



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
FINANCE BUREAU

1225 Fallon Street, Room 210, Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone 510-891-6017· Fax 510-891-6219

TO: POTENTIAL BIDDERS RECEIVING RFP NUMBER SC 011/021

FROM: Superior Court of California, County of Alameda
Finance Bureau

DATE: August 31, 2011

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: ADDENDUM NO. 2 TO RFP NUMBER SC 011/021

CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Linda Salcido: Procurement Manager
TEL: 510-891-6216
FAX: 510-891-6219
E-MAIL: bidquestions@alameda.courts.ca.gov

This Addendum No. 2 is issued for the Alameda Court Voice System RFP No SC 011/021 which was issued on Wednesday, August 24, 2011.

Questions and Responses

Q1: Is it permissible to propose a “hosted” solution, rather than a “premise-based” solution.

A1: For all solutions some elements of equipment will be required at each Court location, for example, telephones, gateways for analog trunks and analog extensions, etc. To the extent that a proposal can meet all of the requirements of the RFP and Court operating and security requirements, vendors may propose to “host” equipment or functions at some site other than a Court location if they do not have to be associated with a specific physical site.

However, the RFP also assumes that the proposed system is a one-time purchase, not a financed or monthly service payment model. Vendors that meet all of the requirements of the RFP as written may propose as an optional alternative other pricing arrangements for the Court to consider.

Q2: Can proposals assume the retention of the existing RightFax system?

A2: Yes, the existing RightFax system may be retained if it can be integrated into the proposed new system. If a proposal assumes retention of the RightFax system, all costs associated with needed upgrades to that

system, integration of the system into the new proposed voice communications system, and ongoing maintenance support and software upgrades must be included in the proposal.

Q3: Why is there a requirement for 8 T1 interfaces/gateway equipment included in the RFP?

A3: As discussed in the RFP, the Court is planning to use SIP trunking. However, how that service will be configured or purchased is proceeding in a separate process. For the purposes of this RFP, the Court wants to include the costs of the hardware and software that would be required to terminate 8 new T1's worth of external network connectivity that could be used for SIP trunking (Item 1.3 on the pricing spreadsheet). This cost is for the terminating gateway equipment, not for any carrier services associate with those terminations.

This specification is not the same thing as SIP trunk licenses that may be required on a new voice communications system. If required, those licenses are included in Item 2.5 of the pricing spreadsheet. If SIP trunk software licenses are required for the proposed system, vendors should include the cost to license 192 (8x24) simultaneous external SIP trunk connections.

Q4: The "96 SLT ports for faxes, modems/credit card terminals/etc" are of concern, since faxing is generally okay but credit card terminals sometimes will not work properly on SIP trunks. Also, placing SLT ports at different sites may require add'l gateways. Are these both "ignore for now" items, or can you quantify the breakout of SLT devices by type and site?

A4: It is assumed that supporting analog stations at each location will require some on-premise equipment. Including that equipment in the quantities shown is a requirement of the RFP. At this time it is not possible for the Court to provide a specific list of how many and what types of analog extensions will be required at each location. Vendors should make a reasonable effort to estimate those individual site requirements based on the current size of a location as shown in the table in Section 2.16.1 of the RFP, but must include a minimum of 96 ports in total, both for hardware and software licenses.

Q5: The RFP includes a requirement for 350 Contact Center agent/supervisor licenses. Is that requirement for "named users" or "concurrent users"?

A5: At a minimum the Court must be able to associate Contact Center agent privileges on the system to 350 unique employee names. However, it is unlikely that 350 employees would be logged in and using that capability at the same time. If agent licenses are assigned dynamically as users log on and that effects the total cost and quantity of licenses required, vendors may assume that only 75% of the named users will be logged in simultaneously. If user licenses are assigned dynamically as logged in agents actually handle a transaction, vendors may assume that only 50% of named users are actually active on a transaction at peak load (i.e. the system must be licensed to handle 175 simultaneous live contact center transactions.)

Q6: Currently the Jury IVR system has 96 analog Centrex lines connected directly into the system that are not part of the Inter-Tel PBX trunking. Is this arrangement going to be maintained in the event that ASC opts not to replace those applications? In other words, in the new IP Tel environment, will the calls to the Jury system originate in the new IP Tel PBX?

A6: It is likely that in any new trunking arrangement that DID blocks would be consolidated on common trunks and Centrex numbers converted to DID numbers. Logically, incoming calls to the current Centrex numbers would then come into the new voice communications switch and be transferred to the IVR system, either new or existing. The RFP has not specifically provided for a trunking connection from the voice switch to the IVR system other than a LAN connection. If your proposal requires analog, T1, or SIP trunking connections between the two new systems, any additional interface hardware and software licenses

required should be included in both the technical proposal and the pricing. Please clearly note where that has been added to the pricing spreadsheets. If the existing IVR systems are to be retained, trunking requirements into the new voice switch will be determined at a later stage of the procurement process.

Q7: Regarding Traffic IVR application, how do the callers reach the Traffic IVR application? Is the "entry" or ingress into the IVR through the Inter-Tel or do they operate independently from one another?

A7: Users call into the Inter-Tel system and are transferred off-net to the EDS system if they select pay-by-telephone from the Auto Attendant menu. Once transferred out they cannot transfer back to the Court telephone system. For an example, you can make a test call to the numbers shown on the Court website. https://www.acgov.org/mvp_app/CitationServlet

Q8: Are any of the contact center agents connected to the IVR applications? In other words, are the callers for the IVR applications given an option to zero out to speak to an agent.

A8: No. Additional information on the Jury IVR can be found at <http://www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/Pages.aspx/Jury-Duty-IVR>

Reminders:

Requests for Clarification:	Friday, September 16, 2011
Proposal Due Date and Time:	Tuesday, October 4, 2011 at 4:00PM
Vendor Presentations:	Wednesday, October 19, 2011
Selection of Lead Vendors:	October 21, 2011
Notice of Intent to Award:	November 4, 2011
Notice of Award:	December 5, 2011

Any further questions should be submitted directly to the Court's email address at bidquestions@alameda.courts.ca.gov. Further questions will be answered in an Addendum and the document will be posted on the Courts website.

Thank you.