The following is additional information regarding Request for Proposal (**RFP) No 4620 - Unified Communications and Contact Center Replacement** released on 10/17/2018. **The Updated due date and time for responses is December 31, 12:00 PM (Pacific)**. This addendum includes both questions from prospective proposers and the City’s answers, and revisions to the RFP. This addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and therefore, the information contained herein shall be taken into consideration when preparing and submitting a proposal.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item # | Date Received | Date Answered | Vendor’s Question | City’s Answer | | RFP Revisions |
| 1 | 10/19/18 | 11/5/18 | Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this?  (like, from India or Canada) | Yes, however, no City data or derivative thereof, may be moved or stored outside the US in any proposed solution. | |  |
| 2 | 10/19/18 | 10/29/18 | Does (companies) need to come (to the City of Seattle) for meetings? | Yes. | |  |
| 3 | 10/19/18 | 10/29/18 | Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA?  (like, from India or Canada) | If planning on performing tasks outside of the US, please specify those tasks during the Q&A period ending Nov 21. (i.e., what is described in the SOW (implementation, etc.) or the work done in preparation for the RFP response). | |  |
| 4 | 10/19/18 | 10/29/18 | Can we submit the proposals via email? | No, Proposals should be submitted as instructed in section 11.8 of the RFP. | |  |
| 5 | 10/19/18 | 10/29/18 | This RFP looks like a re-bid of RFP# ITD-4341 from March, is that correct? If so, why was it cancelled? | Yes, this is rebidding RFP #4341 but with a *significant change* to scope. | |  |
| 6 | 10/22/18 | 10/29/18 | The embedded PDF labeled Exhibit C will not open. Can we please get this separate from the RFP doc? | Although this document opened for most, I am attaching here as well | |  |
| 7 | 10/23/18 | 10/29/18 | Is the city open to a response that could leverage the existing PureConnect (CIC) platform and optimize it, make it more efficient and expand as needed to meet the requirements? Or is the hope of this to fully displace all of the current platforms you have today? | Yes, the City is open to a response to leverage the existing Pure Connect platform.  We are looking for the best solution based on the requirements as outlined in the RFP. | |  |
| 8 | 10/23/18 | 10/29/18 | Is the deadline for questions really on November 21 or are you planning to issue multiple sets of answers to questions on a regular schedule, the last of which is published shortly after November 21? If you could answer this as soon as possible, we’d appreciate it as our intent to respond is dependent on it. | We will be submitting answers to the questions as we receive them to be posted on the Purchasing website. | |  |
| 9 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 2, Purpose: Is upgrading the existing Avaya AACC acceptable or are is the City looking for a complete new contact center solution? | If the existing contact center has an upgrade path that would meet the City’s RFP requirements we would be open to a proposed solution. | |  |
| 10 | 10/30/18 | 11/9/18 | Page 3, Part 2, the RFP identifies that the City will provide Skype for Business licenses. Can the City provide a Visio of the current Skype deployment? Does it currently provide Enterprise Voice? | 1. Yes the city will provide skype for business and teams licenses for every user. **Our current o365 licensed user count is 14,275.** 2. Yes we purchased Skype enterprise voice licensing for 50 users, however are only currently using less than 5. We are using an AudioCodes Mediant 3000 with LDAP integration to route to voice users when UC enabled. 3. We purchased 20 G5 licenses for piloting other areas of o365 (mostly around security and compliance). | |  |
| 11 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 3, Part 2, the RFP identifies the need for CRM integrations. Can you provide a comprehensive list of the CRM integrations and other third-party integrations that are required? | The selected vendor is expected to meet with the Business to identify requirements. Proposers should expect a variety of potential integrations, for example, MS Dynamics and Motorola. | |  |
| 12 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 3, Part 3, the RFP identifies that the City currently uses an Avaya PBX solution. Is the City open to upgrading the current solution? Is the City open to migrating licenses from the Avaya solution to a new Avaya solution? | If the existing PBX has an upgrade path that would meet the City’s RFP requirements we would be open to a proposed solution. | |  |
| 13 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 4 Background: Do any of the Audiocodes MP1XX units connect via analog station circuits for fire alarm, HVAC alarming, etc.? | With the current AVAYA design, the City provides fire and HVAC alarming etc. through flat business lines. | |  |
| 14 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 4, identifies that there are 2747 analog stations and 8520 digital endpoints currently deployed. Between these two set types, how many are eligible to be deployed as IP based stations? E.G. IP/Ethernet network facilities are either already present or planned for prior to proposal deployment. | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  We estimate 95% of the digital endpoints could potentially be converted to VoIP. The remaining 5% in public areas may not. | |  |
| 15 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 4, Identifies that there are 2747 analog stations deployed. RFP also states (Page 6) "Calls to and from phones that process credit card data route to dedicated PRI tie-trunks that connect to Time Division Multiplexing (TDM) and analog station ports for Payment Card Industry (PCI) compliance." Of the 2747 analog stations currently deployed, how many must remain analog due to PCI compliance requirements? RFP (Page 15) Identifies that "Around seventy-five (75) POTS lines are installed to meet PCI compliance policy." Please confirm whether these 75 POTS lines delivered are City provided or PSTN provided POTS lines and whether they are incorporated into the 2747 analog stations previously referenced. | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  The 75 POTS lines are leased lines from the telco and not included in the 2747 analog station count. | |  |
| 16 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 4, Part 3, the RFP states that all current SBC gateways will be replaced. Is the City open to migrating licenses from the current Audiocodes solution to a new Audiocodes solution? | Yes, the City is open to a response to leverage the existing licenses as long as the newer SBC can meet the City’s requirements as outlined in the RFP. |
| 17 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 6, Voice Mail: Are Seattle City Light PAX PBX users (out of scope), whose voicemail mailboxes reside on the City of Seattle Callpilot, to be migrated to the new voicemail system? | Yes, they are to be migrated to the new voicemail system. | |  |
| 18 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 6-7, The City has identified that CallPilot voicemail is currently in use for various purposes. During the execution period of the proposed solution, does the City believe there will be a need or requirement to integrate the CallPilot voicemail solution to the proposed solution for the purposes of person to person voicemail transfers or broadcast messaging? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  Please see RFP 6.1.5.17.  If the solution chosen runs the voicemail systems (old and new) in tandem, we do not anticipate needing message forwarding between systems or the capability of sending broadcast messages to all mailboxes on both systems. | |  |
| 19 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 7, IVR (Interactive Voice Response): Are independent ‘test lab’ environments required for applications development/testing such as those currently running in the MPS and Contact Center systems? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  Please see RFP 6.1.1.18. | |  |
| 20 | 10/30/18 | 11/9/18 | Page 7, IVR (Interactive Voice Response): Please identify, other than MPS, any other IVR functionality/systems/ such as Interalia XMU/SBX, Nortel MIRAN, etc. that will require the units or the recordings/menus to migrate to or be integrated to the new PBX environment. | The City’s Avaya environment has a combination of Interalia RAN and XMUs with a total of 147 recordings. Recordings on these devices are primarily used for basic ACD RAN recordings which are used as backup call processing when AACC is down. The new solution will determine the need for them. | |  |
| 21 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 7, Part 3, the RFP provides a list of current self-service applications. Is it the intent to migrate all existing IVR applications listed (DNIS Driver, SPU/SCL One Stop, Court General Information, Court POT, SDCI, FAS IVR) to a new IVR platform? | Yes. Please see RFP Statement of Work. | |  |
| 22 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 10, The City has identified that Seattle City Light currently utilizes the incumbent Genesys PureConnect ACD solution. The City has also identified (RFP Page 5) that Seattle City Light PBX platforms are out of scope; with specific exceptions stated. What is the City's plan to accommodate the Seattle City Light tenancy or use of the current ACD solution as a proposed solution is integrated? Specifically, will ACD agents within Seattle City Light be expected to utilize phone services from the City of Seattle so as to remain part of any new proposed ACD solution? | All City Light contact center agents, both AACC and Genesys PureConnect agents, will utilize phone services on the new solution.  There are no ACD agents on the City Light systems which are out of scope. | |  |
| 23 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 12, Paging Adjuncts: Do any of the Audiocodes MP1XX units connect to paging systems? If so, which sites are so served? And each such served site, are the connections analog station or analog trunk? (TC) | Yes. They are analog loop start trunks. 70+ sites have paging systems, a subset of this number connect through Audiocodes. | |  |
| 24 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 12, the City references PINNACLE Telecom Expense Management. Does the new platform need to seamlessly integrate to PINNACLE or is the City open to a new TEM solution? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP. Please see RFP section 6.3.  The City is open to all options. | |  |
| 25 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 13, Enhanced 911 (E911): Please confirm what PBX system serves the City of Seattle E911 PSAP and whether these PBXs are in the scope of this RFP. | 911 PSAP is out of scope and not served by the City of Seattle systems.  Please see RFP 6.1.6 | |  |
| 26 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 13, the RFP addresses an ALIPro E911 solution. Is it the intent of the City to include a new E911 solution for the proposed solution or would the City consider reusing the ALIPro and Tone commander solution? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  Please see RFP 6.1.6 | |  |
| 27 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 14, Backup Power: At City of Seattle sites that have DC Power plants, are these sites equipped with inverters or AC UPS system to provide AC power if required? Is it the City’s intent that all UC solutions should be able to support -48DC? Does the City intend to reuse existing UPS configurations? | They are predominantly equipped with inverters, however may need to be resized to meet new solution requirements.  No, it is not the City’s requirement to have the UC solution able to support -48DC.  The City is open to reuse existing UPS where applicable. | |  |
| 28 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 15, identifies that the City maintains an offsite independent call center which is presumably hosted by CenturyLink. Are any elements of this independent call center considered "in scope" for this RFP? If so, please provide further detail regarding this offsite contact center. | No. The off-site contact center is third party and is out of scope. | |  |
| 29 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 16, it states that the City has no plans to move to Microsoft G5 license subscription. If the proposed solution would require G5 licenses in a 7- year life cycle analysis (as described on page 2), would that proposal be eliminated? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  No, that proposal would be considered. | |  |
| 30 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 17, 800 MHz radios: What, if any, is the voice path connection between the current City of Seattle PBX environment and the 800 MHz Emergency Communication environment? | No voice path to the 800 MHz radios exists today. | |  |
| 31 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 18 & Page 30, The City has stated as an objective for a proposed solution - Requirement 6.1.6.2) "Location identification for 911 calls, with ALI information delivered to identify the floor quadrant, at a minimum, with the option to identify individual rooms or workstations." Has the City provided Ethernet access networking assignments (VLANs) to the floor/quadrant of buildings or does it plan to do so if necessitated by a proposed solution? Secondarily, for room/workstation ELIN/ALI assignments, does the City maintain physical port mappings for network access (from the wall port to the closet panel and subsequently from the wall panel to the switch) or will the Vendor be required to map these locations out in order to make appropriate ELIN/ALI assignments? | Yes, the City plans to segment locations by VLAN and use IP ranges to identify locations for 911.  No, the Vendor will not be involved, the City’s intent is to use IP range to map locations for E911. | |  |
| 32 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 18, the RFP describes integration of UM to Outlook or O365. Can you describe the City’s policy for retention and discovery of these UM messages? | The City’s policy for voice message retention is under development at this time.  Please see RFP 6.1.5 | |  |
| 33 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 21, Section 6.1.1 Architecture and Design: Are any of the locations currently served by CS1000 Survivable Media Gateways or by standalone High Availability CS1000 PBXs to have survivability independently of the new geographically distributed core PBX located in Seattle and Spokane data centers? | The City would like to consider survivability at currently survivable sites in addition to those listed in the RFP. Vendor may include an option in their recommendations for proposed Architecture and Design.  Please see RFP Exhibit C, PBX Network Diagram for current SMG sites. | |  |
| 34 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 22, The City has stated - Requirement 6.1.1.8) that local survivability is required for only two sites: West Police Precinct and the EOC. Furthermore, this was identified as a requirement for "hosted or hybrid solutions". What is the City's requirement or preference for local survivability across the entire municipality in reference to hybrid, hosted, and premises based solutions, if any? If the City does have a requirement or preference, would the City be willing to identify which sites or facilities are expected to be locally survivable on the proposed solution? | The City does not intend to have survivability across the entire municipality.  The City would like to consider survivability at currently survivable sites in addition to those listed in the RFP. Vendor may include an option in their recommendations for proposed Architecture and Design.  Please see RFP Exhibit C, PBX Network Diagram. | |  |
| 35 | 10/30/18 | 11/9/18 | Page 24, The City has stated - that assistive technologies must be able to be integrated to the proposed solution. Does the City currently utilize any assistive technologies in the incumbent solutions that are expected to be carried forward into a proposed solution? Please describe any currently in use assistive technologies as well as approximate user counts interacting with each. | There are multiple solutions in place on the Avaya today including amplified handsets, TTY & TTD machines, hearing aid compatible headsets, noise cancelling headsets, wireless headsets with remote answer capability, CapTel service, and visual and audio alerting using light and bells/chimes. | |  |
| 36 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 25, can the 5 separate conference bridges reside on 1 appliance or device, or do these bridges need to be on isolated services (multiple servers)? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  Conference audio bridges are not required to be on isolated devices/services, however they must be configurable to dedicate ports to one of the five departments.  Please see RFP 6.1.3.14 | |  |
| 37 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 26, The City has stated - that group or broadcast IP or station-based paging must be provided within the proposed solution. Please provide the number of stations/sets that are expected to utilize this function. | An estimated 10% currently. | |  |
| 38 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 32, The City has identified that Type-2 "Multi-Line Instrument"(s) must have a 10/100/1000 2-port switch, five (5) extension/line capacity, and the capability to attach a multi-button add on module. The table on RFP Page 33 identifies that only 100 add-on modules should be required. Would the City be willing to support a "Type-2" instrument type as presently stated AND a "Type-2(b)" instrument type which meets the existing requirement of "Type-2" with the exception of the add-on module capacity? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  The City will consider alternative solutions which meet the functional requirements of add-on modules. | |  |
| 39 | 10/30/18 | 11/5/18 | Page 33, The City has stated That "Type-1" sets must support add-on modules or side-cars. The previous requirements in on RFP Page 32 – (Requirement 6.1.8.4) do not have add-on modules listed as a requirement for Type-1 sets. The two requirements appear in conflict with one another. Please clarify.  • The ring-down circuit that are in place today, will this technology be required in the future? Are these two wire or four wire E&M?  • During the 30 month implementation, is the current Avaya under a support agreement? If not, does the City want a support agreement to be included? | The City requires, at a minimum, a Type-2 multi-button set capable of supporting add-on modules.  The City will consider alternative solutions which meet the functional requirements of add-on modules.  Current ring-down designs are either a PBX function (HOT D keys) or a Telco provided circuit (PVR keys). Yes, both options for this functionality are required in the new solution. Two wire E&M.  Based on manufacturer end of support roadmap we fully expect the existing Avaya maintenance contract will remain in place. | |  |
| 40 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Because the scope and breadth of this project would the City consider an extension? The deadline for questions is November 21st. When will the responses be returned? This gives each vendor 1 week to complete the proposal response and there is a Thanksgiving holiday. |  | | Due Date for Proposals has been extended to: December 31, 2018, 12:00 PM Pacific Standard Time.  The Q&A period remains unchanged. |
| 41 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Is it an absolute requirement that the PBX and applications database be encrypted at rest? | In addition to end-to-end traffic ption, all recorded voice calls must be encrypted at rest. The PBX (Call Server) database does not need to be encrypted. The City may find value in the ability to encrypt the data in the application databases. | |  |
| 42 | 10/31/18 | 11/5/18 | Can a more detailed correlation of the sites on Exhibit D – PBX Site Configs.xlsx Worksheet - Sites Tab - be made to the Exhibit C – PBX Network Diagram.pdf (Site Name/ System Type on the PDF to the Site Name on the Excel Worksheet) that can be used to assists in determining the PRI connections to the Existing equipment for the migration plan. | What has been provided in the RFP is the extent of the information the City is providing at this time. | |  |
| 43 | 10/31/18 | 11/5/18 | Are these analog trunks staying or will they be converting to SIP? See Embedded: | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP. | |  |
| 44 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Due to the timing of Thanksgiving holiday week, November 22/23. The deadline for questions November 21, and sealed proposals due November 28, will the city consider an extension to deliver the proposals the following week, December 5 or later in December? | See RFP Revision → | | Due Date for Proposals has been extended to: December 31, 2018, 12:00 PM Pacific Standard Time.  The Q&A period remains unchanged |
| 45 | 10/31/18 | 11/5/18 | Does the City write their own scripts/applications or use a tool kit to achieve different methods of backend integrations/databases with systems currently utilized within the City? If applications/scripts need to be customized, does the city have a list of what needs to be customized and in what programming language/protocols they desire? | Yes.  Vendor will be expected to meet with the business units and IT to review existing call to define customer requirements, create design while incorporating IVR/CC functionality during the build. | |  |
| 46 | 10/31/18 | 11/5/18 | With the RFP divided into sections, UC solution including advanced messaging - Section 6.1, IVR / CC solution - Section 6.2, Telemanagement Solution - Section 6.3, Meeting Rooms – Section 6.4, Robotic Process Automation - Section 6.5.    Q) Are we eligible to bid on 6.1 and/or 6.2 but if we bid 6.1 are we required to bid 6.3 and 6.4? If we bid 6.2 are we required to bid 6.5? There was some confusion on the statements of “OPTIONAL TO BID - NOT SCORED” for sections 6.4 and 6.5 and needed to clarify the options for our responses. | Sections 6.4 and 6.5 are optional.  Please see RFP section 2 Purpose, in addition to sections 6.4 and 6.5, as well as the Table 3 Submittal Checklist for a summary. | |  |
| 47 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Can we submit our response in several documents (overall and parts), or do our responses have to be in one document? If separate parts are acceptable, can the numbering be by part as well (e.g. A-#, B-#) or does the page numbering need to be sequential? | *It is preferred that the responses are submitted in a single document but will accept responses submitted in separate parts as long as the sum is a complete proposal. Number should be easy to follow so that we do not miss any information detailing your requirements.* | |  |
| 48 | 10/31/18 | 11/5/18 | Table 3 – Submittal Checklist at the end of Section 12 has the item “Management Response”, yet this is not listed in Section 12.3 Proposal Submittal. Does this need to be included? If so, what are the instructions? | Please disregard the requirement for “Management Response” as those questions are now part of the Response Form, Section A. | |  |
| 49 | 10/31/18 | 11/5/18 | The Response Form has a section 6.6 at the end with instructions for submitting price quotes, yet there are different instructions in section 12.3.9. Which one should we follow? | Please disregard the instructions in 6.6 of the Response form. Each pricing worksheet contains instructions for pricing as the 1st tab; Please follow those instructions. | |  |
| 50 | 10/31/18 | 11/5/18 | Section 12 page 77 and Attachment A page 3 state that “Vendors shall use any font other than Arial 11 within the response form”, which appears to be a mistake since Attachment A uses Arial 11, so we assume that the statement should be that “Vendors shall not use any font other than Arial 11 within the response form”. Please confirm. | Please disregard this font requirement. It is important that your font size is at a size that is easily legible for evaluating your proposals. | |  |
| 51 | 10/31/18 | 11/5/18 | How is the 100 points for the Inclusion Plan scored? How does WMBE (Women and Minority Business Enterprise) factor in? Instruction #2 in the Inclusion Plan says “The RFP provides the evaluation scoring matrix, which includes how many points this Inclusion Plan will be given in RFP evaluation. Notes below provide you the context of how points will be considered.”. We see the 100 points scoring for the Inclusion Plan, but where are the referenced notes to understand how points will be considered? | The 100 points is weighted between the 5 categories listed in the Inclusion Plan, section 12.3.11 (Aspirational WMBE Goals 20, Strategies 20, Past Performance 20, WMBE Guarantees 30, and Diverse Employment 10). | |  |
| 52 | 10/31/18 | 11/5/18 | Section 11.22 of the RFP states: “Insurance requirements presented in the Contract shall prevail.” The Contract’s insurance requirements do not include Technology Errors and Omission coverage. The RFP also includes Attachment 1 stating that $10,000,000 of Technology Errors and Omission coverage is required. Given the Contract’s insurance requirements prevail, it is correct that Technology Errors and Omissions coverage is not required? | Attachment #1 on page 87 of the RFP is the insurance requirements for this contract and will prevail. This document does list the Tech E/O as $10 Million. | |  |
| 53 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Unlike the previous RFP (ITD-4341), is it correct that Proposals must include all hardware and software for the Vendor’s proposed solution scope (i.e., UC only solution, INV/Contact Center only solution, or combined UC/IVR/Contact Center solution)? | Please see RFP sections 6.1.1.2, 6.1.1.3, 6.2.1.2, and 6.2.1.3. | |  |
| 54 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Leading premise-based contact center solutions are software-only solutions that reside on virtualized hardware, but technical requirements 6.2.1.4 and 6.2.1.6 require that vendors provide the virtualization software and physical hardware. In addition, technical requirement 6.2.1.15 desires to limit the number of manufacturers, but software-only solution manufacturers do not provide virtualization software and physical hardware, so multiple manufacturers will be required for software-only solutions. They can probably procure additional virtualization software licenses and additional physical hardware are a lower price from its existing vendors, so please confirm that virtualization software and physical hardware must be provided for software-only solutions. | Please see RFP sections 6.1.1.2, 6.1.1.3, 6.2.1.2, and 6.2.1.3. | |  |
| 55 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | For technical requirement 6.2.3.26, what tasks, besides interactions, will be assigned to agents and where do these tasks reside? Contact center solutions can assign, distribute, and route work items, such as cases within case management systems, but these systems can route the work items as well, so the contact center solution may not need to route these work items unless the City needs to blend interactions and work items in real-time. |  | | 6.2.3.26 is now optional. |
| 56 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | In section 6.2.3.36 you reference the use of a browser-based desktop for remote agents and supervisors. How will these employees connect to both the desktop and other proposed software proposed? Also, how will they be connecting the phone back to the City of Seattle systems? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP. | |  |
| 57 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | For technical requirement 6.2.4.7, the platform needs to be capable of speech recognition and natural language, but these features do not need to be priced since the existing IVR applications do no use thesefeatures, correct? | No, the City is expecting to implement speech recognition as part of the pilot phase. The selected vendor is expected to meet with the Business and IT to identify requirements. We will not be implementing like for like. | |  |
| 58 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | What are the requirements for Robotic Process Automation (RPA)? Does the City want the RPA platform only, or does the City want the RPA platform and the processes implemented? Section 6.5 provides two examples of processes, but this section does not limit the possible processes, so how does the City expect vendors to scope and price the implementation of other possible processes? RPA can decrease process automation implementation efforts, but it doesn’t eliminate the efforts. | Also see 46  All UC proposals should include a response to sections 6.1 (UC Technical Requirements), 6.3 (TeleManagement Software) and 6.4 (Meeting Room Technology.) **Section 6.4 for Meeting Room Technology is optional to bid and will NOT be scored.**  All IVR / CC proposals should include a response to section 6.2 (CC/IVR Technical Requirements) and 6.5 (Robotics Process Automation.) **Section 6.5 for Robotics Process Automation is optional to bid and will NOT be scored.** | |  |
| 59 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Section 6.5 page 49 states that Robotic Process Automation (RPA) is optional, but Section 12 page 76 states that “All IVR / CC proposals should include a response to section… 6.5”, so please confirm that RPA is optional. | Also see 46. 58  All UC proposals should include a response to sections 6.1 (UC Technical Requirements), 6.3 (TeleManagement Software) and 6.4 (Meeting Room Technology.) **Section 6.4 for Meeting Room Technology is optional to bid and will NOT be scored.**  All IVR / CC proposals should include a response to section 6.2 (CC/IVR Technical Requirements) and 6.5 (Robotics Process Automation.) **Section 6.5 for Robotics Process Automation is optional to bid and will NOT be scored.** | |  |
| 60 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Many contact center solutions are priced by channel (email, web chat, SMS chat, video chat, social media, etc.), so what channels need to be priced for the 250 “Multi-media” in section 6.2.8.? | If priced by channel, the 250 multi-media channels should be priced for email, web chat, call back, voicemail, SMS and voice calls at a minimum. If not priced combined, please breakout pricing by channel. | |  |
| 61 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Sections 8.5.1 and 8.9.1 reference some hardware requirements both pre- and post-delivery. Once the City formally accepts the hardware, does the City own the responsibility for future patches and hardware/OS upgrades? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  Please see RFP 8.9.6 through 8.9.20. | |  |
| 62 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | HA/DR – What services require this? (UC platform, CC/IVR, analog, paging) | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  Please see sections 6.1.1 and 6.2.1. | |  |
| 63 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Are there any objectives to limit or decrease the number of analog devices? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP. | |  |
| 64 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Is 5-digit dial & extension based dialing a hard requirement as part of a move to a UC platform? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  The City’s objective is to retain a 5-digit coordinated dialing plan.  Please see RFP Section 4, #12 and 6.1.13.16. | |  |
| 65 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Is paging required at all 71 locations? | Yes. | |  |
| 66 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | What are the reasons behind replacing the entire AudioCodes infrastructure?  o Would AudioCodes One Voice Operations Center (OVOC) suffice to monitor / management of gateways today? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  The City’s desire is to replace existing SBCs with the most current hardware/software. The analog and SBC solution needs to be managed as part of an integrated toolset.  Please see RFP 6.1.1.4. | |  |
| 67 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | Will data cabling be placed where the current off premises extensions are today? | Yes. Where the City deems it necessary to replace OPX circuits with a VoIP solution, the City will provide cabling. | |  |
| 68 | 10/31/18 | 11/9/18 | In Exhibit E – “Data Sites with Bandwidth” some sites are marked “requires more bandwidth”, is the assumption that these sites will be upgraded before or as part of this project? | Yes, as part of this project. | |  |
| 69 | 10/31/18 | 11/5/18 | We currently support Seattle Public Utilities and have a Master Agreement in place with them that has been fully vetted and negotiated. Can we use our existing agreement for our response rather than needing to create a brand new one? | No, the agreement embedded in this RFP will be the agreement for your contract if awarded. | |  |
| 70 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Does the City’s current operating environment 100% comply with all the requested security standards or is this section simply a representation of a desired end state for a future environment that does not yet exist? | Yes, where applicable. | |  |
| 71 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Is the City expecting the supplier to fund 3rd party compliance audits for each of these --- relative to the specific business units that the City has identified or will the City provide all compliance audits? | The City will provide all compliance audits. | |  |
| 72 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Why does the City want a replacement solution to integrate with old technology (Nortel/Avaya) if this old technology will not be the future/end-state? Is there something broken about the current solution that is feeding these platforms currently? If so, what is not working? | City requires a phased implementation. Integration between systems is required until the Avaya (Nortel) is removed. | |  |
| 73 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Since you already have a working installation of Skype For Business and an existing relationship with Microsoft --- is there anything about that platforms capabilities or the recently released 2019 code release that won’t meet your needs? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP. | |  |
| 74 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | With the complexity of this bid response and the Thanksgiving holiday, would the City entertain a 1 month or longer extension of the RFP Deadline? | See RFP Revision → | | Due Date for Proposals has been extended to: December 31, 2018, 12:00 PM Pacific Standard Time.  The Q&A period remains unchanged |
| 75 | 11/1/18 | 11/5/18 | Often times, the procurement web sites will display a list of contacts (companies and personnel) who’ve downloaded a particular RFP. That allows vendors to see whom else is participating to learn about potential partnering opportunities. I don’t see that anywhere on the buyline. Do you guys capture that information anywhere? | Unfortunately, the City does not have this function. We will however have a sign in sheet during the pre-proposal which we can post in the addendum. | |  |
| 76 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | We are respectfully requesting an extension of the submission deadline from 11/28/18 to hopefully mid to third week of December. The complexity of the requirements and scope of this project require more time to ensure that we have provided the City with a fully vetted design solution. | See RFP Revision → | | Due Date for Proposals has been extended to: December 31, 2018, 12:00 PM Pacific Standard Time.  The Q&A period remains unchanged |
| 77 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | The City specified a contact center a pilot is to be completed in the first six months of the project, during Phase A, for users/agents in the IT department. Is the second pilot contact center group in Phase A also from the IT department? If not, what group/department is the second pilot group? | No, department for the second contact center group is to be determined. | |  |
| 78 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Does the City envision that all of the contact center design will be completed in the first phase, Phase A, or that the group/department specific design will be done in the phase that the group/department will be deployed? | The City’s intent is a phased implementation of existing contact centers over the life of the project.  See RFP Statement of Work 8.2 | |  |
| 79 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Which departments have contact centers? What are all the different contact centers? | Existing contact centers are diverse across City departments. | |  |
| 80 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | How many agents does each department/contact center have? | Agent counts range from 2 to 150. | |  |
| 81 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Which department contact centers are included in each of the implementation phases specified (B, C, D, and E)? | There is no schedule developed at this time to determine phasing by department. The City expects these discussions to be held with the proposer during the initial planning phase of the project.  See RFP Statement of Work 8.2 | |  |
| 82 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | The City specified that the current PureConnect (CIC) workforce management product is not providing the functionality desired - what features or functionality is the current product not providing? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP. | |  |
| 83 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | 7. (Work Force Management, 6.2.1.1) What specific interaction channels require forecasting? Are they immediate, deferred or fixed-staff channels? | The City plans to use the WFM tool for all agent interaction channels and with the ability to forecast both immediate needs and staffing requirements. | |  |
| 84 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | (Work Force Management, 6.2.1.2) Is attendance tracking and reporting different than schedule adherence tracking and reporting? Can the City elaborate on their attendance tracking and reporting requirements? Can the City provide a sample of or mock-up of required attendance reports (current or desired)? | Although attendance tracking is one input to schedule adherence, they are different data points. The ability to track staff attendance / availability is one component but adherence should include actual compliance or non-compliance with the plan, along with reasons why staff were not available as planned. | |  |
| 85 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | (Work Force Management, 6.2.1.7, 6.2.1.8, 6.2.1.9) Would browser/web-based WFM system access be an acceptable alternative to a SmartPhone application? Is the objective to have anywhere, any device type access or specifically a SmartPhone application?   1. In the case of a SmartPhone application, what platforms does the application need to support (e.g. Android, Apple, etc.)? | A browser-based tool is acceptable providing that it is usable with the smaller screens associated with smartphones. It is preferred that the application provide a version that be optimized for a mobile device. If a specific app is provided instead of a browser version, then it should be compatible with both Android and iOS devices. | |  |
| 86 | 11/1/18 | Pending | (Work Force Management, 6.2.1.23) Can the City please prove an example or use case for agent surveys and explain survey requirements and usage for WFM (forecasting and scheduling) purposes? |  | |  |
| 87 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | (Work Force Management, 6.2.1.24) How does the messaging requirement in 6.2.1.24 differ from 6.2.1.8 and 6.2.1.9? Can the City please clarify the requirement to message to all enterprise users? Does this include people/users who are not part of the contact center and/or not configured on the WFM system?  a. Does "messages" refer to notifications in general or specific message types like email and SMS?  b. Does the City require that the message recipient be able to respond to messages? If so, who would handle the responses - contact center agents or Work Force Managers? | This appears to reference 6.2.7.24 and 6.2.7.8 and 6.2.7.9.  The requirements for .8 and .9 are specifically for individual messages regarding WFM between one agent and a supervisor.  .24 is the ability of the system to broadcast a message or report about status, compliance, etc. to groups or individuals that may be interested in the information, but not necessarily part of the contact center. The City is interested in the type of messaging flexibility that exists for proactive notifications. It is anticipated that these group messages would be one-way. | |  |
| 88 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | The City specifies that responses may not refer to websites/URLs or attachments and that all responses must be in the body of the response document. Is it acceptable to embed documents within the body of the response like the City did in the RFP document? | Yes, vendors may include documents as attachments as opposed to website or URL links if the documentation is for supporting your proposal. The City is not obligated to view or consider information outside of the proposal that is submitted. | |  |
| 89 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | What locations require local survivability? | Survivability is required as stated in the RFP at two sites.  The City would like to consider survivability at currently survivable sites in addition to those listed in the RFP. Vendor may include an option in their recommendations for proposed Architecture and Design.  Please see RFP Exhibit C, PBX Network Diagram for current SMG sites. | |  |
| 90 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Is the City purchasing the Licenses/Maintenance directly from Genesys? | No. | |  |
| 91 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Is the City intending to deploy Speech Recognition during the implementation phase? | Yes, during the pilot phase. | |  |
| 92 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | In which phase will each of the IVR applications be tested and deployed? | There is no schedule developed at this time to determine phasing by department. The City expects these discussions to be held with the proposer during the initial planning phase of the project.  See RFP Statement of Work 8.2 | |  |
| 93 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Does the City plan to expand IVR functionality? | The selected vendor is expected to meet with the Business and IT to identify requirements. We will not be implementing like for like.  Scope of the project is to design, build and implement the existing 6 IVR applications. | |  |
| 94 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Regarding the references section, is it possible to use manufacturers’ as the reference for our response? | Yes, if the manufacturer provides the referenced services as part of the proposed solution. In this case the manufacturer resources referenced would need to be on the Proposers project team. | |  |
| 95 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Does the City require staff onsite and for what times? | Yes. Times to be determined with proposer as part of the initial design meetings and anticipate department cutovers to occur after hours and on weekends. | |  |
| 96 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | With the deadline of November 21 for questions (Wednesday prior to Thanksgiving) and the due date of November 28 (Wednesday after Thanksgiving); we respectfully request an extension of a minimum of two weeks from the date answers to Q&A is received from the City. | See RFP Revision → | | Due Date for Proposals has been extended to: December 31, 2018, 12:00 PM Pacific Standard Time.  The Q&A period remains unchanged |
| 97 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Is the City interested in using any of the existing infrastructure? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP. | |  |
| 98 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | What are the City’s pain points for UC and CC/IVR? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP. | |  |
| 99 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | What is the WFM platform the City is using today? | Genesys PureConnect. | |  |
| 100 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | Is the proposer expected to provide PoE switches? | No. | |  |
| 101 | 11/1/18 | 11/9/18 | I noticed the RFP skips sections 12.3.6 and 12.3.8. I’m assuming this was just a numbering issue, and not missing sections but wanted to make sure. | That is correct. Merely a numbering issue. | |  |
| 102 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | How large is the current Contact Center support staff?  How many people do we have dedicated to the Contact Center application? | Five Telephone Analysts and two Telephone Engineers support the contact center environment. Two staff support the IVR separately. | |  |
| 103 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Are we fairly certain about the bill of materials of what is in each of the sites? Or should they plan for formal sites survey? | The information in the RFP is good for sizing for proposal purposes but may not be adequate for implementation.  Site surveys may be needed as part of implementation. | |  |
| 104 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | 1) Why is section 7, have 6.x below them on page 20?  2) Table 3 - Submittal Checklist mentions a "Management Response" document, but we don't see an explanation for it in the RFP. Can you clarify? | 1. Section 7 shows 6.X subsections. That section was misnumbered.      1. There is no Management Response document. It is integrated into the RESPONSE FORM | |  |
| 105 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Is there any thought to coming back with the due date of the RESPONSE TIMES? With the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays? | We will look at it as a team and consider the impacts of the holidays. | |  |
| 106 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | The response says you can withdraw at any time - just notify Purchasing. However, there isn't anything about intent to bid? Was that intentional? | Vendors can withdraw at any time.  Until we have a signed agreement, the vendor is not committed.  We did not require an Intent to Bid letter. | |  |
| 107 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | The RFP prior to this was for MITEL and GENESYS only.  Is there a predisposition to MITEL and GENESYS? | No | |  |
| 108 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | What was the rational for opening the RFP to a broader group? | The City is interested in a wide variety of options. | |  |
| 109 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Will references from a government customer limited to responding yes/no work was completed be sufficient? | Yes, that will meet the minimum requirements. However, references will require a more in-depth analysis of your work.    Generally, government references will provide another government entity a reference. | |  |
| 110 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | If the company is awarded a contract, would the City be willing to act as a reference? | Yes, as described in 110. | |  |
| 111 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Do references have to be public sector only? Are you looking more for completely aligned use cases or with size /scale and functionality/complexity? | No. The proposer may provide any reference meeting or exceeding the minimum requirements in the RFP.  Complexity alignment is more important than reference being a similar government agency. | |  |
| 112 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Process question - Hosted / Hybrid - Pricing structure - Do we adapt the pricing worksheets? | We recognize that the application of these worksheets will differ.  If there are questions or sections that don't apply to your solution, you should make it clear what the reason was for not filling in the section. | |  |
| 113 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | When will you provide the interview questions and use cases? | The City’s goal is at least two weeks before the Interviews and Demos, but earlier if possible. | |  |
| 114 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Does the City have any specific preference for a Cloud / Hosted or Hybrid solution? | No. Looking for the vendors to provide options.  As stated in the RFP, the City is open to On-Premise, Hosted, or Hybrid, as long as requirements are met. | |  |
| 115 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | For the Contact Centers, is there any preference between the Nortel AACC and the CIC? | No preference. We want the solution to be intuitive and very robust, both feature and functionality rich. | |  |
| 116 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | If a vendor intends to provide a Cloud, Hybrid, or On-Prem solution do they need to provide 3 separate proposals? | Yes, submit 3 separate proposals. | |  |
| 117 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | May a given vendor may provide multiple proposals if they are different architectures? | Yes, different architectures or different manufacturers. | |  |
| 118 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Do you list the number of concurrent active agents in the RFP? | Yes. | |  |
| 119 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Are you looking to reuse any of the components of the current system? | The City is looking for a solution with new components. If proposer would like to provide and option to reuse any existing components, please proposed as options. | |  |
| 120 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Would any peripherals solution need to maintain compliance with cloud base storage? | Yes. | |  |
| 121 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Is the City meeting their compliance requirements today? | Yes. | |  |
| 122 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | From a disaster recovery / business continuity perspective?  Do we have direct internet links at each site? | No. | |  |
| 123 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | 1. Will all modalities be required? 2. Given that the City has stated that they are not prescribing.  Are you open to suggestions for network survivability? | 1. All modalities would be desired.  2. Absolutely - You can propose solutions. Survivability - In survivable mode, it is operating in as close to production as possible. | |  |
| 124 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | In 6.2.4.7 - Natural Language Speech Recognition is being requested now | Yes, directed dialogue speech recognition will be deployed as part of the pilot phase. Technology must be capable of natural language (opened ended communication) but may or may not be implemented. | |  |
| ~~125~~ | ~~11/2/18~~ | 11/9/18 |  |  | |  |
| 126 | 11/2/18 | 11/16/18 | Will you be providing numbers of concurrent contact center agents? | Please price as if all agents are concurrent. | |  |
| 127 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | How many languages are you expecting the system to recognize for the Natural Language? | 2 at the low end to 12 at the future end.  We recognize that there will be a licensing component for each of the languages. | |  |
| 128 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Can you provide a Call Flow Diagram for the IVR application? | The selected vendor is expected to meet with the Business and IT to identify requirements. We will not be implementing like for like.  Scope of the project is to design, build and implement the existing 6 IVR applications. | |  |
| 129 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Are there any requirements around ethical communications, firewalls, compliance restrictions? | There is not a need to do segmentation. Can't predict departments need to communicate with other departments. | |  |
| 130 | 11/2/18 | Pending | 6.2.3.26 What is the intention behind the task assignment? |  | |  |
| 131 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Should cost estimate for the use cases be included? | Technology is optional to bid and will NOT be scored.  All IVR / CC proposals should include a response to section 6.2 (CC/IVR Technical Requirements) and 6.5 (Robotics Process Automation.) Section 6.5 for Robotics Process Automation is optional to bid and will NOT be scored.  If there is a way to give an idea of pricing that would be very helpful. | |  |
| 132 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Hold | Hold | |  |
| 133 | 11/2/18 | 11/16/18 | Pg 9 1.c – how many callback queues are there? How many callback calls are there during a peak busy hour? | We currently have two contact centers using callback queueing. The selected vendor is expected to meet with the Business and IT to identify requirements.  We do not have peak hour callback specific metrics. | |  |
| 134 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | Endpoints -- Landscape -- # of Skype certified phones // # of Headsets that are Skype certified? | The City currently does not have certified phones for skype. | |  |
| 135 | 11/2/18 | 11/9/18 | A question has arisen concerning the need for Integration or Co-Existence of the proposed solution with your existing Avaya Infrastructure. Is it the City’s desire that both will need to be running concurrently and be fully integrated with the new Skype for Business contact center during the phased roll-out? If you could clarify it would be greatly appreciated. | The City’s intent is a phased implementation of existing contact centers over the life of the project.  See requirement 6.1.4.1 | |  |
| 136 | 11/6/18 | 11/9/18 | 11.14 Partial and Multiple Awards.  Unless stated to the contrary in the Statement of Work, the City reserves the right to name a partial and/or multiple award, in the best interest of the City. Proposers are to prepare proposals given the City’s right to partial or multiple awards. Further, the City may eliminate an individual line item when calculating award, in order to best meet the needs of the City, if a particular line item is not routinely available or is a cost that exceeds the City funds.  **Q. Would the City be open to accepting partial bids?** | No, the City is only accepting completed bids for the solutions listed in the RFP:   * UC * IVR/Contact Center * Combined UC/IVR/Contact Center   **The City reserves the right to partial or multiple awards based on any combination of the 3 (complete) listed solutions.** | |  |
| 137 | 11/8/18 | 11/9/18 | In the Attachment A Response document, the following section is shown as Optional:  **12.3.4   Acceptance & Exceptions to City Contract**: (**Optional**)  Provide a one-page statement that confirms acceptance of the City Contract (including Terms & Conditions), and represents complete review as needed by the Proposer.  If the Proposer has a legal office that shall review contract prior to signature, the Proposer shall clearly confirm that such review is complete.  However, in the Submittal Checklist, it is listed as Mandatory.  Q. If “vendor” has redlines for the city contract, are you still requiring a statement confirming acceptance of the City Contract? If so, is it acceptable to include the caveat that it is acceptable with the exception of the items redlined in the contract? | A statement regarding acceptance of the City Contract is not mandatory but it is desired to clarify your position. Please reference section 11.12 of the RFP regarding Terms and Conditions; Please note in this section,   * Submittal of a proposal is agreement to this condition. Proposers are to price and submit proposals to reflect all the specifications, requirements, in this RFP and terms and conditions substantially the same as those included in this RFP. * Any specific areas of dispute with the attached Contract shall be identified in Proposer’s Response and may, at the sole discretion of the City, be grounds for disqualification from further consideration in award of a contract. | |  |
| 138 | 11/8/18 | 11/9/18 | Can we assume that a percentage of users will be using a soft phone or mobile client with a USB headset or Bluetooth headset vs. a handset? If yes, for the purposes of the RFP can we suggest a ratio of headsets/headsets for response purposes? | Yes the city anticipates the use of mobile clients and the softphones. See Section 8.2 (Project Planning and Design) for estimated quantities of softphone deployments.  No, we do not want you to propose a suggested ratio.  The City reserves to right to purchase headsets from the selected vendor or use existing contracts. | |  |
| 139 | 11/8/18 | 11/9/18 | Do you know when the following will be posted to the [proposal website](http://thebuyline.seattle.gov/category/bids-and-proposals/rfp-itd-4620/)?   * Pre-Proposal Conference Attendees List (**urgent**) * Addendum Q&A for the remaining questions | Here is the list of in-person attendees of the pre-proposal conference:    We will continue to provide answers to the questions as fast as possible. | |  |
| 140 | 11/9/18 | 11/16/18 | * Do your multi-skilled agents overlap?   Example: some handle call type A, others handle call type B and others handle A and B | Yes | |  |
| 141 | 11/9/18 | 11/16/18 | * Will the 125 agents who use WFM tools also handle non-call work like email? * If yes, will these multi-media agents also handle voice calls? * Do you have method for collecting multimedia contact/Average Handle Time data? | Yes  Yes  Yes | |  |
| 142 | 11/9/18 | 11/16/18 | * Do the 125 agents who will use WFM handle outbound contacts? * If yes, are these agents dedicated to outbound or do they also handle calls? * Please quantify the number of agents doing workload and outbound campaign. | No  There is currently no queuing for outbound contacts. | |  |
| 143 | 11/9/18 | 11/16/18 | * What is the required scheduling methodology for the 125 agents that will use WFM? * Do agents bid for schedules? * If yes, how frequently? * Do you have any unique scheduling rules we should plan for? | Required scheduling methodology to suggest shifts (breaks, lunches, start/stop) based on forecasted volumes.  Yes, agents bid for schedules 3-4 times per year.  Yes. 1) some part-time staff grandfathered into scheduled and 2) agents according to union guidelines need to be off 2 consecutive days per week. | |  |
| 144 | 11/9/18 | 11/16/18 | * How do your agents currently bid for and request vacation time? * Do you currently provide agents with tools to manage/view their schedules (change requests, trades, schedule bids, vacation, etc.)? | Annual bid based on seniority (compensated hours in class).  Yes. 1) limited basis flexing is allowed based on Agent requests, 2) scheduled bids – agents bid for schedules 3-4 times per year, 3) vacation – this is currently managed manually on an Excel spreadsheet, 4) they have flexibility to change their vacation days based on vacation days or remain on waitlist, 5) no schedule trades or swaps currently allowed, 6) our current tool does not forecast how many vacations should be allowed per day. | |  |
| 145 | 11/9/18 | 11/16/18 | * Can we assume that the WFM solution will be deployed in a single phase of your phased Contact Center transition? * If not, please elaborate. * Other than your ACD, are there any systems you would like for us to either collect agent information from (like an HR system) or share information with (like a payroll system)? * Do you need to support agents that connect to the contact center who will be outside the City’s firewall(s)? * Is a DR, Backup, or Lab/Testing WFO system a requirement | Yes, currently there is one contact center using WFM. However, the selected vendor is expected to meet with the Business and IT to identify requirements, which could lead to additional phases.  The City would like to know what is possible for collecting information from HRIS and the payroll system. Please see RFP Response Form section 6.2.7  We anticipate remote agents will connect via existing VPN.  Lab/Testing instance of WFM is required. | |  |
| 146 | 11/9/18 | Pending | Follow-on question:  Original Question: Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)   * City Response: Yes, however, no City data or derivative thereof, may be moved or stored outside the US in any proposed solution. * Additional question: Will you please define on ‘derivative’ as stated? |  | |  |
| 147 | 11/9/18 | 11/16/18 | Follow-on question:  Original Question: Is the city open to a response that could leverage the existing PureConnect (CIC) platform and optimize it, make it more efficient and expand as needed to meet the requirements? Or is the hope of this to fully displace all of the current platforms you have today?   * City Response: Yes, the City is open to a response to leverage the existing Pure Connect platform. We are looking for the best solution based on the requirements as outlined in the RFP. * Additional Question: Will you provide your current PureConnect licensing? | Not included on this list are the SIP Session Licenses.  SIP Session Licenses = 240 | |  |
| 148 | 11/9/18 | 11/16/18 | Follow-on question:  Original Question: Page 4, Part 3, the RFP states that all current SBC gateways will be replaced. Is the City open to migrating licenses from the current AudioCodes solution to a new AudioCodes solution?   * City Response: Yes, the City is open to a response to leverage the existing licenses as long as the newer SBC can meet the City’s requirements as outlined in the RFP. * Additional Question: Will you please provide existing licenses under your current maintenance agreement?  1. City Response: Yes, | We have three AudioCodes boxes, 2 in Production with identical licensing. The 3rd used in Lab has limited licensing. Following is the Production licensing: | |  |
| 149 | 11/12/18 | Pending | “In Attachment A – Response form, when cross compared with Section 6 in the RFP, there appears to be an entire section missing for 6.1.8 – Set Standards – 6.1.8.1 thru 6.1.8.13, as well as desired 6.1.8.14.  Does the City wish to have those added to the Response Form?” |  | |  |
| 150 | 11/12/18 | Pending | “In Attachment A – Response Form, when cross compared with Section 6 in the RFP, there is not a 6.2.8.1 to acknowledge. Would the City please clarify if the response should be to 6.2.8 rather than 6.2.8.1?” |  | |  |
| 151 | 11/12/18 | 11/16/18 | Section 12, page 77  The RFP states, “To make the proposal review process easier, Vendors shall use any font other than Arial 11 within the response form.” Did the city intend to say “shall use no other font than Arial 11?” | See response in #50 above | |  |
| 152 | 11/12/18 | 11/16/18 | Section 6.1.4.3, page 27  The stated number of SIP trunks is 880 – 1760. This seems high, can you confirm that number is correct? Are these for internal connections? | The numbers provided in the RFP are an estimate for the purpose of pricing. We will refine these counts during the design phase. | |  |
| 153 | 11/12/18 | 11/16/18 | Section 6.1.7.8, page 31  Analog ports/handsets. We assume that Is it in scope to replace analog/digital handsets with soft phones or new VOIP hard phones. Is the analog cable plant to be decommissioned and replaced with Ethernet transport? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP. | |  |
| 154 | 11/12/18 | 11/16/18 | Section 3, page 4  Existing AudioCodes M3000s are to be replaced. What is the driver behind that requirement? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  The City’s desire is to replace existing SBCs with the most current hardware/software.  See response to question 16. | |  |
| 155 | 11/12/18 | 11/16/18 | Section 3, page 4  There is considerable building/office survivability built into existing Nortel systems. Is it a requirement to replicate a similar level of survivability in the proposed system? | The City does not intend to have survivability across the entire municipality.  The City would like to consider survivability at currently survivable sites in addition to those listed in the RFP. Vendor may include an option in their recommendations for proposed Architecture and Design. | |  |
| 156 | 11/12/18 | 11/16/18 | Unfortunately, since we weren't able to attend that initial vendor Q&A session and ask our questions directly, we'll require a 15-30 min call with the buyers/evaluation team, to participate in the RFP. | The City does not participate in one-on-one, single vendor discussions at this stage of the RFP. The details of the RFP along with the ongoing addendum should be adequate in participating in this process. Please continue submit all questions via email and we will answer them in our on-going addendum. | |  |
| 157 | 11/12/18 | Pending | In the following section of Part 8.1 of the RFP (Project Management), is it the City’s intent that vendors supply these sample documents as part of their proposals?  Provide a brief sample document for each of the items listed below.   * Project plan and schedule * Detailed cutover plan including a sample Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) * Roles & Responsibilities for all Vendor and City project team members \* * Tasks that must be performed by City staff * Risk management plan * Project tracking to identify risks, actions, issues and decisions (RAID) log * Communications plan and escalation path * Change control process * Project status reporting requirements * Training plans * Testing plan * System Acceptance criteria |  | |  |
| 158 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | Given the extension to December 31, will the city be adjusting the final date for questions by another 2-3 weeks? | No, Q&A remains unchanged. | |  |
| 159 | 11/13/18 | Pending | Section 11.15, page 70  The RFP asks for a single prime contractor over the development, deployment & implementation (DDI) over three years as well as management & operations (M&O) of five years. Will the city consider a different contract model between the DDI phase and M&O if it can be demonstrated to be in the city’s best interest? |  | |  |
| 160 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | Section 5, page 19  In order to meet the minimum requirements, must the qualifications come exclusively from the prime vendor, or can project experience from subcontractors be included as well? | Yes, if the subcontractor provides the referenced services as part of the proposed solution. In this case the subcontractor resources referenced would need to be on the Proposers project team. | |  |
| 161 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | Page 6 under “Voice Network Routing” indicates a single dedicated PRI for calls routed to the PAX PBX.  Q, How many dedicated PRI circuits should be provisioned for this integration? Where is that PRI located? | One PRI circuit with 24 trunks.  It comes into site 1 on the converged voice network diagram, see RFP Exhibit C, “PBX Network Diagram”. | |  |
| 162 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | Page 10, section (2) states that approximately (70) agents are logged in on average during an average day.  Q. Please provide the maximum concurrently logged on agents and supervisors required for the SPU/City Light Contact Center. | Please price as if all agents are concurrent. | |  |
| 163 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | Page 18 states that the contractor needs to integrate with the existing PAX PBXs via multiple ISDN-PRIs  Q. Please clarify how many are needed and where. | One PRI circuit with 24 trunks.  It comes into site 1 on the converged voice network diagram, see RFP. | |  |
| 164 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | 6.1.1.18 page 23. The City requires a test environment to be used to test all new software releases and upgrades, new hardware, new features / functionality, mobile integration, soft client, new system integrations, etc.  Q. How closely does the lab environment need to mimic the production environment? | See RFP 6.1.1.8 for requirement. The City requests bidder creatively propose best solution to provide a full function test and development environment for the entire solution, which may utilize limited production components, without impacting the production environment at an affordable cost.  City desires the ability to test redundancy and failover associated with upgrades, etc. | |  |
| 165 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | Conferencing & Section 6.1.3.14 Page 25. Modern conferencing systems tend to be licensed based on named hosts, not ports. A unique host is a named person that can start a meeting, not a measurement of how many users can join the meeting.  Q. How many unique hosts are required for the voice conferencing systems? | The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP.  Note: solution should have the option for the scheduler/host to not participate. | |  |
| 166 | 11/13/18 | Pending | Section 6.1.3.24 on page 26. The solution must support call recording on demand, providing call tracking and reporting used to document discussions between external callers and City employees.  Q. Is this requirement distinctly separate from the requirements stated in 6.2.6? How many non-contact center-named users require on-demand call recording? What is the required retention period and average call length for these calls? |  | |  |
| 167 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | 6.1.5.9 Page 29. In depth, extensive reporting / metrics must be available for all applications including numbers that are provisioned as auto attendants or basic mailboxes  Q. What is the voicemail retention requirement for end users on the system? | The City’s policy for voice message retention is under development at this time.  Please see RFP 6.1.5 | |  |
| 168 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | 6.1.5.17 page 30. The City would like to consider migrating all Nortel Call Pilot users to the new voicemail system following the successful pilot  Q. Is there a requirement to copy the existing stored voicemails and end-user personal greetings on the current Nortel Call Pilot systems into the new voicemail system? Would it be acceptable to have the users create new personal greetings on the new system once deployed? | No, it is not a requirement for existing voicemail messages and personal greetings on the current Nortel Call Pilot systems to be transferred into the new voicemail system.  Yes, it would be acceptable. | |  |
| 169 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | 6.1.8.4 (1) Page 32 does not specify that the “Type-1” phone needs to have an add-on module, while 6.1.8.4 (2) does specify that requirement for the “Type-2” phones. 8.1.8.11 specifies that BOTH Type-1 and Type-2 phones must support the add-on module.  Q. Is the add-on module truly needed for all Type-1 phones? Many lower-cost phones that qualify for the Type-1 would be disqualified with the add-on module requirement, essentially making the Type-1 and Type-2 phones identical. | The City requires, at a minimum, a Type-2 multi-button set capable of supporting add-on modules.  The City will consider alternative solutions which meet the functional requirements of add-on modules. | |  |
| 170 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | 6.1.8.4, Table on Page 33 - “Type-5” isn’t defined but quantities are called out in the table on Page 33. Video phone sets are called out separately, too.  Q. Are the “Type-5” and “Video phone sets” the same? There’s also mention of a “5th type” in section 6.1.8.14—is that “Type 5” or “Video phone sets”? | Yes. As a 5th type of VoIP set, the City desires video phones with video capabilities for use in Community Centers and Parks sites for public use and ADA compliance. | |  |
| 171 | 11/13/18 | Pending | 6.2.1.4 page 36. For a premises design, the Vendor must provide a separate standalone virtual system software as part of their solution. The City will not install the IVR / contact center system on its existing virtual environment  Q. What is the network port speed and capacity in each data center for the new UC and Contact Center servers? (1G / 10G / 40G, etc.) |  | |  |
| 172 | 11/13/18 | Pending | 6.2.1.4 page 36. For a premises design, the Vendor must provide a separate standalone virtual system software as part of their solution. The City will not install the IVR / contact center system on its existing virtual environment  Q. Please provide a port count and voltage / amperage available on PDUs. |  | |  |
| 173 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | 6.2.1.4 page 36. For a premises design, the Vendor must provide a separate standalone virtual system software as part of their solution. The City will not install the IVR / contact center system on its existing virtual environment  Q. Should the bidder plan on providing racks for housing any required servers proposed? | No, the City will provide rack space. | |  |
| 174 | 11/13/18 | Pending | 6.2.6 on page 42 and Table 6.2.8 on page 44 indicate a desire for 200 call recording named agents.  Q. What is the required retention of these recordings? |  | |  |
| 175 | 11/13/18 | Pending | 6.2.6 Call Recording, page 42  Q. What is the average length of the recorded calls? |  | |  |
| 176 | 11/13/18 | Pending | 6.2.6 page 42 & 6.1.3.24 page 26  Q. Does City of Seattle have an archive storage system available for storing call & screen recordings or should the bidder plan on providing an archive storage system to support the retention of these recordings? |  | |  |
| 177 | 11/13/18 | 11/16/18 | Table 6.2.8 on page 44 Purposes provides the number of total named agents and supervisors.  Q. What is the total number of concurrently logged in agents and supervisors required including any remote agents or supervisors? | Please price as if all agents are concurrent. | |  |
| 178 | 11/14/18 | 11/16/18 | Page 1 RFP  Due to the complex nature of this proposal and the upcoming U.S. Holiday, we would like to request an extension to the proposal until December 17, 2018 |  | | Due Date for Proposals has been extended to: December 31, 2018, 12:00 PM Pacific Standard Time.  The Q&A period remains unchanged |
| 179 | 11/14/18 | 11/16/18 | Page 20 RFP  If the proposer will not be reselling a manufacturer’s products, may the proposer exclude the Manufacturer's Authorized Distributor certificate/authorization in Section 6 of the RFP? | Per Section 6, page 20,  “The Proposer, if other than the manufacturer, must submit with the proposal a current, dated, and signed authorization from the manufacturer that the Vendor is an authorized distributor, dealer or service representative and is authorized to sell the manufacturer's products.”  Manufacturers that are proposing their own products to not need to provide certification certificates. | |  |
| 180 | 11/14/18 | 11/16/18 | Page 70 RFP  Is the City willing to purchase Products under Hardware and/or Licensing Agreements that the City currently has in place for purchase of Products, instead of under the contract awarded under the RFP? | Although the City reserves this option, all proposers must submit a complete solution which includes hardware and software. | |  |
| 181 | 11/14/18 | Pending | Page 74 RFP  We are unable to agree to a proposal validity end date that is not firm. Will the City agree to make the proposal validity end date be through the current anticipated contract award date of April 5, 2019? |  | |  |
| 182 | 11/14/18 | 11/16/18 | Can you confirm your office holiday hours for the week of Dec 24 through Dec 31? | The City is closed “only” on the weekends and December 25th between that timeframe. | |  |
| 183 | 11/14/18 | 11/16/18 | What are your plans for the old equipment if in fact you guys find a solution that you move forward with? Most of this stuff I expect will not be combatable or out of date with your new equipment. Would you guys be interested in someone coming in and purchasing all of this equipment vs throwing it away? There is a market for this equipment and I would be happy to discuss it with you if you guys are interested. | Yes, we would be interested. | |  |
| 184 | 11/14/18 | 11/16/18 | 6.2.1.4 - Does “virtual system” refer to premise-based lab/test/dev system? If so, how many unique virtual systems are required. If not, please describe what is meant by “virtual system” | Yes.  The City is looking for the best solution, both design and price, that proposers can provide to meet requirements and desired options as described in the RFP. | |  |
| 185 | 11/14/18 | 11/16/18 | For 6.5, is the city looking to complete the work in the use cases with little or no UAR involvement? Or is the intent to route and report each step of the use case as defined? | The intent is to streamline processes improving the UAR and customer experience. Reporting is an important component. | |  |
| 187 | 11/14/18 | Pending | To expand our available resource pool, and to minimize costs, is it possible to use off shore non US resources who would have remote access to the development, test and production environments as long as all City data is maintained on the City environment? |  | |  |
| 188 | 11/14/18 | Pending | Will there be any onboarding requirements/restrictions of the resources involved with the project? |  | |  |
| 189 |  |  |  |  | |  |
| 189 |  |  |  |  | |  |
| 190 |  |  |  |  | |  |
| 191 |  |  |  |  | |  |
| 192 |  |  |  |  | |  |
| 193 |  |  |  |  | |  |