REPUBLIKA NG PILIPINAS
KAGAWARAN NG KATARUNGAN
PANGASIWAAN SA PATALAAN NG LUPAIN
(LAND REGISTRATION AUTHORITY)
East Avenue cor. NIA Road, Diliman, Quezon City

MEMORANDUM
07 October 2026

TO	:	**ALL PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS**
SUBJECT	:	**BID BULLETIN NO. 2**
FOR	:	**Supply, Delivery, Installation, Configuration, Testing, and Support of a Scalable Network Attached Storage (NAS) Solution**

This Bid Bulletin is hereby issued for the information and guidance of all prospective bidders, and for inclusion in the Bid Proposal to be submitted to the LRA - Special Bids and Awards Committee (SBAC) for the **Supply, Delivery, Installation, Configuration, Testing, and Support of a Scalable Network Attached Storage (NAS) Solution (Project ID No. LRASBAC-2026-02).**

These changes, revisions, modifications, or clarifications shall become an integral part of the Contract as well the Bidding Documents, and shall be taken into account in the submission of the sealed proposal.

I. **Amendment to Paragraph 2 of the Invitation to Bid (Re: Single Largest Completed Contract or SLCC)**

Paragraph 2 of the Invitation to Bid states that *"bidders should have completed at least one (1) contract similar to the project **within the last three (3) years** from the date of submission and receipt of bids"* (emphasis supplied).
The Bid Data Sheet, however, states that *"the Bidder must have completed at least one (1) contract similar to the Project **within the last five (5) years** prior to the deadline for the submission and receipt of bids."*
The period stated in the Bid Data Sheet shall govern. Accordingly, the Invitation to Bid is hereby amended to require that the **SLCC be completed within the last five (5) years from the date of submission and receipt of bids.**

II. **SLCC Requirement**

- The SLCC requirement cannot be broadened.
- Acceptable SLCC must involve projects with comparable technical complexity, specifically:
  (a) Network Attached Storage (NAS)
  (b) Storage Area Network (SAN)
  (c) Hyperconverged Infrastructure (HCI)
  (d) Enterprise servers with centralized storage subsystems
  (e) Data center modernization
  (f) Virtualization clusters with shared storage
  (g) Enterprise backup/archiving/storage integration systems

- The following projects not considered similar:
  (a) Supply of laptops, desktops, printers, scanners
  (b) Supply of switches, routers, access points

(c) Supply of general ICT peripherals
(d) Any ICT equipment procurement without storage integration, configuration, or commissioning

III. Delivery Period

The **sixty (60) calendar-day completion period shall commence from receipt of the Notice to Proceed (NTP)** issued by the procuring entity. The period covers the entire project scope, including equipment delivery, installation, configuration, migration, testing, training, commissioning, and final acceptance. This timeline is being strictly upheld due to the urgent requirements of the transition project *(Transition Operations and Maintenance Services)*, which necessitates the immediate deployment of the procured solution.

IV. Queries and Clarifications

REF.	PROVISION	BIDDER QUERY	ANSWER
		TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	
A.1	All equipment to be supplied shall be brand new, unused, and of internationally recognized enterprise-class brand. The manufacturer must be ISO-certified and compliant with relevant international standards (e.g., FIPS 140, NIST 800-209, ISO/IEC)	Will LRA accept SOC 2, GDPR, HIPAA, or FIPS 140-2 instead of ISO certification? (asked 2x)	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
B.1	The proposed solution must provide dual-controller High Availability (HA) architecture.	Can we propose a software-defined distributed file system, or any redundant architecture with equivalent or higher availability and failover? (asked 3x)	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
B.2	The proposed solution must support active/passive controller failover with automated resource ownership transfer	Can LRA consider active-active, active-passive, or equivalent dual-controller HA? Can we propose a software-defined distributed file system with software-defined failover covering node and drive failure? (asked 2x)	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
B.3	The proposed solution must eliminate all single points of failure	Does a software-defined distributed file system with automated node and	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.

		drive failover meet this requirement? (asked 2x)	
B.4	The proposed solution must support automatic failover between controllers.	Can we propose a software-defined distributed file system with software-defined failover?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
B.6	The proposed solution must utilize a modern copy-on-write storage architecture.	What workload or compatibility requires copy-on-write? Can LRA allow any architecture with equivalent or superior snapshot, consistency, integrity, and recovery capabilities?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated. ZFS and/or OpenZFS-based file systems and copy-on-write are open standards that are widely used across major Unix/Linux operating systems.
B.8	The proposed solution must support unified storage architecture supporting block, file and object services from a single platform.	Can this be limited to file and object, since block storage is used for SAN and not NAS?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
C.1	The proposed storage solution must have dual highly available storage controllers with failover capability	Can we propose a software-defined distributed file system with software-defined failover?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
C.2	The proposed storage solution must include minimum 384 GB upgradable to 768 GB RAM	(a) Can total memory across both controllers count, if configured at 384 GB and expandable to 768 GB? (b) Can RAM be lowered to 128 GB per server storage node, or fixed at 512 GB per controller?	(a) LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated. (b) LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
C.3	The proposed storage solution must include a minimum 20 physical CPU cores upgradable to 64 CPU cores.	(a) Can LRA consider processor performance instead of a core count? (b) Can the minimum be lowered to 12 physical cores per storage node, and does this apply per controller? (asked 2x)	(a) LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated. (b) LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project. The per-controller question was not directly answered.
C.4	The proposed storage solution must have a minimum 40 processing	(a) Can LRA consider overall processing performance instead of a	(a) LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.

	threads.	thread count? (b) Can the minimum be lowered to 24 threads per storage node? (asked 2x)	(b) LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
C.6	The proposed storage solution must include NVMe-based read acceleration capability.	Can LRA consider SSD, NVMe, RAM-based, or equivalent read-caching technology?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
C.7	The proposed storage solution must have a minimum four (4) NVMe expansion slots	Can LRA consider SSD/NVMe caching or equivalent acceleration instead of four dedicated NVMe slots?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
C.8	The proposed storage solution must have minimum twenty-four (24) 3.5-inches drive bays in the controller enclosure.	Can LRA consider fewer 3.5" bays, provided the complete system meets the required capacity, performance, and resiliency?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
C.9	The proposed storage solution must have redundant hot-swappable power supplies and cooling components	Can LRA consider the required total storage capacity instead of a minimum drive count? Can the requirement be adjusted to a minimum of 160 operational drives?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
C.9	The proposed storage solution must support a minimum of 162 operation drives within the proposed configuration.	Can this be revised to a minimum of 160 operational drives?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the

			requirements of the project.
D.1.1	Raw Storage Capacity 2.91 PB	Can LRA consider sufficient raw capacity to reach the required usable capacity after RAID overhead?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
D.1.2–2	Capacity requirements	Can LRA consider compression and deduplication when calculating effective capacity?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
D.1.3	Effective Capacity 2.9 PB	Can this item be removed or clarified, since it pertains to block storage, which NAS doesn't have? (asked 2x)	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated, but bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
D.1.4	Hot Spare Drives minimum 4	Can this be removed or waived if erasure coding is used instead of RAID levels? (asked 2x)	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
D.2	The proposed solution storage media must be enterprise-class nearline SAS drives	Can LRA consider enterprise-class SAS drives or equivalent enterprise-rated media suitable for 24×7 operation?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
D.3	The proposed solution storage media must have a minimum 18 TB per drive.	Can LRA consider different drive capacities, provided the total required capacity is achieved?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the

			requirements of the project.
D.4	The proposed solution storage media must have dual-port SAS architecture.	(a) Can LRA consider dual-path SAS or equivalent redundant connectivity? (b) Can we offer 25GbE iSCSI expansion for software-defined distributed file systems? (asked 2x)	(a) LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated. (b) LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
E.1	The proposed solution must support end-to-end checksumming of both data and metadata.	Is this a functional outcome or a mandatory implementation mechanism?	This is a mandatory requirement. It helps prevent silent data corruption (bit rot).
E.8	The proposed solution must support FIPS 140 for Data-at-rest and data-in-flight	Can LRA consider FIPS 140 or equivalent recognized encryption standards supported by the manufacturer?	Bidders may propose FIPS 140 or ISO/IEC 19790.
E.9	The proposed solution must support encrypted drives and datasets, KMIP	Can LRA consider KMIP or equivalent secure key-management technology?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
E.10	The proposed solution must support NIST 800-209, GPOS STIG	(a) Can LRA consider NIST, FIPS, ISO/IEC, or equivalent recognized security standards? (b) Can SOC 2, GDPR, HIPAA, and FIPS 140-2 be accepted instead? (c) Will SOC 2 and FIPS 140-2 be accepted in place of NIST 800-209 and GPOS STIG?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
F.1	The proposed solution must support single-parity protection	Can this be revised to allow any of single, dual, or triple parity protection? (asked 2x)	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
F.3	The proposed solution must support triple-parity protection.	Can LRA consider triple parity or equivalent multiple-disk failure protection?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
F.4	The proposed solution must support mirrored storage groups.	Does this pertain to replication? Can LRA share details of the existing NAS? (asked 2x)	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated. This refers to the ability to copy data to two or more

			disk drives.
H.1	The proposed solution must support inline compression and deduplication	Is erasure coding an acceptable alternative? (asked 2x)	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
H.2	The proposed solution must support dataset or volume-level storage policies.	Is a storage policy via snapshot acceptable? (asked 2x)	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated, but bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
H.3	The proposed solution must support thick and thin provisioning	Can we offer thick provisioning only and remove thin provisioning? (asked 2x)	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
H.4	The proposed solution must support SSD and NVMe acceleration	Can LRA consider SSD, NVMe, RAM-based, or equivalent caching and acceleration technology?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
H.6	The proposed solution must support intelligent caching mechanisms.	(a) Can LRA consider ZFS or equivalent copy-on-write with equivalent RAID and data-protection features? (b) What LRA system or dependency requires ZFS? Can it be replaced with outcome-based requirements? (c) Can we propose erasure coding across nodes instead?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated for all three. ZFS and/or OpenZFS-based file systems and copy-on-write are open standards that are widely used across major Unix/Linux operating systems. The requested dependency information cannot be disclosed because it contains confidential and sensitive data.
I.1	The proposed storage solution must include a minimum 2 x 10GbE RJ45 interface.	Can LRA consider 10GbE RJ45, SFP+, or higher-speed Ethernet interfaces?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
I.2	The proposed storage solution must include a minimum 2 x 25GbE SFP28 interface.	Can LRA consider built-in or manufacturer-supported expansion cards for the 25GbE interfaces?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
J.1	The proposed solution	Can LRA consider	LRA prefers to retain the

	must support SMB v.1,2,3/CIFS, FTP, Webshare.	current SMB/CIFS, FTP/SFTP, and web-based file-sharing protocols?	minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
J.4	The proposed solution must support S3-compatible object storage	(a) Can LRA consider S3-compatible storage provided natively or through manufacturer-supported software? (b) Does this refer to integration with S3-compatible object storage using an API?	(a) LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project (b) Yes. It refers to integration capability via S3 APIs.
J.5	The proposed solution must support OpenStack Cinder	Can this requirement be removed, since not all NAS support OpenStack Cinder?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirements as stated.
K.1	The proposed solution must support a minimum of eight (8) expansion shelves per storage system	Can LRA consider total supported expansion capacity instead of a shelf count?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
K.2	The proposed solution must support High-density expansion shelves supporting more than 100 drives per enclosure	(a) Can LRA consider total expansion capacity instead of a drive count per enclosure? (b) Can this be revised to at least 25 drives per storage node/disk shelf enclosure?	For both questions, IRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
K.5	The proposed solution must support growth beyond 8 PB raw storage capacity without controller replacement.	Can LRA consider scale-up, scale-out, or additional manufacturer-supported systems for future expansion?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
L.1	The proposed solution must support Web-based administration,	Can Netdata be replaced by equivalent manufacturer-supported	**The request is accepted in part.** The Web, SSH, and Syslog requirements are

	SSH, Syslog and Netdata	monitoring? Can web management, CLI/SSH, and Syslog or equivalent monitoring suffice? (asked 2x)	maintained, but bidders may propose a Netdata-equivalent real-time performance monitoring tool.
L.2	The proposed solution must support REST/Websocket API integration.	Can LRA consider REST, WebSocket, or equivalent management APIs?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
L.3	The proposed solution must support SNMP monitoring.	(a) Will LRA allow web-based monitoring as an alternative? (b) Can the required integration/security functions be retained while allowing equivalent directory, authentication, authorization, and audit mechanisms?	(a) LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project. (b) **The revision is accepted.** FreeIPA or an equivalent identity platform such as Active Directory, LDAP, or RADIUS may be used.
L.6	The proposed solution must support FreeIPA integration.	(a) Can LRA consider Active Directory, LDAP, Kerberos, FreeIPA, or equivalent directory services? (b) Can the FreeIPA requirement be removed, since not all enterprise NAS support it?	(a) LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated. **(b) Accepted.** FreeIPA or an equivalent identity platform such as Active Directory, LDAP, or RADIUS may be used.
L.10	The proposed solution must support alert notification via email, AWS-SNS, Hipchat, InfluxDB, Slack, Mattermost, OpsGenie, PagerDuty and VictorOPs	Can LRA consider email, SNMP, Syslog, API/webhook, or equivalent integrations? Would email alone suffice? (asked 2x)	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
L.11	The proposed solution must support signed updates with the ability to rollback	Can LRA consider secure updates with manufacturer-supported recovery or rollback? Can the rollback requirement be removed? (asked 3x)	For the first two queries, IRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project. For the third, IRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
L.12	The proposed solution	Can there be a dedicated	The request is accepted. Out-

	must support Out-of-band Management	or separate management interface from production storage traffic?	of-band management means separating production or data traffic from the management VLAN.
M.2	The proposed solution must support KVM, Citrix XenServer and other common hypervisor	Can NFS be proposed as a workaround, or would one common hypervisor suffice?	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirements as stated.
M.4	The proposed solution must support enterprise backup platforms (e.g. Veeam, Commvault, Asigra, Acronis, Nakivo, Netbackup and more)	(a) Can LRA consider support through certified integration or standard storage protocols? (asked 2x) (b) Would support for one enterprise backup platform be acceptable?	(a) LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project. (b) The proposed solution must support at least one enterprise backup platform.
N.11	The proposed solution must deliver ultra-low latency of less than 850 ns.	A bidder proposed a TOR switch with maximum port-to-port latency of less than 10 µs.	LRA prefers to retain the technical requirement as stated.
O.5	Must have an authorized service center in the Philippines, ensuring after-sales support.	Can vendor-supported onsite support be accepted as an alternative to an authorized service center?	Onsite support service may be accepted as an alternative, subject to verification that the vendor can provide equivalent after-sales support, including qualified personnel, spare-parts availability, and guaranteed response times within the Philippines.
Specs	Exact controller RAM/CPU/thread configuration	What benchmark or sizing basis set these values? Can minimum sustained performance, latency, throughput, concurrency, and scalability targets be used instead?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
Specs	Minimum 24 × 3.5" bays in controller enclosure	Why must capacity be in a controller enclosure with this bay count? Can capacity, redundancy, serviceability, and expansion be defined instead?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
Specs	Minimum 162	What calculation sets 162	LRA prefers to retain the

	operational drives	drives as a threshold? Can the drive count be removed in favor of capacity, performance, endurance, rebuild, and resiliency requirements?	minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
Specs	Nearline SAS, ≥18 TB, dual-port SAS	What LRA requirement necessitates these? Can equivalent enterprise media be allowed?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project.
Specs	Expansion shelf / high-density enclosure	What operational need requires this shelf count and density? Can non-disruptive expansion to target capacity be required instead?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project. The requested information will only be disclosed to the winning bidder because it contains confidential and sensitive data.
Specs	Named technologies (Netdata, FreeIPA, OpenStack Cinder, alerting platforms)	Which are deployed or planned by LRA? Can mandatory integrations be limited to actual LRA systems, or standards-based equivalents accepted?	LRA prefers to maintain the technical requirement as stated. For FreeIPA, the request is accepted. FreeIPA or an equivalent identity platform such as Active Directory, LDAP, or RADIUS may be used.
Specs	Overall request to accept equivalent or superior enterprise storage technologies	Will LRA remove or revise the technology- and architecture-specific requirements if the solution meets or exceeds the required capacity, performance, availability, resiliency, security, and support obligations?	LRA prefers to retain the minimum technical requirement as stated. However, bidders may propose higher or enhanced specifications, provided these exceed the minimum and remain fully compliant with the requirements of the project. Detailed information will not be published in the Supplemental Bid Bulletin but will be disclosed exclusively to the winning bidder, in accordance with data security and confidentiality protocols.

1

Specs	ZFS dependency	What existing system, application, or dependency makes ZFS and RAID-Z/dRAID mandatory? If none, can it be replaced with technology-neutral criteria?	LRA prefers to maintain the technical requirement. ZFS and/or OpenZFS-based file systems and copy-on-write are an open-source standard widely used across major Unix/Linux operating systems. The requested information cannot be disclosed because it contains confidential and sensitive data.
	SCOPE OF WORKS		
1.a	Supply and deliver all NAS units, hard disk drives, accessories, and related components.	Is this a scale-out expansion of existing storage or a separate platform? What are the existing components and interoperability needs? (asked 2x)	This is a separate platform. The requested information about the current platform cannot be disclosed because it contains confidential and sensitive data, in compliance with existing cybersecurity protocols. Full disclosure will be provided only to the winning bidder.
2.a	Perform rack mounting, drive installation, cabling, and network setup at the designated site(s).	Is there a dedicated rack space/cabinet, or should rack cabinets be included in the bid? (asked 2x)	Yes. There is a provisioned rack space for this NAS project.
5.a–b	a. Provide migration services from existing systems, including Physical-to-Virtual (P2V) and Virtual-to-Virtual (V2V) migrations. b. Ensure minimal downtime and data integrity during migration.	What is the existing NAS and its specifications, for compatibility checking? (asked 2x)	The requested information cannot be disclosed because it contains confidential and sensitive data, in compliance with existing cybersecurity protocols. Full disclosure will be provided only to the winning bidder.
5.a–b	(same)	The source environment and data volume are not described. Please provide platforms, hypervisors, server and VM counts, protocols, data volume, file shares, connectivity, migration window, allowable downtime, and validation/rollback requirements.	These details will be provided to the winning bidder during project implementation. They form part of the transition and migration planning activities and will be finalized through joint assessment and coordination with LRA's technical team, to ensure data integrity and minimal service disruption.
	QUALIFICATION AND ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS		
E.1.2	E.1.2 At least two (2)	Will certifications from	Yes. Certifications that

	manufacturer-certified engineers assigned to the project, with: • Valid certifications and company IDs • Proof of employment with the bidder for at least one (1) year prior to bid opening	manufacturers other than the one offered be accepted if related to storage? Must they strictly match the proposed brand? (asked 2x)	demonstrate equivalent technical competency will be accepted, subject to validation by the reviewers.
E.3	Experience and Track Record • Evidence of at least one (1) similar completed projects involving Supply, Delivery, Installation, Configuration, Commissioning, Testing And Support of a Scalable Network Attached Storage (Nas) Solution and/or Enterprise-grade ICT infrastructure with centralized storage in the Philippines within the last three (3) years, including end user certificates of completion/acceptance. • Certification from end-user agencies that the bidder has no negative slippage or blacklisting in the last three (3) years.	Would certifications from two (2) end-user agencies suffice?	Yes. It is acceptable as long as it is a certificate or official letter issued by an authorized representative of the end-user and it clearly identifies the project, bidder/contractor, period of implementation, and relevant performance information.
E.3	(same)	What is the required number of certifications?	At least one certificate or official letter issued by an

			authorized representative of the end-user is acceptable, provided it clearly identifies the project, bidder/contractor, period of implementation, and relevant performance information.
E.3	(same)	Does "end-user agencies" mean only LRA, all government agencies served, or only the clients of the similar completed contracts submitted for this bid?	The term refers to the client entities that directly received and used the goods or services delivered under similar completed contracts. The certifications should therefore come from the end-user clients of the similar completed contracts submitted for this bid, not exclusively from LRA and not from all government agencies served by the bidder.
E.3	(same)	Must the certification come from all end-user clients in the bidder's ongoing and completed contracts?	The certification must be obtained only from the end-user client or clients of the similar completed contracts submitted as evidence under this bid.
E.3	(same)	What are the prescribed format, signatory, validity period, and minimum contents?	No format is prescribed. A certificate or official letter issued by an authorized representative of the end-user is acceptable, provided it clearly identifies the project, bidder/contractor, period of implementation, and relevant performance information.
E.3	(same)	Are private-sector references acceptable, or only Philippine government agencies?	Certifications and references from private-sector end users are acceptable, provided the projects are comparable in scope, scale, and complexity to the similar completed contracts being submitted. Certifications from Philippine government agencies are preferred, as they demonstrate compliance with public sector standards, documentation, and performance validation requirements.
SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF THE CONTRACT			
GCC 10.3 Terms of Payment	The SCC states 40% + 40% + 15% + 5% warranty holdback, while	Which is the controlling schedule? Is the last 20% paid upon final	The controlling schedule is 80% upon delivery, installation, configuration, and

	the TOR states 40% + 40% + 20%.	acceptance, or is 15% paid with 5% retained as warranty holdback?	successful testing, and the remaining 20% paid in full upon final acceptance and turnover. There will be no separate 5% warranty holdback, since warranty obligations are covered under the standard warranty provisions of the contract.
GCC 6.2	Delivery and Documents	Is the 5-year requirement a support obligation or only spare-parts availability? Are Years 4 and 5 parts, labor, and services chargeable?	The requirement is a spare-parts availability requirement, not an extended five-year support obligation. After the three-year warranty expires, replacement spare parts, labor, and related services during Years 4 and 5 are chargeable separately to LRA, in accordance with prevailing service and maintenance arrangements.

V. LRA-BAC Reminders:

1. This Supplemental/Bid Bulletin No. 2 shall form part of the Bidding Documents and must be included in the submission of the Bid Proposal. Any provisions in the Bidding Documents inconsistent herewith is hereby amended, modified, and superseded accordingly.
2. Make sure to avail or employ a copy of the revised Omnibus Sworn Statement (OSS) which can be downloadable from the website of the GPPB.
3. All prospective bidders are reminded to carefully review the Bidding Documents and this Bid Bulletin, and to ensure strict compliance with the documentary, technical, and financial requirements prescribed therein.
4. End of Bid Bulletin No. 2 - Supply, Delivery, Installation, Configuration, Testing, and Support of a Scalable Network Attached Storage (NAS) Solution (Project ID No. LRASBAC-2026-02)

[redacted]

ATTY. JAMES BENEDICT R. GUTIERREZ
Chairperson, LRA Special Bids and Awards Committee