

**Questions and Answers for RFP 001-2012**

<b>Date of Response</b>	<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>
4/12/12	1	Who currently services and supports the current Inter-tel System?	The Court does not currently have a support contract. The phone system is currently serviced by Mitel out of the Sacramento area.
4/12/12	2	Will the County of Butte consider a hosted VoIP solution for this project?	No.
4/12/12	3	What feature functionality is the court looking for in the IVR?	Attachment H, section 6-E provides more detail into the requirements for the IVR*. Currently, the Court uses a highly customizable IVR. IVR applications can be built to present callers with menu trees that can prompt and direct callers to the appropriate destinations. The Court requires similar functionality in any proposed phone system.
4/12/12	4	Regarding the public address system: a) Is there currently a system installed? b) If so, what type of system is it?	Yes, there is currently a public address system installed. The existing system is a multi-zone, 70-volt distributed audio overhead paging system.
4/12/12	5	Regarding Conference Calling: How many participants are you requesting for conference calling? Is it to be Audio? Video? Or both options?	Conference calling requires the ability to conference in a minimum of five outside lines. Audio-only conference calling is the requirement, but video conferencing may be included.
4/12/12	6	Can you provide a network diagram that outlines voice and data?	The Court will endeavor to answer questions regarding the network implementation, but network diagrams will not be made available before the contract is awarded.
4/12/12	7	In regards to Fax Options: Do you want Fax as an option integrated into the solution?	Yes.
4/12/12	8	Do you want unified messaging?	Unified messaging is highly desired but not absolutely critical. The Court does want the ability to receive voicemail via forwarding to its e-mail system.
4/12/12	9	Can you provide feedback on the IVR component and how important that aspect is overall? Does the system have to have that feature, or is that a (nice-to-have).	See question number three above. The IVR component is a requirement and, as such, very important.
4/17/2012	10	Can the court's existing scheduled by modified? We don't feel there is sufficient time for the court to provide published responses and yet allow vendors the opportunity to modify or adjust conceptual	Questions submitted within the timelines listed in the RFP will be answered and posted on an ongoing basis up to the final answer posting date listed in the RFP. Specific

		responses within a two-day period. We have an extensive list of questions and concerns, all of which will require the Court to provide more details than were included in the RFP documentation.	technical details regarding a particular proposed solution may be discussed during the conceptual proposal phase. The Court cannot modify the existing schedule.
4/24/12	11	Is your IT infrastructure virtualized (VMware)?	Yes, portions of the Court's IT infrastructure are virtualized; they are not, however, virtualized on VMware.
4/24/12	12	Would you considering a virtualized voice solution?	Yes, the Court would consider a virtualized voice solution.
4/24/12	13	Has the Court determined any preference yet for a hybrid solution that supports digital and IP devices vs. a native IP phone system?	The Court has no preference for a hybrid solution vs. a native IP solution; either solution will be considered.
4/24/12	14	If the Court is interested in considering a voice over IP system and its advantages, can you please advise if there is Cat 5 or better wiring at most locations where phones would be placed	Yes, CAT5 or better cabling exists in most locations where phones would be placed.
4/24/12	15	When was the last LAN/WAN refresh done, and was any of the network upgrade done with the future possibility of IP telephony in mind, such as support for VLANS, Quality of Service, and power over Ethernet? If unknown, can we assume for the purposes of the response that network equipment pricing may need to be determined at a future date?	The most recent LAN refresh was completed in December of 2011, and the second phase of that project, the WAN refresh, is scheduled to be completed this month (April, 2012). VLAN support is in place for IP telephony. Quality of Service (QoS) is currently not implemented on the network, but could be implemented. Most of the switches on the Court network are capable of providing power over Ethernet (POE) and the Court understands that there may be requirements to replace those switches that do not have the POE capability.

\* Note that the Court currently uses/requires tone input with (Court created) pre-recorded audio playback