



Council Agenda Item

Meeting Date:	May 27 th , 2025
Agenda Item:	2024 Server Replacement and Optimization
Staff Contact (name, email, phone):	Tim Neubeck, tneubeck@whitewater-wi.gov , 262-473-1391

BACKGROUND

(Enter the who, what when, where, why)

In 2015, the City implemented an on-premise telephone system from Shoretel as implemented by Digicorp which has been the City's IT support vendor since 2007. In September 2017, Shoretel was acquired by Mitel. The City's system stopped receiving updates in 2018 and has been living on a virtual machine (VM) server with an operating system (OS) that reached end of life in October, 2023. Staff and Digicorp were unable to migrate the Shoretel system to a newer OS as it would no longer function because Mitel no longer updates this system. This system does not require any additional annual fees – besides a support contract with Digicorp – but it is currently a security issue as well as the fact that it does not provide softphone functionality to users. Furthermore, it was recommended the City needed to implement new host servers before this project can occur to ensure it was not only licensed properly but also would likely require far more space than what was available on the previous host servers.

The City now needs to replace its current on-premise solution with another preferably on-premise solution. We received RFPs from April 1st to May 1st and received 10 proposals from 9 different companies, and 5 of those proposals are for a Mitel solution. In March, Mitel filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection in Texas seeking to complete a restructuring to eliminate debt; however, the company has put out press releases that the company is still going to exist and support its products. Thus, the City had to take this into account when evaluating proposals. Proposals were awarded points based on the following:

Cost of products and/or services: bidders will be evaluated on the cost of the solution(s) based on the work to be performed in accordance with the scope of this project	30
Implementation Cost: proposed solution(s) will be evaluated on any additional cost to the City to implement the proposed solution(s)	20
Design and technical bid submission: proposed solution(s) must meet the scope and needs included herein and be presented in a clear and organized manner	15
Organizational Experience: bidders will be evaluated on their experience as it pertains to the scope of this project	10
Previous Work: Bidders will be evaluated on examples of their work pertaining to the scope of this project and any previous experience, if any, with the City	5
Technical Expertise and Experience: bidders must provide descriptions and documentation of staff technical expertise and experience	10
Financial Stability: bidders will be evaluated on the financial stability of the organization	10

We narrowed it down to 4 proposals based on the above criteria. Others were not considered because the system is not a fit for the City's needs, high one-time costs, high annual costs, and a lack of an on-premise solution. No matter what, the City will have to pay annual licensing and/or service costs, and among 3 of the 4, they are close. BTS's solution is white-glove and factors in the total administration of the system besides support. Because there are fewer than 200 lines, administering the phone system is not very labor intensive.

Ultimately, I recommend CCCC's FortiVoice proposal. Besides being the more cost-effective solution, FortiVoice has the same manufacturer as our firewall and wireless access points, and the platforms can be administered from the same user interface. As the IT team is already familiar with the firewall, this would make integration and administration much easier. CCCC provided references from CESA 5; Glendale Heights, IL; and De Pere, WI who all gave good reviews of the product, the company, and highlighted the ease of use using other FortiNet products. In putting together their proposal, CCCC visited the City, reviewed its current Shoretel system, and spoke with key employees regarding features they need and anticipate using. While Mitel offers more features (mass texting, chat, collaboration tools, etc.) and a more visually striking user interface, many of those features would not be put to use to make up for the increased cost. In conversations with the manufacturer, FortiNet, they informed me their telephony services are going to be a core offering going forward. All of their hardware and services give a 5-year notice of end of life support as well.

PREVIOUS ACTIONS – COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

(Dates, committees, action taken)

The City purchased a Shoretel telephony system from Digicorp in 2015 for \$74,098.00.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

(If none, state N/A)

Company	Solution	One-Time Cost	Annual Cost
BTS	3CX	\$78,400.52	\$16,748.04 <u>after</u> 3 years for 3CX licensing & managed service
Camera Corner Connecting Point (CCCC)	FortiVoice	\$61,262.00	\$2,546 <u>after</u> 1 year for FortiVoice licensing & support
Digicorp	Mitel	\$90,587.00	\$2,369 <u>after</u> 5 years for Mitel licensing
Marco	Mitel	\$74,125.95	\$2,330 <u>after</u> 3 years for Mitel licensing

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends selecting CCCC's FortiVoice telephony system in the amount of \$61,262.00.

ATTACHMENT(S) INCLUDED

(If none, state N/A)

1. BTS's proposal packet
2. CCCC's proposal packet
3. Digicorp's proposal packet
4. Marco's proposal packet