

**CRITERIA FOR  
SOLE SOURCE / BRAND PROCUREMENT  
"SOLE SOURCE JUSTIFICATION FORM"**

Please address by specific reference each question listed below ( 1 – 5 ) in your justification.  
Failure to respond to any of the questions may result in the rejection of your request.  
( When answering questions use separate sheets of paper as needed )

**Please submit this document in a WORD format, and include the following information:**

- **Contractor Name, (if applicable/assigned): Autel New Energy US Inc.**
- **Contract Term: July 7, 2026 – July 7, 2029**
- **Value of the Contract: \$250,000.00**
- **Contract Number: PO Request**
- **Extension from a Previous Contract/PO? No**
- **If so, please provide the previous contract/PO number: N/A**

**1. Why was the particular product and / or vendor selected?**

Autel EV charging equipment was selected because it best meets Contra Costa County's operational, technical, and long-term infrastructure needs for electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE). The County's prior charging standard was equipment supplied by FLO Inc. However, FLO has since stopped manufacturing the hardware previously used by the County and has partnered with Autel for hardware supply. As a result of this business relationship, Autel equipment represents the most practical and compatible path forward for continuation and expansion of the County's EV charging infrastructure.

Selection of Autel allows the County to maintain consistency in charging equipment deployment, reduce incompatibility risk across sites, and support a smoother transition from previously installed charging infrastructure. Autel also offers equipment that is Open Charge Point Protocol (OCPP) compliant, which is an important requirement for the County because it supports interoperability, flexibility in software/network provider selection, and reduced risk of vendor lock-in over the life of the assets.

For these reasons, Autel was selected as the product/vendor that best aligns with the County's existing infrastructure strategy, operational needs, and long-term objectives for scalable EV charging deployment.

**2. What are the unique performance factors of the selected product / service?**  
Provide detailed specifications and descriptions.

The selected Autel EVSE offers several performance factors that are necessary for County use:

**a. Compatibility with County charging infrastructure strategy**

Autel hardware aligns with the County's transition from the prior FLO hardware standard. Because FLO is no longer manufacturing the charger hardware previously used by the County and is now partnered with Autel for hardware, Autel is the most compatible replacement and expansion platform available within the County's established charging approach.

**b. OCPP compliance**

Autel chargers are OCPP compliant, which is a critical technical requirement. OCPP compliance allows chargers to communicate with a variety of network and software management platforms rather than requiring permanent reliance on a single proprietary backend provider. This supports long-term flexibility; competitive software procurement, and better lifecycle management of County assets.

c. Scalable commercial EV charging functionality

Autel commercial charging equipment is designed for fleet and workplace/public sector applications and provides the operational functionality needed for County sites, including user access controls, charger monitoring, data reporting, remote management capability, and load management features, depending on final model selection and site configuration.

d. Standardization and maintainability

Using a consistent hardware platform across County sites improves maintenance, staff familiarity, spare parts management, troubleshooting, training, and future expansion planning. Standardization reduces administrative and operational complexity compared to introducing multiple unrelated charging equipment platforms.

e. Future procurement flexibility

Because OCPP compliance supports interoperability, the County is better positioned to adapt over time to changing software vendors, operational requirements, and funding/program requirements without fully replacing installed charger hardware.

3. Why are these specific factors required?

These factors are required in order to ensure that the County's EV charging investments remain functional, maintainable, interoperable, and adaptable over the long term.

First, continuity with the County's prior charging standard is required because the County has already deployed and planned EV infrastructure around a defined hardware approach. Since FLO no longer manufactures the applicable hardware and has transitioned to a partnership model involving Autel hardware, the County must use equipment that supports an orderly and low-risk continuation of its charging infrastructure program.

Second, OCPP compliance is required because the County must avoid unnecessary dependence on a closed proprietary system. County EV charging infrastructure is a long-lived capital investment, and interoperability is necessary to preserve future flexibility in network services, maintenance strategy, and procurement options. This reduces lifecycle risk and protects the County's investment.

Third, standardization is required to support efficient operation and maintenance across multiple County facilities. Introducing multiple charger models and platforms would create added burden on staff training, maintenance support, troubleshooting, replacement planning, and overall asset management.

Finally, these factors are required because County charging infrastructure must support both current operational needs and future growth. The selected equipment must therefore be suitable not only for immediate deployment, but also for future expansion as the County continues electrifying its fleet and related facilities.

#### 4. What other products / services have been examined and rejected?

The County has considered continuation with previously used FLO hardware as well as the potential use of other EV charger manufacturers.

Continuation with FLO's prior hardware offering is not feasible because FLO has stopped manufacturing the hardware that served as the County's prior standard. As a result, that product line is no longer available as a direct path for continued deployment.

The County has also considered the general availability of other EVSE manufacturers and products in the commercial marketplace. However, alternative products were not selected because they would introduce unnecessary variation from the County's established charging equipment path, may not provide the same continuity with the prior FLO-based standard, and would require additional review for compatibility, supportability, and lifecycle integration within the County's existing and planned EV charging portfolio.

Given the County's need for consistency, interoperability, and an efficient transition from its prior equipment standard, those alternatives were rejected in favor of Autel.

#### 5. Why are other sources providing like goods or services unacceptable?

Other sources of like goods or services are unacceptable because they do not provide the same combination of continuity, compatibility, interoperability, and risk reduction that Autel provides under the County's current circumstances.

The County's previous charging hardware standard was based on FLO equipment. Because FLO no longer manufactures that hardware and has partnered with Autel for hardware supply, Autel is uniquely positioned as the logical successor platform for maintaining consistency with the County's prior infrastructure approach. Procuring unrelated alternative hardware would introduce avoidable complexity and could result in inconsistent equipment standards across County facilities.

Use of other manufacturers would also increase operational and lifecycle risk by requiring the County to support a more fragmented charger environment. This could create additional burdens related to maintenance, staff training, parts management, troubleshooting, and future replacement planning. It may also complicate site design, commissioning, software integration, and long-term management of EV charging assets across multiple County locations.

In addition, the County requires OCPP-compliant equipment to preserve interoperability and reduce vendor lock-in. While some other products in the market may also claim similar functionality, they do not provide the same direct continuity with the County's prior FLO-based standard and transition path. In this case, the County is not seeking merely any charger with similar general capabilities; it is seeking a charger solution that satisfies both the technical interoperability requirement and the County's need for a practical, supportable continuation of its existing EVSE strategy.

For these reasons, other sources are unacceptable for this procurement.

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT:

- 1) I am an approved County department representative. I understand the County's requirements for competitive bidding, as well as the criteria for justification for sole source.
- 2) I have gathered the required technical information and have made a good faith effort to review comparable and / or equal equipment / product / services.  
Copies are attached.

I certify to the best of my knowledge the validity of the information contained herein.

Department / Division / Office name Public Works, Administration, Energy Program

Department representative name Brendan Havenar-Daughton  
( print name )

Date: 6/10/26

**GSD PURCHASING DIVISION USE ONLY:**

BUYER: CYNTYHIA SHEHORN PURCHASING AGENT: PROCUREMENT SVCS MGR

APPROVED: XX

NOT APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 6/15/26

**THE CONTRACTOR, AUTEL US ENERGY, INC., IS APPROVED  
BY CSHEHORN ON 6/15/26**