

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 2

RFP Number: ERS 060109

Statewide Emergency Notification Service Program

June 18, 2009

Question 6: On the Pricing Attachment it indicates a 60 minute message. Should this read a 60 second message?

AOC Response: “60 minutes” will be revised to read “2 minutes” for all line items in RFP Attachment D. See also RFP Addendum 1.

Question 7: Can you please explain the “60 minutes per message” in the Pricing section on page D-1? We ask because an average message length would be 30-60 seconds. Do you mean “60 minutes included per contact”?

AOC Response: See the answer to Question 6.

Question 8: Is it the intention that the proposed Emergency Notification System is to be potentially utilized by all 58 Superior Courts? If so, how many employees (members) would reside within the Emergency Notification System for notification purposes? Is “purchasing group member” referring to the 58 Superior Courts? Does this mean there will potentially be 58 “purchasing group members” or how many “purchasing group members” will there be?

AOC Response: As defined in the preface of Attachment B of the RFP (“Master Agreement Terms and Conditions”) as well as referenced in the second paragraph of section 1.1 of Section 1, Introduction – Summary of Intended Procurement, of the RFP, the 58 Superior Courts of California; the California Appellate Courts, including the Supreme Court of California and the AOC are collectively referred to as the “Purchasing Group”, and individually referred to as “Purchasing Group members”. As noted in Section 3, Relationship of the Parties, in Attachment B, Master Agreement Terms and Conditions, of the RFP as well as referenced in the fourth paragraph of section 1.4 of Section 1, Introduction – Summary of Intended Procurement, of the RFP, the Purchasing Group members may elect, but

are not required, to purchase emergency notification services from any Master Agreement that may result from this RFP, the number of individuals within the Purchasing Group who may utilize the service is unknown. The estimated number of full time staff for each court is provided in a separate attachment (Attachment 1 to Questions and Answers #2 - entitled "California Judicial Officers and Employees"). As the number of full time staff at the Administrative Office of the Courts is not provided in the Attachment; this number is 1,038.

Question 9: Regarding the Attachment F, DVBE Form, our company does not use sub-contractors. Is there a waiver form that can be used or do we need to fill out attachment F as a No Compliance? Will this block our ability to participate in the bid?

AOC Response: If your firm does not subcontract any of its services, please provide a letter or statement that acknowledges Attachment F and states that your firm does not subcontract any of its services. This letter or statement must be submitted with the DVBE Participation Form, with only the first three lines of the form completed; i.e., Vendor Name, RFP Project Title, and RFP Number. See the answer to Question 1 of the previously posted Questions and Answers. Submitting Attachment F in this manner will not block your ability to participate in this solicitation.

Question 10: Is there already a budget in place? and what is that budgeted number? What is this "Purchasing Group", do they purchase something for the AOC? If not, what do they purchase?? How many 'Purchasing Groups are there??? It seems like this purchasing group is throughout the state of California. I am trying to get an idea of the volume of this 'Purchasing Group???

AOC Response: There is no budget specifically allocated for this solicitation. See the answer to Question 8 for the definition of "Purchasing Group". There is no minimum ordering estimate for any of these Purchasing Group members (see section 4.2 of Section IV, Statement of Work, of the RFP).

Question 11: How many jurisdictions are included in the Master Agreement? What is the average number of employees per jurisdiction?

AOC Response: See the answer to Question 8.

Question 12: Because we own the hosted solution that is being proposed for our response on RFP No. ERS-060109 we do not have options for sub contract activities to be provided for by DVBE nor would a good faith effort be respectful of the DVBEs efforts required to respond, we respectfully request the DVBE requirement be removed. If the requirement or good faith effort is not removed would the AOC provide addition guidance on this requirement?

AOC Response: See the answer to Question 1 of the previously posted Questions and Answers and the answer to Question 9, above.

END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS #2