

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ADDENDUM 1
RFP 54-1025

The dates have been corrected and extended to allow for additional bidders.

Who is the current vendor for online payments?

Authorize.net

Are these web payments currently integrated /validated? Or are they blind payments made online by defendants?

They are made online or through the IVR by the defendant.

Does the Court require the POS payment terminals to be integrated to the Courts Cashiering system?

It is not a requirement, but if available we would do this integration separately.

Please describe cashiering system if not Journal Technologies.

The cashiering system is eCourt Case Management Software built by Journal Technologies.

Can the Court confirm that Journal Technologies will work with a selected vendor, if/as needed, to develop a PCI compliant payment interface? There may be questions or some limited assistance required.

Yes they will.

Do all the transaction data provided on last page of the RFP, include all the payment channels the Court wishes to accept?

Yes it does.

Does the court currently accept inbound phone payments (handled by court staff)? If not, can the Court provide those transaction numbers or estimation of numbers?

Yes, staff will take payments over the phone; however we don't have a way of knowing the volume. Currently all transactions are run using the POS Terminals.

There is no transaction Data on e-checks. Does the court currently accept e-checks? If not, will e-checks be a desired payment method?

We currently do not accept e-checks but we would like to.

Are you looking for just a gateway, or gateway and processor?

We are looking for both, the Processor being the most important.

What version of eCourts CMS software is the Court currently using?

Tulare Release: 2016.01-SR1-LTS-b385

We note in item 3.0 F that the Court is requesting the ability to close by payment channel, product category or by other categories including closing by transaction. Can you please clarify what you mean by "close"? Are you referring to balancing the activity for each of these categories by day and reconciling to cash/credit receipts, or are you referring to daily transaction cut-off times?

We are referring to balancing the activity by day and reconciling to cash/credit receipts.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ADDENDUM 1
RFP 54-1025

Please identify the current vendor being used for the services contemplated in the RFP and the current service charges being charged to users of the system.

We currently use Elavon and Authorize.net. We do not charge the customers a convenience fee.

Please provide the Court's current \$ volume by channel by card type?

This is outlined in Attachment 5

We note that the devices listed in item A include both data key entry pad, optical display and optical or internal PIN pad. These seem to be conflicting requirements for the same device, but may indicate there are varying devices in use. Can you provide us with a listing of devices currently in use?

We currently use VX 520 devices.

We also note in item A the requirement for VOIP communications. Is the Court currently using a dial up connection for credit card processing?

We don't use dial up. VOIP Communication is used with the IVR.

Please clarify what you are referring to in terms of "payment terminal". Does this refer to the POS device used to take payments, or the desktop/workstation the POS device is connected to?

In this context it would be the POS device used to take payments.

Who is the Court's current IVR vendor?

ATI (Streamwrite) with Autorize.net as the payment gateway.

Is the Court asking for a payment processing hosted service that includes the capability to take IVR payments? If so, how does this relate to the Court's current premise IVR system?

The court has an IVR product, so we need the gateway. We currently use Authorize.net

Who is the Court's current merchant bank?

Elavon

Did the Court support IVR payment processing prior to Oct 2016, and if so, what were the monthly or annual transaction and dollar volumes?

February 2015, 176 Trans, \$34,704.75;

March 2015, 163 Trans, \$33,796.75;

April 2015, 147 Trans, \$29,965.50;

May 2015, 105 Trans, \$19,155.00

Does the Court want a payment processing service that accesses the specific user's payment amount from the eCourt database, or allows the user to just input the payment amount in a "blind" transaction?

If integration is possible we need to discuss what are the advantages and disadvantages to the different methods of handling the transaction. We currently do not have this functionality

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ADDENDUM 1
RFP 54-1025

Does the Court have a need for automating its call center (such as ACD and CTI functionality) where live operator/agents take calls from the public?

Not today, but in the future we might look into this.

Section 4.2 – Please provide more functional detail for the requirement to “integrate” with the Court’s current “Online Payment Center”.

This would be to provide the payment gateway that would replace our current vendor.

Section 4.3 – Will the Court provide the specified kiosks?

Yes we will

Section 4.4 – Is this requirement for the Court’s live operators/agents in a call center to take payments using the proposed payment processing service, or is this only for IVR and IWR automated payments directly with the public?

This would be for live operators to take payments over the phone. For instance they could login to a website and process the payment, versus having to go to the POS terminal with someone on the phone and process the payments.

Section 4.5 A – Please describe in more detail, the requirement to “integrate” with the Court’s existing IVR system.

The processing company selected could provide the gateway

Section 4.5 C – Please describe in more detail, what “information” is to be verified with the user before accepting a payment.

The card information would be verified before the transaction continues.

Section 4.9 – Please clarify the meaning of “convenience fee”. Is this the fee the bidder will charge the Court to process a payment, or is this the fee the Court would like to charge the user making a payment and that the Court may want to retain all or a portion of this fee in addition to the base bail/fine/etc required for the transaction?

The convenience fee would be what the bidder will charge the court to process the payment. We would consider a hybrid pricing model where a flat fee would be charged to the customer and the balance paid by the court.