



**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Voice Communications System Project

RFP SC 011/021

PROPOSALS DUE BY

September 27, 2011 – 4:00 PM Pacific Time

Table of Contents

I. Introduction – Summary of the Intended Procurement

- 1.1 Issuing Body
- 1.2 RFP Layout and Sections
- 1.3 Project Overview

II. Procurement and Evaluation Process

- 2.1 Procurement Schedule and General Instructions
 - 2.1.1 Contact List
 - 2.1.2 Disposition of Material and Confidential or Proprietary Information
 - 2.1.3 Proposal Preparation Costs
- 2.2 Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference
- 2.3 Pre-Submittal Process
 - 2.3.1 Request for Clarifications or Modifications
 - 2.3.2 Ambiguity, Discrepancies, Omissions
 - 2.3.3 Contact with Court
 - 2.3.4 RFP Addenda
- 2.4 Submission of Proposals
 - 2.4.1 Proposal Delivery
 - 2.4.2 Amendment or Withdrawal of Proposals
 - 2.4.3 Mistake in Proposal
 - 2.4.4 Error in Submitted Proposals
 - 2.4.5 Authorized Signatures, Validity Period of Proposals
 - 2.4.6 Knowledge of Requirements
 - 2.4.7 Independence of Proposal and Joint Proposals
 - 2.4.8 Covenant Against Gratuities
- 2.5 Overview of Evaluation Process
 - 2.5.1 Evaluation Committee
 - 2.5.2 Reservation of Rights
 - 2.5.3 Evaluation of Price Sheets
 - 2.5.4 Requests for Additional Information
 - 2.5.5 Brand Names
 - 2.5.6 Samples
- 2.6 Minimum Qualifications
- 2.7 Evaluation Criteria
- 2.8 Interviews and Negotiations
 - 2.8.1 Interviews
 - 2.8.2 Negotiations
 - 2.8.3 Payment
 - 2.8.4 News Releases
- 2.9 Award of Contract
- 2.10 Protest Procedures
 - 2.10.1 General
 - 2.10.2 Prior to Submission of Proposal
 - 2.10.3 After Award
 - 2.10.4 Form of Protest
 - 2.10.5 Determination of Protest Submitted Prior to Submission of Proposal
 - 2.10.6 Determination of Protest Submitted After Submission of Proposal
 - 2.10.7 Appeals Process
 - 2.10.8 Protest Remedies
- 2.11 General Instructions for Pricing
- 2.12 Government Rates
- 2.13 Warranty
- 2.14 Invoicing
- 2.15 Contract Terms

- 2.16 Existing Voice/Video/Data Systems and Facilities Plans
 - 2.16.1 Existing Voice and Video Communications Systems
 - 2.16.2 Existing Data Communications and Processing Systems
 - 2.16.3 Facilities Plans
- 2.17 Overview of New Voice Communications System Requirements
- 2.18 Description of IVR System Requirements

III. Vendor Qualifications

- 3.1 Executive Summary
 - 3.1.1 Executive Summary Content
 - 3.1.2 Vendor Information, Validity, and Authorized Signature
- 3.2 Company and Subcontractor Information
 - 3.2.1 Company Background Information
 - 3.2.2 Subcontractors
- 3.3 Experience and Qualifications
 - 3.3.1 Prior Experience and References
 - 3.3.2 Subcontracts
- 3.4 Personnel, Staffing, and System Support Operations
 - 3.4.1 Design and Installation Project Team and Project Manager
 - 3.4.2 Post-Install Support Team and Customer Service Operations
 - 3.4.3 Installation and Training Project Plan
- 3.5 System and Station Feature List
- 3.6 Environmentally Preferable Purchasing
 - 3.6.1 Manufacturer
 - 3.6.2 Channel Partner/VAR
 - 3.6.3 Products

IV. Technical Proposal – Voice Communications System

V. Technical Proposal – IVR System

VI. Pricing

- 6.A Voice Communications System
- 6.B IVR System

VII. Attachments

- A- Vendor Certification Form
- B- Guidelines for Evaluation Committee Review of Technical Proposals
- C- Voice Network Diagram
- D- Data Network Diagrams
- E- Features List
- F- Voice Communications System Pricing
- G- IVR System Pricing
- H- Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Worksheet
- I- Sample Contract

I. INTRODUCTION – SUMMARY OF THE INTENDED PROCUREMENT

1.1 Issuing Body

The Superior Court of California, County of Alameda (“Court”) is issuing this Request for Proposal (“RFP”) to provide the Court with competitive bids for a Voice Communications System and Interactive Voice Response/Interactive Web Response (IVR/IWR) System.

1.2 RFP Layout and Sections

This RFP is set forth in sections as follows:

- I. Introduction – Summary of the Intended Procurement
- II. Procurement and Evaluation Process
- III. Vendor Qualifications
- IV. Technical Proposal – Voice Communications System
- V. Technical Proposal – IVR System
- VI. Pricing
- VII. Attachments

1.3 Project Overview

The Court is requesting proposals from highly qualified vendors with expertise in providing voice communications systems, professional services for design, installation and configuration of the systems, and ongoing support and maintenance services.

Voice communications services at the Alameda Superior Court are currently provided by a networked system of Inter-Tel Axxess digital PBX’s and Enterprise Messaging voicemail systems. The system includes advanced Contact Center technology and desktop integrated messaging. The PBX systems at the court locations are currently connected to each other using the Court’s multi-service Opt-E-Man network from AT&T. All of the Inter-Tel systems and equipment were purchased under the a “Total Solutions Plan” (TSP) lease agreement. The leases were activated as each site was turned up on a staggered implementation plan. Leases for approximately half of the extensions on the system will reach their expiration in the fall of 2011. However, leases on the two largest of the Court’s locations do not reach their full term until November 2012 and February 2013.

This RFP is part of a process initiated by the Court to evaluate options for providing voice communications services to all of its locations in the future. Vendors are being asked to provide a proposal for a system that would replace or supercede the existing system. The Court is asking vendors to propose a “next-generation” system built on IP technology. In addition, the Court is requesting vendors to provide proposals for a self-service Interactive Voice Response (IVR) platform that can support multiple applications.

The Court intends to reach an agreement with a vendor for the system that best meets the Court’s future needs for voice communications at the lowest total long-run cost. The agreement is expected to include a base voice communications system and optional elements that can improve the effectiveness and efficiency of Court operations. However, the Court reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, in whole or in part, submitted in response to this RFP. The Court further reserves the right to make no award and to modify or cancel, in whole or in part, this RFP.

II. PROCUREMENT AND EVALUATION PROCESS

2.1 Procurement Schedule and General Instructions

The Court has developed the following list of key events from RFP issuance through notice contract award. All deadlines are subject to change at the Court’s discretion.

No.	EVENTS	Key Dates
1	Issue RFP	8-24-11
2	E-mail Letter of Intent from Proposers to Participate in Pre-Proposal Conference	8-31-11 5 PM
3	Pre-Proposal Conference Date and Time	9-7-11, 10AM-Noon
4	Deadline for Proposer Requests for Clarifications or Modifications	9-16-11
5	Proposal Due Date and Time	9-27-11, 4PM
6	Vendor Presentations	10-12-11
7	Selection of Lead Vendor	10-14-11
8	Notice of Intent to Award (estimated)	10-31-11
9	Notice of Award (estimated)	11-30-11

The RFP in PDF format will be available on the following website:
<http://www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/Pages.aspx/Contract-Opportunities>

2.1.1 Contact List

Submittal Contact:

Linda Salcido
Procurement Manager
1225 Fallon Street, Room 210
Oakland, CA 94612
510-891-6017
bidquestions@alameda.courts.ca.gov

Project Manager:

Matthew McDonald
Finance Director
Rene C. Davidson Courthouse
1225 Fallon Street, Room 210
Oakland, CA 94612

Contracting Officer and
Court Executive Officer:

Pat Sweeten
Superior Court of California, County of Alameda
1225 Fallon Street, Room 209
Oakland, CA 94612

2.1.2 Disposition of Material and Confidential or Proprietary Information

All materials submitted in response to the solicitation document will become the property of the Court and will be returned only at the Court’s option, and at the expense of the vendor submitting the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and become a public record. **Any material that a vendor considers as confidential, but does not meet the disclosure exemption requirements of the California Public Records Act, should not be included in the vendor’s proposal as it may be made available to the public.**

Even though the Public Records Act (PRA) does not apply to the Court, the Court's policy is to look to the PRA for guidance in responding to requests for documents. If a vendor's proposal contains material noted or marked as confidential and/or proprietary that, in the Court's sole opinion, meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then that information will not be disclosed pursuant to a written request for public documents. If the Court does not consider such material to be exempt from disclosure under the PRA, the material may be made available to the public, regardless of the notation or markings. If a vendor is unsure if its confidential and/or proprietary material meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then it should not include such information in its proposal because such information may be disclosed to the public.

2.1.3 Proposal Preparation Costs

Vendors submitting proposals do so entirely at their expense. There is no express or implied obligation by the Court to reimburse a vendor for any costs incurred in preparing or submitting proposals, providing additional information when requested by the Court, participating in any selection interviews or product demonstrations, or participating in this procurement.

2.2 Mandatory Pre-proposal Conference

A Pre-Proposal Conference to answer questions related to this RFP will be held on the date and at the time specified in Section 2.1. The location of the pre-proposal conference is stated below:

Office of Information Technology
Mt Olympia Conference Room
7751B Edgewater Drive
Oakland, CA

The Pre-Proposal Conference is mandatory; prospective proposers are required to attend in order to better understand the proposal requirements. In the event a potential proposer is unable to attend the Pre-Proposal Conference, an authorized representative may attend on their behalf. A representative may only sign in for one vendor. Proposals from vendors who did not attend the Pre-Proposal Conference will not be accepted and will be returned unopened.

A Letter of Intent from a pre-proposal conference participant must be sent to the Submittal Contact via e-mail at the address listed in Section 2.1.1 bidquestions@alameda.courts.ca.gov by the date and time noted in Section 2.1 indicating the number of individuals (of vendor and its subcontractors) who plan on attending the pre-proposal conference. The Court will prepare a summary of questions and answers from the pre-proposal conference, as an addendum, which will be provided to attendees.

2.3 Pre-Submittal Process

2.3.1 Request for Clarifications or Modifications

Vendors interested in responding to this solicitation may submit questions on procedural matters related to the RFP or requests for clarification or modification of this solicitation document, including questions regarding the Contract Terms and Conditions in Attachment I, to the Project Manager. If the vendor is requesting a change, the request must set forth the recommended change and the vendor's reasons for proposing the change. All questions and requests must be submitted in writing via e-mail to the Submittal Contact listed in Section 2.1.1 no later than the date specified in Section 2.1, Procurement Schedule and General Instructions. Questions or requests submitted after the due date will not be answered.

Without disclosing the source of the question or request, the Project Manager will provide a copy of the questions and answers to all potential proposers.

If a vendor's question relates to a proprietary aspect of its proposal and the question would expose proprietary information if disclosed to competitors, the vendor may submit the question conspicuously marking it as "CONFIDENTIAL." With the question, the vendor must submit a statement explaining why the question is sensitive. If the Court concurs that the disclosure of the question or answer would expose proprietary information, the question will be answered, and both the question and answer will be kept in confidence. If the Court does not concur regarding the proprietary nature of the question, the question will not be answered in this manner and the vendor will be notified.

2.3.2 Ambiguity, Discrepancies, Omissions

If a vendor submitting a proposal discovers any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in this solicitation document, the vendor shall immediately provide the Submittal Contact listed in Section 2.1.1 written notice of the problem and request that the solicitation document be clarified or modified. Without disclosing the source of the request, the Court may modify the solicitation document prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by providing an addendum to potential proposers or, if identified in Section 2.1, by posting the addendum on the Court website.

If prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals a vendor submitting a proposal knows of or should have known of an error in the solicitation document but fails to notify the Court of the error, the vendor shall propose at its own risk, and if the vendor is awarded the contract, the vendor shall not be entitled to additional compensation or time by reason of the error or its later correction.

2.3.3 Contact with Court

Vendors are specifically directed NOT to contact any Court personnel or consultants for meetings, conferences, or discussions that are specifically related to this RFP at any time prior to any award of a contract. Unauthorized contact with any Court personnel or consultants may be cause for rejection of the vendor's response.

2.3.4 RFP Addenda

The Court may modify this solicitation document prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by providing notice to potential proposers. If any potential vendor determines that an addendum unnecessarily restricts its ability to propose, it must notify the Submittal Contact listed in Section 2.1.1 no later than three (3) business days following the date the addendum is provided.

Pricing shall reflect all addenda issued by the Court. Failure to do so will permit the Court to interpret the proposal to include all addenda issued in any resulting contract.

2.4 Submission of Proposals

2.4.1 Proposal Delivery

The following must be received no later than the Proposal Due Date and time specified in Section 2.1 (the "Proposal Closing Time"):

- One signed original copy of the proposal and separate original copy of the pricing proposal delivered to Rene C. Davidson Courthouse, 1225 Fallon Street, Room 210, Oakland, CA 94612
- Seven additional copies of the proposal and of the pricing proposal in three-ring binders delivered to Rene C. Davidson Courthouse 1225 Fallon Street, Room 210, Oakland, CA 94612

- One electronic copy of the technical proposal , and one electronic formatted copy of the pricing proposal delivered via e-mail to the Court at bidquestions@alameda.courts.ca.gov

All Technical Proposal copies may be submitted in binders that are not sealed. The outside of the binder must be clearly marked with the Project Title, the Contents of the Binder, the proposer's name, and the date submitted. **Pricing proposals must be included in a separately sealed envelope and should be marked with "Price Proposal" and the proposer's name.**

The hard copy(s) and electronic copies of the Technical Proposals must not include any pricing information. Proposals may be submitted prior to the Proposal Closing Time. Late proposals will not be considered.

All printed proposals must be delivered via U.S. Mail, common carrier, or hand delivery. A receipt should be requested for hand delivered material.

The proposer is solely responsible for ensuring that the full proposal is received by the Court in accordance with the solicitation requirements, prior to the date and time specified in the solicitation, and at the place specified. The Court shall not be responsible for any delays in mail or by common carriers or by transmission errors or delays or missed delivery.

2.4.2 Amendment or Withdrawal of Proposals

A vendor may amend its proposal prior to the Proposal Closing Time. All amendments must be in writing and received by the Court prior to the Proposal Closing Time.

A vendor may withdraw its proposal at any time prior to the Proposal Closing Time by notifying the Submittal Contact listed in Section 2.1.1 in writing of its withdrawal. Amendments or withdrawals offered in any other manner, than described above will not be considered. Proposals cannot be amended or withdrawn after the Proposal Closing Time.

2.4.3 Mistake in Proposal

If prior to a contract award, a proposer discovers a mistake in their proposal that renders the proposer unwilling to perform under any resulting contract, the proposer must immediately notify the Submittal Contact listed in Section 2.1.1 in writing and request to withdraw the proposal. It shall be solely within the Court's discretion as to whether withdrawal will be permitted. If the solicitation contemplated evaluation and award of "all or none" of the items, then any withdrawal must be for the entire proposal. If the solicitation provided for evaluation and award on a line item or combination of items basis, the Court may consider permitting withdrawal of specific line item(s) or combination of items.

2.4.4 Error in Submitted Proposals

If an error is discovered in a vendor's proposal, the Court may at its sole option retain the proposal and allow the proposer to submit certain arithmetic corrections. The Court may, at its sole option, allow the proposer to correct obvious clerical errors. In determining if a correction will be allowed, the Court will consider the conformance of the proposal to the format and content required by the solicitation, the significance and magnitude of the correction, and any unusual complexity of the format and content required by the solicitation.

If the proposer's intent is clearly established based on review of the complete proposal submitted, the Court may, at its sole option, allow the proposer to correct an error based on that established intent.

The total price of unit-price items or individual line items will be the product of the unit or line item price and the quantity. If the unit or line item price is ambiguous, unintelligible or uncertain for any cause, or is omitted, the unit or line item price shall be the amount obtained by dividing the “extension” price by the item quantity.

2.4.5 Authorized Signatures, Validity Period of Proposals

Proposals must include the vendor name, address, telephone, and federal tax identification number. The proposal must be signed by a duly authorized officer or employee of the vendor and include the name, title, address, and telephone number of the individual who is the proposer’s designated representative.

Proposals will be valid for ninety (90) days after the Proposal Due Date specified in Section 2.1 (“Proposal Validity Date”). In the event a final contract has not been awarded by the date specified in Section 2.1, the Court reserves the right to negotiate extensions to the Proposal Validity Date.

2.4.6 Knowledge of Requirements

The vendor shall carefully review all documents referenced and made a part of the solicitation document to ensure that all information required to properly respond has been submitted or made available and all requirements are priced in the proposal. Failure to examine any document, drawing, specification, or instruction will be at the proposer’s sole risk.

Proposers shall be responsible for knowledge of all items and conditions contained in their proposals and in this RFP, including any Court issued clarifications, modifications, amendments, or addenda. The Court will provide notice to perspective proposers or, if identified in Section 2.1, post addenda and clarifications to the Court website; however, it is the proposer’s responsibility to ascertain that the proposal includes all addenda issued prior to the Proposal Due Date.

2.4.7 Independence of Proposal and Joint Proposals

Unless a proposer is submitting a joint proposal, the proposer represents and warrants that by submitting its proposal it did not conspire with any other vendor to set prices in violation of anti-trust laws.

A proposal submitted by two or more vendors participating jointly in one proposal may be submitted, but one vendor must be identified as the prime contractor and the other as the subcontractor. The Court assumes no responsibility or obligation for the division of orders or purchases among joint subcontractors.

2.4.8 Covenant Against Gratuities

Proposer warrants by signing its proposal that no gratuities, in the form of entertainment, gifts, or otherwise, were offered by the proposer or any agent, director, or representative of the proposer, to any officer, official, agent, or employee of any Court with a view toward securing award of or securing favorable treatment with respect to any determinations concerning the performance of any resulting contract. For breach or violation of this warranty, the Court will have the right to terminate any resulting contract in whole or in part. The right and remedies of the Court provided in this provision shall not be exclusive and are in addition to any other rights and remedies provided by law or under the resulting contract.

2.5 Overview of Evaluation Process

2.5.1 Evaluation Committee

The Court will conduct a comprehensive, fair, and impartial evaluation of proposals received in response to this RFP. Proposals received from vendors will be initially reviewed and evaluated by technical and procurement specialists to ensure that they meet minimum qualifications. A secondary screening will then be made to determine which proposals are to be submitted to an Evaluation Committee that includes representatives from Information Technology management, Operations management, Finance, and Judicial Officers. The name, units, or experience of the individual members of the Evaluation Committee will not be made available to any vendor.

Proposals submitted for review by the Evaluation Committee will be evaluated in accordance with the general criteria set forth in Section 2.7. The Evaluation Committee will first review and complete the evaluation of the technical proposals, without the price proposal. Included in this RFP as Attachment B are the guidelines that have been provided to the members of the Evaluation Committee for review of the technical proposals. Thereafter, the price proposals will be reviewed and evaluated by the Committee to determine an overall evaluation score. The scores assigned by evaluators will be used in the selection process as part of the final review process that leads to the selection of the best vendor/product combination for the Court.

2.5.2 Reservation of Rights

The Court, at its sole discretion, may eliminate proposals that have not met the minimum qualifications of Section 2.6, or have not scored adequately in relation to other proposals to warrant further consideration. The Court reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, in whole or in part, and may or may not waive any immaterial deviation or defect in a proposal.

The Court's waiver of an immaterial deviation or defect shall in no way modify the solicitation document or excuse a vendor from full compliance with solicitation document specifications.

If a proposal fails to meet a material solicitation document requirement, the proposal may be rejected. A deviation is material to the extent that a response is not in substantial accord with the requirements of the solicitation document. Material deviations cannot be waived.

Unless otherwise specified in the solicitation, the Court may accept any item or combination of items as specified in the solicitation; of any proposal unless the proposer expressly restricts an item or combination of items in its proposal; and conditions its response on receiving all items for which it provided a proposal. In the event that the proposer so restricts its proposal, the Court may consider the proposer's restriction and evaluate whether the award on such basis will result in the best value to the Court or may determine in its sole discretion that such restriction is non-responsive and renders the proposer ineligible for further evaluation.

The Court reserves the right to negotiate with proposers who have presented, in the opinion of the Evaluation Committee, the best proposal in an attempt to reach a contract. If no contract is reached, the Court can negotiate with other proposers or make no award under this RFP. At any time the Evaluation Committee can reject all proposals and make no award under this RFP. Moreover, the Court reserves the right to reconsider any proposal submitted at any phase of the procurement. It also reserves the right to meet with vendors to gather additional information.

Proposals that contain false or misleading statements may be rejected if in the Court's opinion the information was intended to mislead the Court regarding a requirement of the solicitation document.

2.5.3 Evaluation of Price Sheets

Price sheets will be reviewed only if a proposal is determined to be otherwise qualified. Price sheets must be submitted in the format given as described in Section VI.

Where more than one line item is specified in the solicitation, the Court reserves the right to determine the highest evaluated proposer, either on the basis of individual items, combination of items as specified in the solicitation, or on the basis of all items included in the solicitation, unless otherwise expressly provided.

2.5.4 Requests for Additional Information

The Court reserves the right to seek clarification or additional information from any proposer throughout the solicitation process. The Court may require a proposer's representative to answer questions during the evaluation process with regard to the vendor's proposal. Failure of a proposer to demonstrate that the claims made in its proposal are in fact true may be sufficient cause for deeming a proposal non-responsive.

2.5.5 Brand Names

Any reference to brand names and/or numbers in the solicitation is intended to be descriptive, but not restrictive, unless otherwise specified. Proposals offering equivalent items meeting the standards of quality specified may be considered, unless otherwise specified, providing the proposal clearly describes the article offered and how it differs from the referenced brand. Unless a proposer specifies otherwise, it is understood that the proposer is offering a referenced brand item as specified in the solicitation. The Court reserves the right to determine whether a substitute offer is equivalent to and meets the standards of quality indicated by the brand name references, and the Court may require the supply of additional descriptive material and a sample.

2.5.6 Samples

Samples of goods may be required prior to award to determine proposer's responsiveness to the RFP's technical requirements. If requested, such samples must be provided at no cost and delivered to the address specified within the timeframe identified in the notification. Failure to submit samples as specified may be grounds for rejection of a vendor's proposal.

Unless expressly set forth in the solicitation, the sample of goods furnished must be identical in all respects to the product or products being offered.

Proposers offering products of a different manufacturer and model number than those specified in the solicitation may be required to submit samples for inspection and specification compliance testing in order for the Court to determine if the item offered is equivalent to and meets the minimum standards of quality acceptable to the Court as indicated by the manufacturer and model number specified in the solicitation.

Samples, if not destroyed by tests, may, upon request made by the proposer at the time the sample is furnished, be returned at proposer's expense.

2.6 Minimum Qualifications

To be considered for full evaluation and possible award, proposers must first meet the threshold minimum qualification requirements listed in the following table (minimum requirements can be met by combining experience, expertise, and resources of vendor and any proposed subcontractors):

No.	Minimum Qualifications
1	Be an authorized dealer of equipment manufacturer being proposed and must be in good standing with proposed manufacturer.
2	Maintain an appropriately staffed company office within 50 miles of the Courthouse at 1225 Fallon Street, Oakland, CA 94612
3	Employ a minimum of (3) technicians qualified to install, maintain, and support the proposed systems hardware and software.
4	Neither vendor nor any of its proposed subcontractors are currently under suspension or debarment by any state or federal government agency, and neither vendor nor any of its proposed subcontractors are tax delinquent with the State of California or Federal Government (reference <u>Attachment A</u> , Vendor Certification Form).
5	Meet insurance and labor requirements included in the standard contract. (Attachment I)

The proposer must state specifically in its Executive Summary (see Section 3.1) how it will comply with each minimum qualification specified above. Subject to the Court’s right in its sole discretion to waive minor deviations or defects, only those proposals that meet all of the foregoing minimum qualifications shall be considered for a full evaluation and a possible contract award.

Vendors who fail to meet any of the listed minimum qualifications will be notified in writing, and will have three (3) business days from receipt of such notification to file proof that all such qualifications are met.

2.7 Evaluation Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated to determine the proposal or proposals that best meet the criteria set forth below.

1) Vendor –

- Quality and Completeness of Proposal
- Size and Scale of Vendor
- Stability of Vendor
- Experience
- Project Staffing
- Project Planning and Management
- On-Going Support
- Eco-Responsibility

2) Product –

- Quality and Completeness of Proposal
- Manufacturer
- Technology
- Systems Architecture
- Features
- Manageability
- Reporting
- Eco-Responsibility

With regards to price, the Court reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to reject any proposal whose price is outside of the competitive range.

2.8 Interviews and Negotiations

2.8.1 Interviews

Following the initial screening of proposals, the Court reserves the right to require, and each proposer must be prepared to conduct, oral presentations and other discussions (written or verbal) on the content of its proposal. If the Court determines that interviews or presentations are required, selected proposers will be notified in writing of the date, place, time and format of the interview or presentation. Proposers will be responsible for all costs related to the interview, which, at the Court's sole discretion, may be in-person and/or by teleconference. Failure to participate in such interviews or presentations shall result in a proposer's disqualification from further consideration.

2.8.2 Negotiations

If the Court desires to enter into negotiations, it will do so with one or more proposers, at its discretion. If the Court enters into negotiations and no contract is reached, the Court can negotiate with the other proposers or make no award under this RFP. The Court reserves the right to award a contract, if any, without negotiations.

2.8.3 Payment

Payment is made based upon completion of tasks as provided in the contract between the Court and any selected vendor.

2.8.4 News Releases

News releases pertaining to the award of any contract resulting from this solicitation may not be made by a vendor without the prior written approval of the Court Executive Officer, Pat Sweeten, as noted in Section 2.1.1.

2.9 Award of Contract

The Evaluation Committee will make a final recommendation for award of the contract. Upon award, the successful proposer(s) will be required to execute a Contract in accordance with the specific requirements and pricing of the RFP response, and provide a certificate of insurance in conformance with the requirements set forth in the General Conditions within thirty (30) business days of award. The period for execution of the Contract may be changed by mutual contract of the parties. Contracts are not effective until signed by both parties.

2.10 Protest Procedures

2.10.1 General

Failure of proposer to comply with the protest procedures set forth in this Section 2.10, will render a protest inadequate and untimely, and will result in rejection of the protest. In no event shall a protest be considered if all submittals are rejected or after a contract has been executed.

2.10.2 Prior to Submission of Proposal

An interested party that is an actual or prospective proposer with a direct economic interest in the procurement may file a protest based on allegedly restrictive or defective specifications or other improprieties in the solicitation process that are apparent, or should have been reasonably discovered prior to the submission of a proposal. Such protest must be received prior to the Proposal Closing Time.

The protestor will have exhausted all administrative remedies specified in Section 2.3.1, Request for Clarification or Modifications; Section 2.3.2, Ambiguity, Discrepancies, Omissions; Section 2.3.4, RFP Addenda; and this Section as applicable, prior to submitting the protest. Failure to do so may be grounds for denying the protest.

2.10.3 After Award

A vendor submitting a proposal may protest the award based on allegations of improprieties occurring during the proposal evaluation or award period if it meets all of the following conditions:

- a. The vendor has submitted a proposal that it believes to be responsive to the solicitation document.
- b. The vendor believes that its proposal meets the administrative and technical requirements of the solicitation; proposes items and/or services of proven quality and performance; offers a competitive price; and
- c. The vendor believes that the Court has incorrectly selected another vendor submitting a proposal for an award.

Such protests must be received no later than five (5) business days after the protesting party receives a no-award notification.

2.10.4 Form of Protest

A vendor who is qualified to protest should submit the protest to the Contracting Officer listed in the Submission of Proposal section of this RFP.

- a. The protest must be in writing and sent by certified or registered mail or delivered personally to the address noted above. If the protest is hand-delivered, a receipt must be requested.
- b. The protest shall include the name, address, telephone and facsimile numbers of the party protesting or their representative.
- c. The title of the solicitation document under which the protest is submitted shall be included.
- d. A detailed description of the specific legal and factual grounds of protest and any supporting documentation shall be included.
- e. The specific ruling or relief requested must be stated.

The Court, at its sole discretion, may make a decision regarding the protest without requesting further information or documents from the protestor. Therefore, the initial protest submittal must include all grounds for the protest and all evidence available at the time the protest is submitted. If the protestor later raises new grounds or evidence that was not included in the initial protest but which could have been raised at that time, the Court will not consider such new grounds or new evidence.

2.10.5 Determination of Protest Submitted Prior to Submission of Proposal

Upon receipt of a timely and proper protest based on allegedly restrictive or defective specifications or other improprieties in the solicitation process that are apparent, or should have been reasonably discovered prior to the submission of a proposal, the Court will provide a written determination to the protestor prior to the Proposal Closing Time. If required, the Court may extend the Proposal Closing Time to allow for a reasonable time to review the protest. If the protesting party elects to appeal the decision, the protesting party will follow the appeals process outlined below and the Court, at its sole discretion, may elect to withhold the contract award until the protest is resolved or denied or proceed with the award and implementation of the contract.

2.10.6 Determination of Protest Submitted After Submission of Proposal

Upon receipt of a timely and proper protest, the Court will investigate the protest and will provide a written response to the vendor within a reasonable time. If the Court requires additional time to review the protest and is not able to provide a response within ten (10) business days, the Court will notify the vendor. If the protesting party elects to appeal the decision, the protesting party will follow the appeals process outlined below and the

Court, at its sole discretion, may elect to withhold the contract award until the protest is resolved, or denied, or proceed with the award and implementation of the contract.

2.10.7 Appeals Process

The Contracting Officer's decision shall be considered the final action by the Court unless the protesting party thereafter seeks an appeal of the decision by filing a request for appeal with the Court Executive Officer, noted in Section 2.1.1, within five (5) calendar days of the issuance of the Contracting Officer's decision.

The justification for appeal is limited to:

- A. Facts and/or information related to the protest, as previously submitted, that were not available at the time the protest was originally submitted; or
- B. The Contracting Officer's decision contained errors of fact, and that such errors of fact were significant and material factors in the Contracting Officer's decision; or
- C. The decision of the Contracting Officer was in error of law or regulation.

The request for appeal shall include:

- (1) The name, address, telephone and facsimile numbers of the vendor filing the appeal or their representative;
- (2) A copy of the Contracting Officer's decision;
- (3) The legal and factual basis for the appeal; and
- (4) The ruling or relief requested. Issues that could have been raised earlier will not be considered on appeal.

Upon receipt of a request for appeal, the Court Executive Officer will review the request and the decision of the Contracting Officer and shall issue a final determination. The decision of the Court Executive Officer shall constitute the Court's final action.

2.10.8 Protest Remedies

If the protest is upheld, the Court will consider all circumstances surrounding the procurement in its decision for a fair and reasonable remedy, including the seriousness of the procurement deficiency, the degree of prejudice to the protesting party, or to the integrity of the competitive procurement system, the good faith efforts of the parties, the extent of performance, the price to the Court, the urgency of the procurement, and the impact of the recommendation(s). The Court may recommend any combination of the following remedies:

- a. Terminate the contract for convenience;
- b. Re-compete the contract;
- c. Issue a new solicitation;
- d. Refrain from exercising options to extend the term under the contract, if applicable;
- e. Award a contract consistent with statute or regulation; or
- f. Other such remedies as may be required to promote compliance.

2.11 General Instructions for Pricing

Vendor must submit pricing as required by Attachments F and G. (see section VI. Below)

In addition to submitting the pricing in the form requested by the Court, vendors must include their standard pricing sheets in the format that they normally use internally and for customers.

The total price shown on both the RFP Attachment Pricing sheets and the vendor's standard pricing sheets must match. Both sheets should include a similar level of detail for component line items, unit pricing, and extended pricing.

The electronic version of the Pricing sheets should be submitted as unlocked spreadsheets that can be used by the evaluation committee for pricing various configuration options. Vendors chosen for contract negotiations will be responsible for ensuring that pricing in contract documents do not conflict with prices submitted in response to this RFP.

Pricing should include all anticipated charges, including but not limited to, sales tax, freight and delivery, insurance, cost of materials and product, travel expenses, overhead, profits, and other costs or expenses incidental to the vendor's performance.

The Court is exempt from federal excise taxes and no payment will be made for any taxes levied on the vendor's or any Subcontractor's employee's wages. The Court will pay for any applicable State of California or local sales or use taxes on the products provided. Taxes shall be included as a separate line item on a vendor's invoice.

2.12 Government Rates

It is expected that all vendors responding to this solicitation will offer the vendor's government or most favorable comparable rates.

2.13 Warranty

It is expected that any products supplied will be new, un-modified equipment as manufactured, and that all manufacturer warranties will be intact. Vendors cannot perform any work on equipment or software that invalidates any or all parts of the equipment warranties. Any modifications or customization done on the hardware or software must be accepted and approved by manufacturer and the Court.

2.14 Invoicing

The vendor shall provide a description of the invoicing process for hardware, software and Professional Services. Vendor selected will be required to provide payment schedule based on mutually agreed acceptance of implementation. If there are unique billing arrangements for deposits, leasing terms, or auto-renewal of any services (i.e. Maintenance), this should be described.

2.15 Contract Terms

Vendors should include a copy of their standard purchase and software licensing agreements with the response to the RFP.

Although the Court will consider contract language proposed by a vendor, the Court will not be bound by contract language received as part of a prospective vendor's response. If the proposer requires that the Court be bound by some or all of the vendor's proposed contract language, the proposal may be considered non-responsive and may be rejected.

2.16 Existing Voice/Video/Data Systems and Facilities Plans

2.16.1 Existing Voice and Video Communications Systems

Digital PBX

The Inter-Tel Axxess system is a traditional digital "TDM" PBX system with gateways that allow for interconnection to the Court's data network. Twelve Court locations are supported by individual PBX's that have local T1/PRI's as well as analog trunk connections for emergency 911 calls. There are blocks of local DID numbers for each Court location that are associated with the local T1/PRI circuits.

Adjunct Voice Equipment

The voice communications system purchased from Inter-Tel includes not just the base PBX system and telephones, but numerous adjunct systems as well. Those systems include System

Management Tools, voicemail/Unified Messaging systems, Contact Center management and reporting systems. As shown in the diagram the Court uses five voicemail systems, which was due to capacity limitations of the Enterprise Messaging platform at the time the system was installed.

A diagram of the existing voice communications is included as Attachment C. Service quantities in place now are:

Alameda Courts - Existing PBX Equipment and Circuits By Location

Location	Final Payment	Number of Working Stations	Number of T1/PRI Circuits	Number of Analog Trunks	Voicemail System	Number of Voicemail Boxes	Number Call Center Agents	Number of Digital Stations	Number of Analog Stations
1 OIT Office OIT	Oct 2011	70	2	2	OIT	51	10	54	16
2 Alameda GEM	Oct 2011	76	1	2	OIT	29	24	64	12
3 Pleasanton GSH	Oct 2011	96	1	2	OIT	37	74	80	16
4 Fremont FHJ	Oct 2011	154	2	2	Hayward	60	64	126	28
5 Hayward HHJ	Oct 2011	262	3	2	Hayward	184	99	230	32
6 Hayward Family Ct	Nov 2011	37	0	4	Hayward	22	4	32	5
7 ADM Building	Nov 2011	143	1	2	RCD	92	24	111	32
8 Post Office	Nov 2011	41	0	3	RCD	28	4	36	5
9 San Leandro - JJC	Apr 2012	66	1	2	WWM	33	19	47	19
10 WWM Courthouse	Nov 2012	277	2	2	WWM	150	116	240	37
11 RCD	Feb 2013	351	3	2	RCD	200	213	290	61
12 Berkeley Courthouse	Feb 2013	51	1	2	Berkeley	25	32	35	16
		1624	17	27		911	683	1345	279

IVR System for Jury Services

The Court uses software from ACS Government Solutions, now owned by Xerox, to manage jury service by citizens. That system includes an Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system from Sonant, Inc, an ACS partner. The Jury IVR system was upgraded in 2009 and telco services that were with the County Telecom were transferred to the Court. 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.

Traffic IVR

The IVR system used to collect credit card payments by telephone for traffic fines is outsourced to EDS, which is now part of Hewlett-Packard. The service is provided under the AOC Master Agreement signed in 2006, with a term of 7 years. The agreement allows EDS to offer the service on behalf of the Courts and to collect a “convenience fee” for each transaction.

RightFax Electronic Fax System

The Court uses an electronic fax system from Rightfax, now known as Open Text. The system was recently upgraded to v9.4 and is maintained by OIT staff. The Rightfax system has its own network Supertrunk connection with a block of 200 DID’s. It is not connected to the Inter-Tel PBX system and does not share trunking resources with that system.

The RightFax system supports a critical Fax Filings application for the Court. Incoming faxes are routed to a network shared file and handled by a special team of Court employees. Additional information may be provided to vendors about the Fax Filings application if it is necessary for vendors to create complete and accurate proposals. Vendors should submit specific questions to the Court as provided for in the RFP process.

Videoconferencing System

The Court has seven locations that are equipped for group videoconferencing. Those locations use a Polycom RMX2000 bridge installed on 2010 for interconnections for conferences. The sites are equipped with monitors and cameras. At four sites the cameras have been recently upgraded to High-Definition. Use of the equipment for conferences is scheduled by the room using the Exchange calendar for that room.

Court Call

In Alameda Court, 40 of the of the 88 courtrooms are equipped with Conference Units provided as a service by Court Call under the AOC Master Contract. The Conference Unit equipment belongs to Court Call. Court Call is responsible for: 1) installing and maintaining the phone lines, 2) installing and maintaining the equipment (Conference Equipment; Polycom), 3) performing adds/move/changes, and 4) providing the conference services (Conference Bridge).

2.16.2 Existing Data Communications and Processing Systems

Network

Over the last few years the Court has continually upgraded its data network with the AOC-sponsored "Tech Refreshes". The entire network is "VoIP Ready" in that all of the network components are designed and equipped to support packet-based voice traffic. LAN access switches are PoE enabled. The network connections between sites are OPT-E-MAN (MPLS network core) services provided by AT&T under the State CalNet2 contract and are already carrying packet-based voice traffic. As currently configured the network has VLAN's for users, servers and videoconferencing, but not for voice.

A general overview diagram of the he current configuration of the Court's WAN is shown in Attachment D. To ensure security and protection of proprietary information, additional detailed information on the WAN/LAN configuration and equipment may be provided to vendors as part of the RFP process. Vendors that require additional detailed information should submit their questions and information needs to the Court as soon as possible after receipt and initial review of the RFP. The Court will then determine the time and manner for providing additional detailed information.

VoIP Network Management

The Court has Cisco Network Analysis Modules (NAM) installed in the 6509 core switches at both the primary and secondary host sites. The majority of network traffic hits the core. Although the NAM resides in the Catalyst 6509 switch, it can provide performance monitoring, traffic analysis and troubleshooting across the entire network. It uses features residing on other Cisco devices on the network to collect LAN and WAN traffic - i.e. VACL, NetFlow, SPAN/RSPAN. http://www.cisco.com/en/US/prod/collateral/modules/ps2706/data_sheet_c78-551847.html

However, the NAM's have not been set up for use by the Court and Court IT staff have not been trained on its use.

IP Addresses

The Court currently uses IP addresses in the 10.101 range as assigned by the AOC. The Alameda Court has sub-nets by location with mostly Class C licenses.

Wireless Project

The Court is currently in the process of deploying a wireless system that is intended to provide wi-fi access to all parts of all Court locations. When completed the system will have one Cisco AIR-WLC4404-100-K9 wireless controller, one AIR-CT5508-500-2PK, twenty-one Cisco AIR-AP1142N-A-K9 Wireless Access Points (WAP's) and three hundred Cisco AIR-CAP35021-A-K9 WAP's. The project is expected to be completed in Fall 2011.

Desktop Environment

Currently applications are delivered via Citrix XenApp Services. The Court has a large number of Wyse Thin Clients in the field that cannot support locally installed applications. The Court also employs a number of Windows XP Professional Desktops for Management and Executive users. Microsoft Office 2003 is the current operating standard for productivity and the Court is testing to adopt Office 2010 globally.

Citrix Environment: Citrix XenApp 5.0 Feature Release 3 on Windows 2003 R2 SP2
Wyse Thin Clients: Windows XP Embedded
Desktops: Windows XP Pro SP2 or SP3. Most Desktops employ either Single or Dual-Core processors and 2GB of RAM.
Office: Office 2003 SP3

In the future the Court expects to be using Citrix more for Remote access and will be replacing aging Thin Clients with desktop systems that are Windows 7 compliant. The migration is expected to happen throughout CY 2012. The planned future configuration is:

Citrix: Either XenApp 5.0 or XenApp 6.0 on Windows 2003 with an eventual migration to Windows 2008 R2.
Desktops: Windows 7 Business SP1 (aiming for 64-bit).
Office: Office 2010 (32-bit only)
Exchange: Exchange 2010 SP1 (or later)

Servers

Servers and Services are currently virtualized in VMWare ESXi 4.1.1 with a migration to ESXi 5.X, possibly in 2012.

E-mail

The Court upgraded to Exchange 2010 SP1 in 2Q2011.

Mobile Communications

The Court recently replaced all existing Court-paid cellular communications devices with 50 standard cell phones and 32 HTC Android based Smart Phones operating on the Sprint network. These handsets have been provided to Judicial officers, managers, and technical staff.

The court supports a variety of other mobile devices as well including iPhone/iPad, Android and Blackberries. These are all personal devices

2.16.3 Facilities Plans

The Court is currently in the process of moving and consolidating some functions within existing locations. However, no locations are expected to be closed completely. A new Courthouse to be jointly owned with the County of Alameda in Dublin, CA is in the design process. It is expected to open in 2014. At that time the Pleasanton Courthouse will be closed and the current Office of Information Technology (OIT) will be relocated to the new building. This move will include the relocation of the existing data center at the OIT office and require reconfiguration of the Court network.

2.17 Overview of New Voice Communications System Requirements

The purpose of this project is to evaluate proposals for a new voice communications system that can replace the existing system at the Court. The Court expects that the architecture and technology in proposals will be for products representing the most current technology commonly in use. It is further expected that the proposed systems will enable to Court to develop new applications and business processes that are more efficient, reducing costs while improving service to the public.

In general, any system to be considered by the Court will need to integrate with the existing network and video communications systems, except in the cases where those systems would be replaced. Specifically, the systems must integrate with the Cisco LAN/WAN/Security/wi-fi systems, the Microsoft e-mail and desktop systems, The Citrix XenApp/Wyse Thin Client system, the Polycom videoconferencing system, and VMWare virtualization technologies.

As stated in the RFP introduction, it is the expectation that any new system for the Court will be an “all IP” system. To that end, the Court expects to transition away from traditional analog and digital network connections when a new system is installed. Concurrently with this RFP process the Court is going to be evaluating IP/SIP trunking technologies that would replace the T1/PRI circuits at each location and allow local DID numbers to be independent of a specific Court location. The Court expects that moving to this newer technology will enable rationalizing and reducing trunking resources by using existing high-bandwidth network connections, which could substantially reduce recurring network expenses.

For this RFP response, Vendors should assume that the target cutover date for the entire system is June 2012. That is, however, only a planning assumption. Depending on circumstances the Court could choose to accept a vendor’s proposal, but agree to a different date for actual system installation.

The specific quantities of system components to be included in the proposal are detailed on the pricing spreadsheet included as Attachment F and in Section VI., below. However, it is expected that quantities of lines and stations will change as needs become better defined during the process of evaluating RFP responses.

2.18 Description of IVR System Requirements

The purpose of soliciting proposals for Interactive Voice Response/Interactive Web Response (IVR/IWR) platform is primarily to evaluate the potential benefit to the Court of creating an automation platform that can offer real-time, 7x24, customer self-service capabilities for various activities of the Court. A shared platform offers the Court an opportunity to reduce overall costs, increase revenues, simplify operations, and utilize automation technology in new, innovative ways.

This RFP asks vendors to propose a base IVR system that includes hardware, software, and any professional services that might be required. The Court currently has three specific applications for IVR: Tentative Rulings, Jury and Traffic. As a separate pricing element, vendors are asked to propose costs for applications to support the three existing functions. In the text of the RFP vendors are also invited to describe other applications and capabilities that they have developed for Courts that extend the capability of the IVR platform to other Divisions or activities beyond the three listed applications.

Tentative Rulings (TR's)

Currently TR’s are available on the web. The Court currently provides recorded playback of TR's for Department 31 and parties are able to contest TR's by phone. The Court also has a message line available for TR'S in other Civil Departments. Parties dial 1-866-223-2244, make a selection and can leave a message in a TR voice mail box. Court staff reviews the message, calls back, and recites the TR to the interested party over the phone. The Court wants to consider automating the current manual process so that the same information is available via the telephone as on the web.

For the web applications, Court staff in 18 Departments (14 Civil, 2 Complex Litigation, 1 Asbestos, and 1 Law & Motion) enter TR’s into the Domain case management system. Those TR’s are then accessible on line using either the Case Number, or Department Number and Date. In total, an average of approximately 40 TR’s are issued per week. TR’s in Unlawful Detainer cases are not available on line.

The TR web application is currently updated in real-time with live data as it is entered into Domain. The Domain system is an internally developed software product that is written in Java and uses an Informix database. Since 2003 Case Numbers in the Domain case management System have been standardized as 2 letters and 8 digits, with the first 2 digits indicating the calendar year. Detailed information about Domain and the requirements for an interface to it are not included in this RFP. Additional information may be provided in response to specific questions from vendors.

Jury

As noted above the Alameda Court uses ACS Juror software to manage its requirements for summoning citizens for jury service and managing interactions with those who have been noticed for jury service. The Alameda Court issues 900,000-1,000,000 jury summons per year using an outsource vendor to manage printing and mailing. The Court has both online and IVR systems that interface to the ACS Juror software. At present there are no reliable statistics available for the number of citizens who would use automated systems for jury information, deferrals, excusals, etc if those systems were reliably available.

As with TR's, this RFP does not include technical details about API's or required interfaces to the ACS Juror software. Vendors that do not already have some type of partnership or relationship with ACS can investigate those requirements as part of their proposal.

Traffic

The Court will be rolling out a new Traffic Case Management System (TCMS) developed in an ASP.Net environment with an Oracle database. Citizens will be able to access information about traffic citations, pay citations, schedule traffic school, etc., online at the Court's website. The TCMS system will continue to use the existing outsourced IVR application with EDS/HP that is described above.

The Court would like to consider the option of adding to the base platform its own Traffic IVR application that could decrease operating costs and increase revenues to the Court.

END OF INFORMATIONAL SECTION OF RFP

SECTIONS III., IV., V., and VI. BELOW, ARE THE TEMPLATE FOR RESPONDING TO THE RFP. TEXT FROM SECTIONS 1 AND 2 ABOVE ARE INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE VENDORS AND ARE NOT TO BE INCLUDED IN THE RFP RESPONSE.

Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements of this solicitation. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed in conformity to the Court’s instructions, requirements of this solicitation, and the completeness and clarity of content.

The electronic copy of the response sections III., IV., and V., may be submitted as a single PDF file (preferred), or as multiple files as long as the files can be opened and read using Microsoft Office software.

III. VENDOR QUALIFICATIONS

3.1 Executive Summary

3.1.1 Executive Summary Content

The proposer must provide a one to two page Executive Summary of its proposal. The Executive Summary should be a “high-level” general overview of the proposal and how the proposed solution can benefit the Court. The proposer must also address in this section how it meets the minimum qualification requirements in Section 2.6.

3.1.2 Vendor Information, Validity, and Authorized Signature

The Executive Summary should include the vendor information, validity period, and authorized signature, as required in Section 2.4.5.

3.2 Company and Subcontractor Information

3.2.1 Company Background Information

The Court requires the vendor to be a reputable company of strong financial standing with experience in the design, installation, and management of Voice Communications and IVR/IWR Systems. The vendor’s proposal must provide the information requested below. If the proposer is a joint venture, information about the prime subcontractor and the subcontractor must be submitted separately. The information to be provided is as follows:

- a. Complete name and address of main company location.
- b. Federal tax identification number.
- c. If incorporated, state in which incorporated.
- d. A brief description of the vendor’s organization.
- e. Total number of years in business.
- f. Number of years providing products and services similar in size and scope to those requested in this RFP.
- g. If subcontractors are proposed for this RFP, describe the vendor’s contract management process for subcontractors included in the vendor’s proposal and provide copies of signed formal contracts (e.g., teaming contracts or any other legally binding document), if any exist, between the vendor and each proposed subcontractor.

3.2.2 Subcontractors

If subcontractors are proposed for this RFP, provide the following information for each subcontractor:

- a. Subcontractor name and address of main company location.
- b. Federal identification and/or social security number.
- c. If incorporated, state in which incorporated.
- d. A short narrative of the subcontractor's organization, including organization charts and indication of company officers where applicable.
- e. Principal type of business.
- f. Total number of years in business.
- g. Number of years providing services similar in size and scope to those requested in this RFP.

3.3 Experience and Qualifications

3.3.1 Prior Experience and References

The Court requires the vendor and its subcontractors to have prior experience in all aspects of the products and services described in this RFP for customers similar to or with relevance in the size, complexity and scope of this RFP. The Court reserves the right to contact any named customers as part of vendor evaluation. Vendor shall:

Provide the names, addresses, and telephone numbers for a minimum of five (5) customers for whom the vendor has provided similar products and services within the last 36 months. *If necessary, provide more than (5) references to ensure that there are (5) references for the Voice Communications System and (5) references for the IVR/IWR.*

3.3.2 Subcontractors

If the vendor intends to subcontract, describe the vendor's experience with each of the proposed subcontractors. For each proposed subcontractor provide the names, addresses, and telephone numbers for a minimum of three (3) customer references, for products and services similar to those described in this RFP. The vendor should include a brief description of the scope of products and services provided to the customer and the duration of the contract.

3.4 Personnel, Staffing, and System Support Operations

3.4.1 Design and Installation Project Team and Project Manager

Proposers shall provide the name, a role description, and brief statement of qualifications for the specific individuals that will be assigned to complete the design and installation of the system; including a Project Manager, Technicians, and Trainer

3.4.2 Post-Install Support Team and Customer Service Operations

Proposers shall provide a description of the Customer Service operation that will support the Court after the successful completion of the installation. The information provided should include a brief description of the following:

- Ongoing Account Management and Customer Support Role
- Contact process (phone, email, fax, etc.) during regular business hours and non-business hours

- Remote monitoring capabilities offered
- Standard on-site service response times guaranteed by the vendor
- Follow-up process for customer reported trouble tickets
- Internal procedures to track customer service contact and resolution
- Escalation process to resolve outstanding customer service issues
- The location from which service technicians will be dispatched for on-site services in Alameda County
- Description of how subcontractors are used in support and the guaranteed performance standards

3.4.3 Installation and Training Project Plan

Proposers shall provide a description of the installation and cutover project plan. The information provided should include, at a minimum, a description of installation methodology, milestones, and a proposed sample project schedule. Also, Proposers should include a description of the training process to be used to provide the training services required. Proposers should describe the expected role of Court personnel and resources to be provided by the Court as part of installation plan and training.

3.5 System and Station Features

Vendors are to complete the Features List included as Attachment E.

- A “Supports Feature in Based System” response indicates that the feature is included on the proposed system and does not require any additional hardware, software, or system modification to enable its use.
- A “Cannot Support Feature” response indicates that the feature is not available on the proposed system.
- A “Supports Feature as an Option” response indicates that the feature could be available on the proposed system but will require some additional hardware, software, or system modification that has not been included in this proposal. All responses in this column should include an explanation of what is required to enable the feature.

3.6 Environmentally Preferable Purchasing

The Court requests available information from all participating vendors regarding the support and employment of environmentally responsible business practices.

3.6.1 Manufacturer

For each of the manufacturers whose name brand appears on a product you are proposing on your pricing sheet, answer the following questions:

- a. Does the manufacturer have a formal Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Program?
- b. If yes, please provide details about the prescribed program.
- c. Does the manufacturer have a product takeback and end-of-life management program for IT equipment?
- d. If yes, please explain the program details.
- e. Does the manufacturer have a program for reducing product packaging waste and for using reusable, recyclable, environmentally benign materials in product packaging?
- f. If the manufacturer does NOT have a formal recycling program do they have programs for:
 - Universal Waste management in compliance with California law?
 - E-Waste management in compliance with California law?

3.6.2 Channel Partner/VAR

For the company that will be the contracting entity providing the system integration, installation, management and support services to the Court, answer the following questions:

- a. Does your company have a formal Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Program?
 - b. Does your company have a formal Environmental Management System?
- If yes please explain the program in detail.

3.6.3 Products

- a. Any personal computer product proposed as part of the system solution must be EPEAT certified at a level of silver or higher.
- b. Vendors should propose only flat-panel devices and any computer monitor or display proposed must be TCO 99 certified, or equivalent.
- c. Any product included in your proposal that is covered by any US EPA Energy Star standards category must be Energy Star compliant to the most current standard.
- d. Complete the attached worksheet (Attachment H) for energy consumption specifications of each type of component included in your proposal.
- e. Are all products compliant with the European Union RoHS directive, including restrictions on the use of lead-free solders?
- f. Do the proposed servers include power supplies that meet the 80 PLUS® performance specifications?

IV. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL – VOICE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

4.1 Base Voice Communications System

- a. Describe the base call control hardware and software system that is proposed.
- b. Provide a summary of benefits that can be delivered to the Court with the proposed system using specific examples for Court operations where possible.
- c. Provide a schematic diagram that shows the major components of the system, where they would likely be located, and how they are interconnected, including all peripheral devices required to support the additional features such as ACD, Contact Center reporting, Desktop Fax, and Unified Messaging.
- d. What is the current software level for the product, when was it issued for general availability, and what is the planned release date for the next software revision?
- e. What is the current version of the proposed system hardware and when is the next planned introduction of new hardware components that will supersede what is proposed?
- f. For the proposed system specified in the spreadsheet included in Section VI., how many IP and Analog telsets can be added for growth before any expansion of the device hardware is required?
- g. Describe the design for redundancy and failover in the system proposed, with a specific description of what services/applications are retained and lost in the event of a failover.
- h. Describe in detail what services/applications are retained and lost at a branch/remote location that goes into “local survivability mode” if the connection to the main call control system is lost.
- i. Describe the capabilities for audio conferencing included in the base system, and describe the user interface for those capabilities.
- j. Describe the desktop call management software proposed, including the current software release level for the product, when was it issued for general availability, what is the planned release date for the next software revision, and the method(s) used for desktop installation.
- k. Does the Base System as proposed support “presence”? If yes, describe the “presence” feature and system architecture.
- l. Does the Base System as proposed support Instant Messaging (IM) between users on the system? If yes, describe the IM feature and system architecture.
- m. Can any of the Base System software be installed and operated in a VMWare virtualized server environment? If yes, describe which components and any limitations.
- n. Are any elements of the proposed software available as a VMWare Virtual Appliance?
- o. Does the system support the use of physical fax machines as analog extensions? If YES, describe what is included in the proposal for that requirement.
- p. What mobility applications does the system offer for Android and iPhone smartphones?
- q. What mobility applications does the system offer for other smartphones or tablet devices?

- r. Describe how the system supports 911 emergency calls that are correctly identified to the PSAP by the actual physical location of the caller.
- s. Provide a list of SIP trunking vendors/carriers that have certified the proposed product to work with their network.

4.2. Voice Messaging System

- a. Describe the type and model of voice messaging system proposed.
- b. What type of integration is used between the base Voice Communications System and the voice messaging system?
- c. Does the proposed product support “integrated” or “unified” desktop messaging that displays voice messages, faxes, and e-mails on a single user screen? If YES, describe the system architecture and features.
- d. What is the current software release for the product, and when was it issued for general availability and what is the planned release date for the next software revision?
- e. Are AutoAttendant (AA) features supported on this system, or some other part of the proposed system?
- f. Can the system support provide both system-wide AA menus and greetings, as well as localized AA menus and greetings for each Court location, Divisions and Departments?
- g. Can any of the Messaging System software be installed and operated in a VMWare virtualized server environment?
- h. Are any elements of the proposed software available as a VMWare Virtual Appliance?

4.3 System Management Tools

- a. What administrative system software does the vendor propose?
- b. What server platform and operating system does the software require?
- c. Must the server platform be dedicated to the system management application (i.e. can other applications run on the same computer)?
- d. What type of connection and protocol does the system use to communicate with the Voice Communications System and the messaging system?
- e. Does the system allow the system manager to administer both telephone stations and voice mailboxes from same screen in the same session? If NO, provide a description of the process for managing standard MAC orders.
- f. What system monitoring and reporting capabilities are included in the proposed administrative software package for traditional switched telephony functions (for example, trunk utilization)?
- g. What system monitoring and reporting capabilities are included in the proposed administrative software for IP transport and packet processing (for example packet delay times, packet loss, codec usage, etc.)?
- h. What capability does the base system include for Call Accounting that would enable the Court to review historical usage data by station, extension or user?
- i. Describe the system’s ability to integrate with Active Directory.
- j. Can any of the proposed software be installed and operated in a VMWare virtualized server environment? If yes, describe which components and any limitations.
- k. Are any elements of the proposed software available as a VMWare Virtual Appliance?
- l. Describe the training plan and course requirements for the Court to have one technical staff person certified in the management and administration of the system proposed, including the base system, messaging systems, and contact center systems.

4.4 Telephone Sets

- a. Describe the telephone sets that are proposed for:
 - Basic IP Phones
 - Standard IP Phones
 - Executive IP Phones
 - Conference IP Phones
 - In-Building Wireless Phones

- b. When is the next planned introduction of new telsets that will add to or supercede what is proposed?
- c. Does each of the proposed telsets include an Ethernet switch? If yes, briefly describe capabilities of switch.
- d. What color options exist for each of these types of sets?
- e. Do any of these types of telsets require printed paper labels to be created and installed for the labeling of function keys? If YES, which ones use paper labels and is software for creating and printing labels included with the proposed system?
- f. Are the physical telsets proprietary and only usable with that manufacturer's equipment or do they use an open standard such as SIP for communicating with the base system?
- g. Describe the softphone proposed for use on Windows desktop or laptop computers.
- h. Is there a specific brand of headset that the vendor recommends for use with the proposed telsets?
- i. Are there any known problems with the proposed telephone sets working with common wired or wireless headsets?

4.5 Automatic Call Distribution

- a. Is the ACD function built into the base telephone hardware and software system? If YES, briefly describe the capabilities and limitations of the ACD within the overall system. If NO, describe the separate proposed hardware and software that will support the ACD function.
- b. If a separate server is required, describe the required server platform and operating system.
- c. If a separate server is required, must the server be dedicated to the ACD application (i.e. can other applications run on the same computer)?
- d. What is the current software release for the product and when was it issued for general availability? What is the planned release date for the next software revision?
- e. Can any of the proposed software be installed and operated in a VMWare virtualized server environment? If yes, describe which components and any limitations.
- f. Are any elements of the proposed software available as a VMWare Virtual Appliance?
- g. What tool is used for managing changes to the ACD configuration? Briefly describe the capabilities of the tool and the user interface. Is the ACD function configurable by a Court IT staff using a Windows GUI tool or does it require advanced programming skills using specialized tools?
- h. Can changes to the ACD configuration be made in real-time?
- i. Does the ACD allow agents to log into more than one call queue at the same time?
- j. Does the system provide the ability to inform callers of expected wait times and/or their place in queue? If YES, describe how that feature works, including limitations.
- k. Does the system allow inbound callers who leave a queue temporarily, for example to an IVR application, to be restored to their original place in queue?

4.6 Contact Center Management Tools

- a. Describe the proposed hardware and software required for administration, management, and reporting for Contact Center operations.
- b. What is the current software release for the product and when was it issued for general availability? What is the planned release date for the next software revision?
- c. Can any of the proposed software be installed and operated in a VMWare virtualized server environment? If yes, describe which components and any limitations.
- d. Are any elements of the proposed software available as a VMWare Virtual Appliance?
- e. If a separate server is required, describe the required server platform and operating system.
- f. If a separate server is required, must the server be dedicated to the system management application (i.e. can other applications run on the same computer)?
- g. Briefly describe the *real-time* reporting capabilities for the proposed system, including devices (telsets, PC's, wallboards) and content (calls in queue, longest hold time, agents logged in, etc.).
- h. Briefly describe the *historical reporting capabilities* of the proposed system, for both standard and custom reports, including limitations on those capabilities and the export of report data to other programs.

4.7 E-fax Server

- a. Describe the e-fax system hardware and software that is proposed.
- b. Is the e-fax system part of the voice messaging system, or is it a separate system? If it is a separate system, is it a 3rd-party product or was it created by the same company as the voice messaging system software?
- c. If a separate fax server is required to support this application, what integration is proposed between that server and the base Voice Communications System?
- d. What is the current software level for the product and when was it issued for general availability?
- e. What is the planned release date for the next software revision(s)?
- f. What client software is proposed that will be installed on individual desktop PC's for managing, creating, and sending faxes?
- g. How does fax client software get installed on a Personal Computer?
- h. Does the e-fax server and client software integrate with Microsoft Outlook and Microsoft Exchange 2010?
- i. Can any of the proposed software be installed and operated in a VMWare virtualized server environment? If yes, describe which components and any limitations.
- j. Are any elements of the proposed software available as a VMWare Virtual Appliance?
- k. Describe the Fax Filing application that would be created to replace the current process.
- l. For the Fax Filing application, can the proposed system provide receipt of confirmation and notification of receipt to both the sender and to the Court work group handling incoming fax filings?

4.8 Mobility/Unified Communications

- a. Describe the capabilities of the proposed system to support mobile handsets using the Court's new Cisco wi-fi infrastructure.
- b. Describe integration capabilities with Android and iPhone operating systems that would benefit the Court.

NOTE: Items specifically not included in this RFP are:

- Wired or wireless headsets
- Overhead paging speakers and amplifiers
- External or 3rd Party System for recording telephone calls
- Outbound calling campaign software/database
- Audio conferencing bridge
- Video conferencing systems

V. TECHNICAL PROPOSAL – IVR/IWR SYSTEM

5.1 Basic System Description

- a. Provide a brief summary description of the proposed system.
- b. Provide a summary of benefits that can be delivered to the Court with the proposed system using specific examples for Court operations where possible.
- c. Describe how the proposed IVR/IWR system interfaces with the proposed Voice Communications System (e.g. analog, digital, integrated system).
- d. Does the proposed system use industry-standard, non-proprietary voice computer-telephony boards? If YES, list make and model. If NO, describe proposed product.
- e. What is the Text-to-Speech engine included in the proposal?
- f. In general terms describe how the proposed system is configured to conform to PCI Security Standards for handling credit card transactions.
- g. In addition to English and Spanish, what languages can the proposed system be programmed to use for customer self-service applications? What additions to the system proposal would be required to enable programs in any of these other languages?

5.2 Proposed System Hardware

- a. Does the proposed system include a server platform? If yes, describe the technical specifications for the server.

- b. What is the maximum number of boards and ports that the proposed or recommended server system can support?
- c. List the type, brand, and model of cards to be installed in the server.
- d. Do any of the cards to be installed come in different port densities than what is proposed? If YES, explain.
- e. Can the proposed system cards support speech recognition for applications without any additional or replacement hardware?
- f. What elements of the system as proposed include redundancy in the event of component failure? As proposed, how is the system designed for redundancy and failover?
- g. What hardware options are available for backup and recovery of applications programming in the event of system failure? What backup system is proposed that will allow recovery and re-deployment of applications programming within 2 hours of repair of a hardware failure?

5.3 Proposed Base System Software and Interfaces

- a. List the software products that are proposed including software name, manufacturer and current release version
- b. Briefly describe the functions, capabilities, and limitations of each software component proposed.
- c. What is the Operating System software for the proposed system?
- d. In what programming language(s) is the proposed application software written?
- e. Can any of the proposed software be installed and operated in a VMWare virtualized server environment? If yes, describe which components and any limitations.

5.4 IVR/IWR Applications

- a. Describe the Tentative Ruling (TR) IVR application that is proposed and any assumptions the proposal makes about what the Court will need to provide or do to participate in development and deployment. Is the software for the application a modified version of an existing application, or will it require custom programming to develop?
- b. Describe the Jury IVR application that is proposed and any assumptions the proposal makes about what the Court will need to provide or do to participate in development and deployment. Is the software for the application a modified version of an existing application, or will it require custom programming to develop?
- c. Would any additional software components or API's from ACS Juror be required for your proposed Jury application?
- d. Describe the Traffic IVR application that is proposed and any assumptions the proposal makes about what the Court will need to provide or do to participate in development and deployment. Is the software for the application a modified version of an existing application, or will it require custom programming to develop?
- e. If the proposed applications are to be custom software development projects, please describe the process that is used for developing customized software.

5.5 Speech Recognition

- a. What additional software and hardware components would be required to enable speech recognition in addition to the standard touch-tone IVR?
- b. What brand or manufacturer of speech recognition software would you propose?
- c. Describe the standard grammars that would be included with the proposed system.

5.6 System Administration, Diagnostics, and Development Tools

- a. List and describe the System Administration and Diagnostic tools that are included in your proposal.
- b. List and describe the Application Development and programming tools that are included in your proposal.
- c. Does the application development software tool, as proposed, provide the ability to test new or modified scripts before they are made active? Explain.
- d. Describe the automatic self-testing and diagnostic tools included with the proposed system and how they function within the existing network environment.

- e. List and describe the standard system operating reports included with the proposed system and how those reports can be accessed by Court Staff.
- f. Describe the training resources that are available for the proposed system and what classes/training would be required for the Court to have 1 technician certified as a System Administrator and/or Developer.

VI. PRICING

Pricing must be submitted using the spreadsheets Attachments F and G. For the printed version, the spreadsheet may be shifted to landscape mode and printed on multiple pages if that is required to make space for notes. The electronic version of the pricing spreadsheet must be submitted as an unlocked Excel file with working formulas and no hidden columns.

In addition to submitting the pricing in the form requested by the Court, vendors must include their standard pricing sheets in the format normally used internally and/or for customers. The total price shown on both the RFP Attachment Pricing sheets and the vendor's standard pricing sheets must match. Both pricing submissions should include a similar level of detail for component line items, unit pricing, and extended pricing.

This RFP has been written knowing that the type of systems for which the Court is soliciting proposals have a variety of architectures and pricing schemes. The pricing sheets have been structured in a manner that attempts to capture, in detail, the pricing for the various elements that should be included in all system proposals. However, all of the individual line items will not apply to every proposal or system.

In completing the pricing sheets, vendors are to break out the pricing of the various components included in their system proposal in a way that best meets the intent of the pricing spreadsheet. Modifications, insertions, and deletions are allowed on the pricing spreadsheet as long as the basic form and structure is retained, but all changes should be noted and explained in the space provided for notes. However, Totals and sub-totals in the pricing spreadsheet should not be added or deleted.

Vendors must provide detailed pricing by component parts, unit pricing for those components, and the direct cost of installation for those components as shown on the Pricing spreadsheet. On the spreadsheet, vendors should fill in all gray shaded areas. Where specific quantities of components are given on the pricing sheet, vendors must propose that quantity. Where the phrase "Vendor Spec" appears, proposers are to include that quantity or amount that their proposed system will require to meet the needs of the Court as expressed in this RFP. Specific items on the pricing spreadsheet should be addressed as describe in the sections below.

VI.A Voice Communications System – Attachment F

1. System Hardware – This section should include prices for all of the tangible, physical equipment required for the installation and operation of the basic Voice Communications System, except telsets. It is assumed for this proposal that all voice traffic will be carried on Court's LAN within buildings and on the existing AT&T network between Court locations.

1.1 and 1.2 – Include any servers or appliances required for the basic call control system for a system that can support 1,100 stations (1,000 IP and 100 analog) at the time of installation. Hardware should be designed for both internal (for example, processors and power supplies) and geographic redundancy (full call control at more than 1 site). For systems that are not based on industry-standard servers and plan to install call control devices at multiple sites, size the devices to cover the 12 sites in approximately the same proportions of extensions as exist today within the total capacity required.

1.3 - The Court plans to move to SIP trunking and may be able to use existing data network connections for voice communications access to the PSTN. However, the actual service configuration or carrier has not yet been determined. For pricing this proposal, vendors should include gateways in the quantity shown on the pricing spreadsheet for terminating T1/PRI's that would handle SIP trunks.

1.4 - Two analog trunk interfaces must be provided at each of the 12 locations for 911 calls.

1.5 - The base system as proposed should include the hardware required to support 950 physical IP stations.

1.6 - The proposal should include hardware to provide for 96 analog station interfaces, eight (8) at each Court location. A more detailed review of analog station requirements will be made before any final agreement is reached.

1.7 and 1.8 - For voicemail system hardware, if the proposed voice messaging system is capable of running entirely on the Court's VMWare virtualized server infrastructure, vendors may assume the Court will provide that capacity. However, any requirements or assumptions must be noted both in the text of the RFP response and as notes on the right-hand column of the pricing spreadsheet. If the vendor is proposing physical servers for the voice messaging system, the proposal should be designed for redundancy as described above for call control hardware.

1.11-1.15 - For each of these items, vendors should determine the type and quantity of equipment required to support their proposal as a complete installation for the Court. Types and quantities of equipment should be noted both in the text of the RFP response and as notes on the right-hand column of the pricing spreadsheet.

1.16 - For each physical hardware element included in this section that requires power to keep the system operating (server, appliances), vendors should include rack-mounted UPS's of sufficient capacity to keep those devices operating for 4 hours at normal loads.

2. System Software – As proposed, the system must be fully-licensed for the number of stations shown in Sections 2 and 3 of the pricing spreadsheet.

2.1 and 2.2 – Include the basic system software including the redundancy provisions as described above.

2.3 - Include any additional software components that might be required for networking together the 12 sites over the existing AT&T data network.

2.4 Include the price of the system administration software as described in the text section of the proposal.

2.5 to 2.10 Include the cost of licenses for each of the line items shown in the quantities shown, including any installation costs.

2.11 For Unified Messaging the quantity shown is for nine hundred (900) licenses. If a vendor's base pricing for those software licenses includes a higher quantity (e.g. 1,000) that should be noted. If these licenses are automatically included in the Extension/User license, that should be noted as well.

3. Telephones – Vendors should choose and propose telephones in the five (5) categories as shown. Beyond the basic requirement of a Standard 3-line telephone and an Executive 6-line telephone, specific requirements for those telsets have not been provided. Vendors are to propose the devices they think would best meet the needs of the Court based on the information provided. The requirement for in-building wireless phones (item 3.5) are for devices that could temporarily substitute for a standard IP phone, connecting to the voice communications system over the wi-fi infrastructure.

During the installation of the system it will be the responsibility of the vendor to install all telephones at the Court locations. Due to the security and operating requirements of the Court, this can be a challenging task. Vendors are to include the installation labor required for this task. As with 1.1 above, assume that the number of telephones to be placed at each site will be in approximately the same

proportion to the total of number of extensions as exist today. A more detailed station count by location will be made before any final agreement is reached.

4. Professional Services – In this section vendors are to include pricing for all professional services that are not directly related to the system installation and included in section 1, 2 and 3 above. Where specific quantities of hours are given, vendors are to provide only their hourly rate for those services. Do not change the quantities. For items shown as “Vendor Spec”. vendors are to provide both quantity and price for that line item.

4.1 to 4.3 – Vendors are to assume they are providing appropriate engineers and project managers for the tasks shown.

4.4 – Vendors are to provide the costs of a professional trainer for two weeks of user training classes to be delivered on site at the Court locations. The actual schedule and format for training will be determined before any final agreement is reached.

4.5 – Vendors are to provide a total of 8 hours of on-site assistance to the Court’s technical staff for hands-on training. The actual schedule and format for training will be determined before any final agreement is reached.

4.6 – Vendors are to provide a price for the training plan for full system certification for two (2) Court employees as administrators of the proposed voice communications system.

4.7 - Vendors are to provide a price for a training course for the Court Network Admin in the use of the Cisco NAM for management of voice traffic on a converged network.

5. Contact Center – In this section vendors are to provide pricing for all additional ACD and Contact Center functionality that is not part of the base system. In Section 3 of the RFP response, proposers should include a complete description of the proposed Contact Center system.

5.1 and 5.2 – Hardware and software, plus installation costs, for any ACD system not included in the base system should be entered here.

5.3 and 5.4 - Hardware and software, plus installation costs, for the tools required to manage and monitor the Contact Center should be included in this section.

5.5 to 5.7 – Vendors should include licenses for agents and supervisors in the quantities shown on the pricing spreadsheet. It is assumed that each agent and supervisor will also have an option for a desktop display of call center statistics. If there is a price difference between the desktop displays for agents and supervisors, another row can be entered into the spreadsheet to show that.

5.8 to 5.13 – As with professional services for the based system above, vendors are to provide either hourly rates or hours and rates for the line items as shown.

6. E-fax Desktop Fax System - Vendors should provide pricing of a complete turn-key e-fax solution with the capacities indicated on the pricing spreadsheet. If the hardware and/or software for this feature are included in the base system pricing, that should be noted on the form.

7. Ongoing System Support and Maintenance, Base System - In this section, vendors are to provide pricing for the specific service support options requested, by year and by hour. Items 7.1 and 7.2 are discrete options. Pricing is to be provided for both of the options if the vendor offers both. The pricing in this section is for a twelve (12) month agreement. Longer-term contracts with discounted rates may be proposed as an option.

7.1 and 7.2 For the System Maintenance Agreement, vendors should assume that the agreement covers system hardware repair and replacement coverage excluding telephone sets, onsite and remote service support for system failures and operating problems and regular software patches/maintenance (i.e. “dot releases”).

7.3 is for a service contract covering major new software releases. If all upgrades are part of the ordinary service offering, it should be noted.

Sections 8 and 9 of the pricing spreadsheet are for Ongoing System Support and Maintenance Costs for the Contact Center and E-fax system. The instructions for Section 7 apply to these sections.

VI.B IVR/IWR System – Attachment G

1. System Hardware – This section should include prices for all of the tangible, physical equipment required for the installation and operation of the basic thirty-six (36) port IVR/IWR system with touchtone access, web access, and optional speech recognition capability. The costs of configuration and installation are not to be included in this section.

1.1 – If some or all operations of the proposed system could be supported on virtualized servers, vendors should provide a specific description in the RFP text response of what would be required and can note that assumption on the pricing spreadsheet.

1.3 – The base system as proposed should be able to handle 36 simultaneous voice (IVR) transactions. Voice processing cards that can scale up or down in capacity would be desirable as there is no good data to use in estimating peak demand for a system that supported the three applications requested.

1.4 – Information on the Court’s existing back-up system has not been provided in this RFP. It may be possible that the requirement for back-up and restore may be met by existing systems. However, for this RFP vendors should propose a solution would allow for restoration of the main system within 2 hours if the programming on that system was lost or compromised.

2. System Software – As proposed, the system must be able to support 36 simultaneous voice (IVR) transactions. The base proposal should include system administration software and any other software required to support the required application.

2.4 and 2.5 – For the purposes of this RFP, it is assumed that the Jury and Traffic application would be enabled for both English and Spanish speaking callers, but that the TR application would only be in English. If the TTS capability would be used in applications other than the TR applications, vendors may need to include that in item 2.5. Please describe the assumptions in the RFP response text and note them on the pricing spreadsheet as well.

3. Installation Professional Services – Vendors must include pricing to assemble, prepare, and install the base system on site at the Court.

4. Applications – As described in the RFP text, the Court is requesting pricing for the platform that can support three applications: Tentative Rulings, Jury, and Traffic. For the purposes of the RFP it is assumed that all three will provide automated customer service over the telephone that is equivalent to what is available on the web. In addition, the Jury application may include a Interactive Web Module.

5. Options and Additions – Vendors are to provide pricing for the Options and Additions as listed. If any of the listed items are included as components of the basic system, at no additional cost, that should be noted.

5.1 – The Court would like to consider the option of enabling the system for speech recognition. Based on the response in the RFP text, vendors should include the complete cost of speech recognition for all three applications.

5.2 – Vendors should include a budgetary cost for adding a web component to the Jury services application.

5.3 – A budgetary cost should be included for software licenses and development services to create programs that would allow the system to make outbound reminder calls to citizens noticed for Jury service and to select groups of jurors already serving.

5.6 – Vendors should include the cost of a development server license that would allow the Court to set up its own application development environment for the proposed system.

5.7 – The costs of the training program for Court staff to be able to develop applications on the system, as described in the RFP text response, should be included here.

6. Ongoing Support Costs – In this section, vendors are to provide pricing for the specific service support options requested, by year and by hour.

For the System Service Support Agreement, vendors should assume that the agreement covers system hardware repair and replacement coverage, onsite and remote service support for system failures and operating problems, and regular software patches/maintenance. An agreement for periodic major system software upgrades is to be included in 6.2. Support and upgrade agreements for the three applications are listed individually. The pricing requested in this section is for twelve (12) month agreements. Longer-term agreements may be proposed as an option.

VII. ATTACHMENTS

-
- Attachment A – Vendor Certification Form (included in this document)
 - Attachment B – Guidelines for Evaluation Committee Review of Technical Proposals
 - Attachment C – Voice Network Diagram
 - Attachment D – Data Network Diagram
 - Attachment E – Features List
 - Attachment F – Pricing Spreadsheet – Voice Communications System
 - Attachment G – Pricing Spreadsheet – IVR/IWR System
 - Attachment H – Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Worksheet
 - Attachment I – Standard Contract

**ATTACHMENT A
VENDOR CERTIFICATION FORM**

I certify that neither _____ (Proposer) nor any of its proposed subcontractors are currently under suspension or debarment by any state or federal government agency, and that neither Proposer nor any of its proposed subcontractors are tax delinquent with the State of California. I have listed all contracts with government or commercial customers during the five (5) years preceding submission of this Proposal.

I acknowledge that if Proposer or any of its subcontractors subsequently are placed under suspension or debarment by a local, state or federal government entity, or if Proposer or any of its subcontractors subsequently become delinquent in California taxes, our Proposal may be disqualified.

Signature

Printed Name

Title

Date