Proposal Instructions and provide a complete response to the items indicated in the table below. References and links to websites or external sources may not be used in lieu of providing the information requested in the RFP within the proposal. Include the Respondent’s company name in the header of all documents submitted with your proposal.

Document	Description	Response Instructions
Cover Page	Provides RFP title and number, important dates, and contact information for MSU	Informational
Proposal Instructions	Provides RFP instructions to Respondents	Informational
Respondent Information Sheet	Company and Contact Information, and Experience	Respondent must complete and submit by proposal deadline
Scope of Work	Describes the intended scope of work for the RFP	Respondent must complete and submit by proposal deadline
Pricing	Pricing for goods and services sought by the University through this RFP	Respondent must complete and submit by proposal deadline
Master Service Agreement	Provides legal terms for a contract awarded through this RFP	Deemed accepted by Respondent unless information required in Section 9, Master Service Agreement is submitted by proposal deadline
HECVAT	Provides security information	Respondent must complete and submit by proposal deadline
Mandatory Minimum Requirements	Includes information about the supplier solution’s capabilities	Respondent must complete and submit by proposal deadline

2. **EXPECTED RFP TIMELINE.**

Activity	Date
Issue RFP	June 2, 2026
Deadline for Respondent Questions to MSU	June 19, 2026
RFP Response Due	July 24, 2026, 3:00 pm Eastern
Estimated Contract Award	September 2026

3. **CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE UNIVERSITY.** The sole point of contact for the University concerning this RFP is listed on the Cover Page. Contacting any other University personnel, agent, consultant, or representative about this RFP may result in Respondent disqualification.

4. **QUESTIONS.** Respondent questions about this RFP must be submitted electronically by email to the contact listed on the cover page of this RFP. In the interest of transparency, only written questions are accepted. Answers to all questions will be sent to Respondents via email. Submit questions by referencing the following: (i) Question Number, (ii) Document Name, (iii) Page Number, and (iv) Respondent Question. Please refer to **Section 2** above for the deadline to submit questions.
5. **MODIFICATIONS.** The University may modify this RFP at any time. Modifications will be sent via email. This is the only method by which the RFP may be modified.
6. **DELIVERY OF PROPOSAL.** The Respondent must submit its proposal, all attachments, and any modifications or withdrawals electronically via email to the contact listed on the cover page of this RFP. **The price proposal should be saved separately from all other proposal documents and should be sent as a separate attachment from the other proposal documents.** The Respondent should submit all documents in a modifiable (native) format (examples include but are not limited to: Microsoft Word or Excel and Google Docs or Sheets). In addition to submitting documents in a modifiable format, the Respondent may also submit copies of documents in PDF. Respondent’s failure to submit a proposal as required may result in disqualification. The proposal and attachments must be fully uploaded and submitted prior to the proposal deadline. **Do not wait until the last minute to submit a proposal.** The University **may not** allow a proposal to be submitted after the proposal deadline identified in the Cover Page, even if a portion of the proposal was already submitted.
7. **MANDATORY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.** The RFP may contain minimum qualifications, which will be identified as “**Mandatory Minimum Requirements**” in the Scope of Work Section of this RFP. If the RFP does contain mandatory minimum requirements, any proposal not meeting these minimum requirements **will be deemed non-qualified and will not be considered.** All proposals meeting these mandatory minimum requirements will proceed for review and evaluation consistent with **Section 8, Evaluation Process.**
8. **EVALUATION PROCESS.** The University will convene a team of individuals from various Departments within MSU to evaluate each proposal based on each Respondent’s ability to provide the required services, taking into consideration the overall cost to the University. The University may require an oral presentation of the Respondent’s proposal; conduct interviews, research, reference checks, and background checks; and request additional price concessions at any point during the evaluation process. The following criteria will be used to evaluate each proposal:

Criteria	Weight
Technical Approach & Methodology	20%
Relevant Experience	15%
Quality of Analytical Outputs & Insights	15%
Project Management & Schedule Feasibility	10%
Cost & Value	10%
Supplier Risk	10%
Future Scalability	5%
Acceptance of and Adherence to Legal Terms	5%
Total Cost to MSU	5%
Solution Security & Privacy Posture	5%
	100%

9. **MASTER SERVICE AGREEMENT.** The University strongly encourages strict adherence to the terms and conditions set forth in the Master Service Agreement. The University reserves the right to deem a proposal non-responsive for failure to accept the Master Service Agreement. Nevertheless, the

Respondent may submit proposed changes to the Master Service Agreement in track changes (i.e., visible edits) with an explanation of the Respondent's need for each proposed change. Failure to include track changes with an explanation of the Respondent's need for the proposed change constitutes the Respondent's acceptance of the Master Service Agreement. General statements, such as "the Respondent reserves the right to negotiate the terms and conditions," may be considered non-responsive.

10. **CLARIFICATION REQUEST.** The University reserves the right to issue a Clarification Request to a Respondent to clarify its proposal if the University determines the proposal is not clear. Failure to respond to a Clarification Request timely may be cause for disqualification.

11. **RESERVATIONS.** The University reserves the right to:
 - a. Disqualify a Respondent for failure to follow these instructions.
 - b. Discontinue the RFP process at any time for any or no reason. The issuance of an RFP, your preparation and submission of a proposal, and the University's subsequent receipt and evaluation of your proposal does not commit the University to award a contract to you or anyone, even if all the requirements in the RFP are met.
 - c. Consider late proposals if: (i) no other proposals are received; (ii) no complete proposals are received; (iii) the University received complete proposals, but the proposals did not meet mandatory minimum requirements or technical criteria; or (iv) the award process fails to result in an award.
 - d. Consider an otherwise disqualified proposal, if no other proposals are received.
 - e. Disqualify a proposal based on: (i) information provided by the Respondent in response to this RFP; or (ii) if it is determined that a Respondent purposely or willfully submitted false or misleading information in response to the RFP.
 - f. Consider prior performance with the University in making its award decision.
 - g. Consider total-cost-of-ownership factors (e.g., transition and training costs) when evaluating proposal pricing and in the final award.
 - h. Refuse to award a contract to any Respondent that has outstanding debt with the University or has a legal dispute with the University.
 - i. Require all Respondents to participate in a Best and Final Offer round of the RFP.
 - j. Enter into negotiations with one or more Respondents on price, terms, technical requirements, or other deliverables.
 - k. Award multiple, optional-use contracts, or award by type of service or good.
 - l. Evaluate the proposal outside the scope identified in **Section 8, Evaluation Process**, if the University receives only one proposal.
 - m. Obtain and consider information from other sources concerning a Respondent, such as the Respondent's capability and performance under other contracts, the qualifications of any subcontractor identified in the Proposal, the Respondent's financial stability, past or pending litigation, and other publicly available information.
 - n. Utilize third parties to assist in the evaluation process, provided such parties are subject to confidentiality requirements.

12. **AWARD RECOMMENDATION.** The contract will be awarded to the responsive and responsible Respondent who offers the best value to the University, as determined by the University. Best value will be determined by the Respondent meeting any mandatory minimum requirements and offering the best combination of the factors in **Section 8, Evaluation Process**, and price, as demonstrated by the proposal. The University will email a **Notice of Award** to all Respondents. A Notice of Award does not constitute a contract, as the parties must reach final agreement on a signed contract before any services can be provided. The awarded Respondent is prohibited from partnering with losing bidders unless the RFP specifically allows for such arrangement, and any violation of this prohibition may result in disqualification of the awarded Respondent.

- 13. GENERAL CONDITIONS.** The University will not be liable for any costs, expenses, or damages incurred by a Respondent participating in this solicitation. The Respondent agrees that its proposal will be considered an offer to do business with the University in accordance with its proposal, including the Master Service Agreement, and that its proposal will be irrevocable and binding for a period of 180 calendar days from date of submission. If a contract is awarded to the Respondent, the University may, at its option, incorporate any part of the Respondent's proposal into the contract. This RFP is not an offer to enter into a contract. This RFP may not provide a complete statement of the University's needs, or contain all matters upon which agreement must be reached. Proposals submitted via email are the University's property.
- 14. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.** Respondent acknowledges that any responses, materials, correspondence or documents provided to the University may be subject to the State of Michigan Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), Michigan Compiled Law 15.231 *et seq.*, and may be released to third parties in compliance with FOIA or any other law. Questions about the Respondent's own performance can be directed to the RFP Contact indicated on page 1 of this document. Questions about the overall evaluation and any other post-award inquiries must be submitted via a formal FOIA request to the [Michigan State University FOIA office](#).

RESPONDENT INFORMATION SHEET

Please complete the following Information Sheet in the space provided:

Information Sought	Response
Contact Information	
Respondent's sole contact person during the RFP process. Include name, title, address, email, and phone number.	
Person authorized to receive and sign a resulting contract. Include name, title, address, email, and phone number.	
Respondent Background Information	
Legal business name and address. Include business entity designation, e.g., sole proprietor, Inc., LLC, or LLP.	
What state was the company formed in?	
Main phone number	
Website address	
DUNS# AND/OR CCR# (if applicable):	
Number of years in business and number of employees	
Legal business name and address of parent company, if any	
Has your company (or any affiliates) been a party to litigation against Michigan State University? If the answer is yes, then state the date of initial filing, case name and court number, and jurisdiction.	
Experience	
Describe relevant experiences from the last 5 years supporting your ability to successfully manage a contract of similar size and scope for the services described in this RFP.	
Experience 1	
Company name Contact name Contact role at time of project Contact phone Contact email	
1. Project name and description of the scope of the project 2. What role did your company play? 3. How is this project experience relevant to the subject of this RFP?	
Start and end date (mm/yy – mm/yy)	
Status (completed, live, other – specify phase)	
Experience 2	
Company name Contact name Contact role at time of project Contact phone	

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Contact email	
1. Project name and description of the scope of the project 2. What role did your company play? 3. How is this project experience relevant to the subject of this RFP?	
Start and end date (mm/yy – mm/yy)	
Status (completed, live, other – specify phase)	
Experience 3	
Company name Contact name Contact role at time of project Contact phone Contact email	
1. Project name and description of the scope of the project 2. What role did your company play? 3. How is this project experience relevant to the subject of this RFP?	
Start and end date (mm/yy – mm/yy)	
Status (completed, live, other – specify phase)	

SCOPE OF WORK

Please address each of the sections below in a written response, which can be completed on a separate sheet (using the same section headings).

1. University Overview

Michigan State University (MSU), the nation's pioneer land-grant university, is a globally recognized public research institution founded in 1855. A member of the Association of American Universities and the Big Ten Conference, MSU has advanced the common good for more than 165 years.

MSU is one of the largest universities in the United States, serving more than 50,000 students across 17 degree-granting colleges and offering more than 400 academic programs. 32 MSU programs are ranked in the top 25 nationally by *U.S. News & World Report*, including nine ranked No. 1. The university's global alumni network includes approximately 552,000 individuals.

Located in East Lansing, Michigan, MSU's contiguous campus spans approximately 5,200 acres and includes 525 buildings—111 of which contain academic or instructional space—totaling more than 25 million gross square feet. MSU's physical infrastructure is a critical institutional asset, directly supporting teaching, research, outreach, and the success of students, faculty, and staff.

2. Purpose of Proof of Concept

Michigan State University is launching a rapid, low-cost proof of concept (PoC) to assess whether passive Wi-Fi analytics—derived exclusively from MSU's existing Cisco and Juniper Mist wireless infrastructure—can reliably generate:

- Building, Floor, and Zone/Room-level occupancy counts
- Dwell time and persistence of use
- Peak utilization periods
- Time-based usage trends

To effectively align occupancy patterns with classroom schedules and operational decision-making, the University expects utilization trends to be captured at least on an hourly basis, with a strong preference for finer temporal granularity (e.g., 30-minute or 15-minute intervals). Solutions leveraging higher-frequency data such as the 15-minute interval data available through Juniper Mist may provide enhanced analytical value by enabling more precise understanding of how spaces are used throughout the day.

The PoC will cover up to approximately 500,000 gross square feet (GSF) and is intended to evaluate technical feasibility, analytical value, and decision support usefulness. This effort is not intended to procure or deploy a long-term enterprise system.

The study will not utilize physical sensors, cameras, badges, beacons, or any other installed hardware. Proposals that rely on new sensor deployment are out of scope and will not be considered.

3. Scope of Work

3.1 Study Approach

The proof of concept shall rely exclusively on passive Wi-Fi data sourced from MSU's existing Cisco wireless network infrastructure and Juniper Mist wireless environment.

No physical sensing technologies, devices, or hardware may be installed as part of this engagement. All data collection and analysis will leverage existing infrastructure and available system logs, with processing conducted on MSU-managed virtualized computing resources if and where needed. The study will evaluate the accuracy, consistency, and interpretability of Wi-Fi-derived occupancy data across a representative set of campus buildings with varying space uses, HVAC systems, and wireless network configurations.

3.2 Vendor Responsibilities

Proposers must clearly and explicitly describe:

- How Wi-Fi data will be accessed from Cisco and Juniper Mist environments, including required integrations, permissions, and data flows
- The analytical methodology used to estimate occupancy, dwell time, and utilization
- How MAC address randomization is addressed or mitigated
- Accuracy assumptions, confidence ranges, and known limitations across different space types
- Any impacts—or lack thereof—on MSU’s network performance or security posture
- The approach to defining and managing spatial zones, including:
 - Methods for automating or streamlining zone creation using existing institutional data sources, such as CAD files, room inventories, space management databases, or other authoritative facility records
 - The extent to which zone definitions can be generated, synchronized, or updated automatically rather than requiring manual drawing and maintenance
 - Processes for incorporating floor plan revisions, room reconfigurations, and space assignment changes while minimizing manual effort
 - Available tools, integrations, and workflows that support ongoing synchronization between occupancy zones and institutional space records
 - Examples of how other institutions have managed zone maintenance at scale, including lessons learned and best practices for reducing administrative overhead

3.3 Evaluation Focus Areas

The PoC will explicitly assess:

- Technical feasibility of using existing Wi-Fi infrastructure for space analytics
- Data accuracy and consistency across buildings, space types, and occupancy conditions
- Security and privacy posture of the proposed approach
- Zone definition accuracy and maintainability, including:
 - Alignment of zones to real-world space configurations
 - Ease and efficiency of updating zones over time

- Sustainability of zone maintenance processes
- Scalability potential across larger portions of campus

Results may inform future decisions related to:

- HVAC optimization
- Maintenance and operational strategies
- Capital planning and space investment prioritization

3.4 Desired Integration Capabilities

While the proof of concept will not require full system integrations, MSU seeks to understand both the integration potential and data accessibility of the proposed solution. The ability to reliably extract, export, and integrate occupancy and utilization data is critical to supporting institutional analytics, reporting, and long-term scalability.

Proposers should describe how their solution supports integration and data exchange with the following systems and use cases, either during the PoC or in a potential future phase:

Data Accessibility and Export Capabilities (Required Across All Integration Areas)

Proposers must describe:

- Available options for bulk data export, including supported formats (e.g., CSV, Parquet, JSON)
- Capabilities for scheduled and automated exports, including frequency limits and configuration options
- Availability and structure of API access, including endpoints, authentication methods, and rate limits
- Ability to extract data at varying levels of granularity (e.g., building, floor, zone, or space level) and time intervals (e.g., hourly, 15-minute)
- Any limitations related to:
 - Data volume (e.g., export size caps, throughput constraints)
 - Data retention periods
 - Export frequency or concurrency limits
- How exported data can be used to support:
 - Integration with institutional data platforms and warehouses
 - Custom analysis and modeling
 - Combination with other campus datasets (e.g., scheduling, energy, maintenance)

Academic Scheduling & Space Systems

- Integration with classroom and event scheduling systems (e.g., 25Live)

- Ability to compare scheduled vs. actual utilization at the room or zone level
- Export of utilization metrics to support academic and space planning reviews

Building Automation & Facilities Systems

- Integration with Building Automation Systems (BAS/BMS, e.g., Siemens)
- Potential to inform occupancy-based HVAC strategies, setback schedules, or demand-driven controls
- Alignment with maintenance and operations workflows, including data sharing with CMMS/IWSM platforms

Planning, Reporting, and Data Platforms

- Integration with enterprise data warehouse and reporting environments
- Compatibility with space management, asset management, or IWMS platforms
- Ability to leverage or integrate with MSU IT-managed APIs and data services
- Support for combining occupancy data with other institutional datasets for cross-domain analytics

Dashboards & Visualization Tools

- Ability to provide dashboards or visualizations that can be embedded, exported, or aligned with existing MSU analytics environments (e.g., Power BI)
- Minimum visualization at the building floor level, with preference for finer granularity (zone, space, or sub-zone as applicable)
- Configurable time resolution (hourly, 15-min intervals, etc.)
- Supported metrics (e.g., occupancy counts, peak utilization %, dwell time)
- Support for role-appropriate views (e.g., executive, facilities, academic planning)

4. Locations

The proposed study will include a subset of MSU buildings not to exceed 500,000 GSF, selected collaboratively during project initiation. The building set will represent a range of space uses, wireless network hardware, and HVAC technologies.

Building	GSF	Primary Use	Desired Analysis Level	Network Hardware
Life Science	199,517	Laboratory	Floor/Zone	Cisco
Interdisciplinary Science & Technology Building (ISTB)	146,478	Laboratory	Floor/Zone	Cisco
Hannah Administration	146,711	Office	Floor/Zone	Juniper

Bessey Hall	133,016	Classroom	Floor/Zone	Juniper
Kedzie Hall	137,579	Classroom	Floor/Zone	Cisco
Morrill Hall of Agriculture	113,725	Office/ Classroom	Building/Floor	Juniper

5. Deliverables

At a minimum, the selected firm shall provide the following deliverables as part of the proof-of-concept study:

Phase 1 – Initiation Deliverable

PoC Implementation Plan (finalized and approved), including:

- Final building list
- Confirmed data sources and assumptions
- Detailed analytical approach
- Project schedule and milestones

Phase 2 – Interim Deliverable

- Midpoint check-in
- Preliminary findings
- Data quality observations
- Identified risks or constraints

Phase 3 – Final Deliverables

Final Report and Executive Briefing, including:

- Occupancy and utilization findings
- Visualizations suitable for executive and leadership review
- Discussion of accuracy, limitations, and confidence levels
- Guidance on scalability and recommended next steps

6. Data Privacy and Governance

6.1 Data Ownership and Intellectual Property

- All data provided by Michigan State University, collected from MSU systems, generated, derived, processed, analyzed, or otherwise created in connection with this Proof of Concept—including but not limited to raw data, intermediate datasets, transformed datasets, analytical models, algorithms (as applied), calculations, metrics, dashboards, visualizations, reports, documentation,

and all analytical outputs (collectively, “Project Data”)—shall be the exclusive property of Michigan State University.

- MSU shall retain all right, title, and interest in and to the Project Data, including any derivative works created therefrom. The Respondent shall have no ownership rights in the Project Data and may not use, disclose, sell, license, benchmark, aggregate, or otherwise exploit the Project Data for any purpose other than performing services for MSU under this RFP, without MSU’s prior written consent.
- Upon request and at project close, all Project Data must be returned to MSU in a mutually agreed, usable electronic format, and any copies retained by the Respondent must be securely destroyed in accordance with MSU data governance requirements.

6.2 Data Privacy and Use Requirements

All Wi-Fi data used in this study must be:

- Anonymized and aggregated prior to analysis
- Free of personally identifiable information (PII)
- Used solely for space utilization analytics

Proposals must describe:

- Data handling and protection measures
- Compliance with institutional data governance standards
- Data retention and destruction protocols at project close

7. Proposal Requirements

7.1 Mandatory Minimum Requirements

Proposals must meet all of the following to be considered responsive:

1. Proposal must include exclusive use of passive Wi-Fi analytics derived from MSU’s existing Cisco and/or Juniper Mist wireless infrastructure; no sensor deployment.
2. Proposal must include demonstrated experience delivering Wi-Fi-based space utilization analytics for higher education campuses.
3. Proposal must include documented capability to work with Cisco and/or Juniper Mist wireless data.
4. Solution must use anonymized, aggregated data with no access to personally identifiable information (PII).
5. Respondent must be able to complete the proof of concept within 90–120 days of data access.
6. Respondent must provide delivery of planning relevant analytical outputs including dashboards or other visual tools.

7. All data provided by MSU or generated through the use of MSU systems, networks, or facilities, as well as all analytical outputs, reports, dashboards, metrics, models (as applied), and derivative datasets produced as part of this study, shall be owned exclusively by Michigan State University.

7.2 Future Scalability & Pricing

MSU requests that proposers provide indicative pricing information for scaling the proposed solution beyond the proof of concept, should the University elect to pursue a future phase.

This information is requested for planning and evaluation purposes only and does not constitute a commitment by MSU to proceed with any expanded deployment or to procure additional services.

Proposers should, at a minimum, describe:

- Pricing models for scaling coverage (e.g., additional buildings, increased square footage, or campus-wide deployment)
- Cost drivers and assumptions (e.g., number of access points, buildings, users, or data volume)
- Subscription vs. term-based pricing structures, if applicable
- Any one-time fees versus recurring costs
- Expected changes to cost with increased scale or functionality

Proposers should clearly distinguish PoC pricing from indicative future pricing and identify any elements that would require further scoping or negotiation.

PRICING

Please include two (2) Pricing proposals as identified below on a separate sheet:

1. Proof of Concept Pricing Model
2. Future Scalability and Pricing Model

1. Proof of Concept (PoC) Pricing Model

1a. Pricing Overview

Provide a high-level summary of your pricing approach for the Proof of Concept (PoC).

Total proposed PoC cost: \$

Pricing structure (select all that apply):

- One-time fixed fee
 Subscription-based
 Term-based
 Usage-based

1b. One-Time Costs (Implementation / Setup)

Provide detailed one-time costs below:

Cost Component	Description	Unit Basis	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Implementation					
Data Integration					
Configuration					
Training					
Other (Please describe)					
Other (Please describe)					
Other (Please describe)					

1c. Recurring Costs

Provide recurring costs (if applicable):

Cost Component	Billing Frequency	Unit Basis	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Subscription					
Data Processing					
Support					
Hosting					
Other (Please describe)					
Other (Please describe)					
Other (Please describe)					

1d. Cost Drivers and Assumptions

Identify key pricing drivers and assumptions:

- Number of access points
- Buildings
- Square footage
- Users/devices
- Data volume
- Integration complexity
- Update frequency
- Other

1e. Optional / Add-On Services

List optional services and associated pricing.

1f. Risks and Pricing Sensitivities

Identify risks or conditions that may impact pricing.

1g. PoC Pricing Validity

The signature below confirms that this proposal is valid for 120 days after the due date.

Supplier

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Company: _____

Date: _____

2. Future Scalability and Pricing Model

2a. Pricing Overview

Provide a high-level summary of your pricing approach for future scalability beyond the proof of concept.

Pricing structure (select all that apply):

- One-time fixed fee
 Subscription-based
 Term-based
 Usage-based

2b. One-Time Costs (Implementation / Setup)

Provide detailed one-time costs below:

Cost Component	Description	Unit Basis	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Implementation					
Data Integration					
Configuration					
Training					
Other (Please describe)					
Other (Please describe)					
Other (Please describe)					

2c. Recurring Costs

Provide recurring costs (if applicable):

Cost Component	Billing Frequency	Unit Basis	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Subscription					
Data Processing					
Support					
Hosting					
Other (Please describe)					
Other (Please describe)					
Other (Please describe)					

2d. Cost Drivers and Assumptions

Identify key pricing drivers and assumptions:

- Number of access points
- Buildings
- Square footage
- Users/devices
- Data volume

- Integration complexity
- Update frequency
- Other

2e. Optional / Add-On Services

List optional services and associated pricing.

2f. Risks and Pricing Sensitivities

Identify risks or conditions that may impact pricing.

2g. Pricing Model and Scaling Approach

Describe how pricing scales with:

- Additional buildings
- Increased square footage
- Additional access points
- Additional users/devices
- Campus-wide deployment
- Expanded analytics/features

2h. Future Scalability Pricing Validity

The signature below confirms that this proposal is valid for 120 days after the due date.

Supplier

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Company: _____

Date: _____

MASTER SERVICE AGREEMENT

(attached as a separate document)

Please refer to Section 9 of the RFP Instructions when reviewing the Master Services Agreement terms and conditions.