In the cort information document can you tell is where we can find the user break up (copied as typed in the live chat through Webex)

**Answer:  Will provide more detailed information regarding type of users and number within this document as an answer to a previously submitted question. See below.**

Are we looking for three or five years of ongoing support and maintenance?

**Answer: The court is looking for a five year maintenance and support agreement.  The court has updated section 7.2 in the RFP.**

What is the authentication soulution (active directory, Oracle, CA, IBM) (copied as typed in the live chat through Webex)

**Answer: The court is using Active Directory on the court network. Authentication should be built in to the CMS solution and based on whichever platform the CMS is built on.**

Will the court be addressing already submitted questions?

**Answer: Yes, all questions previously submitted are included in this Questions and Answers document**.

**PREVIOUS SUBMITTED QUESTIONS**

Since many attachments posted in the San Luis Obispo Superior Court RFP and the Kings Superior Court RFP were collaborated and are similar documents, does Kings Court want to use the same template (attachment 17) that San Luis Obispo posted?

**No.**

Will attachment 17 be available in word format?

**No.**

Would the county be open to accepting an alternative proposal that offers a solution that meets or exceeds 100% of the judiciary's requirements to view and manage documents real-time in the courtroom/chambers and would be integrated into both the current CMS and the proposed CMS? This proposal would address the requirements specified in attachment 14 and is not a CMS but offers a solution that could be implementable even now as county migrates to the new system.

**Answer: No, the Court is not seeking an interim system and is in need of a complete replacement of its current Criminal, Traffic, and Juvenile CMS.  The Court prefers a CMS that will manage (including but not limited to) all its**

Civil case types as well. The court will consider a "two phase" approach to implementation with criminal, traffic, and juvenile cases implemented first followed by remaining civil case types.

What is the number of internal users? **100**

What is the number of third party users from other organizations? **200**

What is the number of External users anonymous? **50 (concurrent)**

What is the number of External users registered? **Not applicable**

What is the current data volume listed by entities (e.g. Users 50,000, Cases 200,000etc)? ~**231,000 cases**

How much of the existing data needs to be migrated to the new system?

**Answer: All records will need to be migrated. Vendor can (as an alternative) filter records to only migrate records which have not expired.**

Are there any legacy documents that need to be scanned and converted? **No**

Number of scanners the new system will have. Has any specific brand been chosen?

**Answer: 6 scanners. No specific brand preferred**

What it the currently used CRM/Contact/Case management system, Document Management System and Portal (website)?

**Answer: No current document management system in place. Civil cases are managed by an Oracle base CMS, Criminal, Traffic, Juvenile cases are managed on a Cobol Mainframe system.**

What are the current security solutions? (e.g. Active Directory, Oracle IDM, CA, IBM etc)?

**Answer: Security is built in to current CMS's system**

Of the 50 Integrations listed in "Attachment 11 - Integration Requirements" how many already exist? Can we get the details of the message formats for each?

**Answer: Most currently exist. Message formats can be flexible though it is important that required fields and data are present.**