



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

FINANCE DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-7739 • Fax 415-865-7217 • TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

WILLIAM C. VICKREY
Administrative Director of the Courts

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
Chief Deputy Director

STEPHEN NASH
Director, Finance Division

TO: POTENTIAL PROPOSERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts
Finance Division

DATE: December 16, 2010

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Information Services Division (ISD), a division of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), seeks the services of up to nine (9) Key Personnel for the following categories to provide maintenance and support for the CCMS-V3 Case Management System:

Developer	– up to 4 Key Personnel
Application Architecture Support	– up to 1 Key Personnel
Quality Assurance	– up to 2 Key Personnel
Infrastructure Architect	– up to 1 Key Personnel
Operations Coordinator	– up to 1 Key Personnel

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposals (RFP), as posted at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/>:

Project Title: Court Case Management System (CCMS-V3) Transition Program

RFP Number: ISD-201001-RB

QUESTIONS TO THE SOLICITATIONS MAILBOX: Questions regarding this RFP must be directed to solicitations@jud.ca.gov by **no later than December 20, 2010, 3:00 p.m. Pacific Time**

DATE AND TIME PROPOSAL DUE: There will not be a pre-proposal conference for this RFP. Proposals must be received by no later than **1:00 p.m. Pacific Time, January 4, 2011.**

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals must be sent to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. ISD-201001-RB
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. BACKGROUND

1.1.1. The Judicial Council of California, chaired by the Chief Justice of California, is the chief policy making agency of the California judicial system. The California Constitution directs the Council to improve the administration of justice by surveying judicial business, recommending improvements to the Courts, and making recommendations annually to the Governor and the Legislature. The Council also adopts rules for Court administration, practice, and procedure, and performs other functions prescribed by law. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency for the Council and assists both the Council and its chair in performing their duties.

1.2. AOC DIVISIONS

1.2.1. The Information Services Division (ISD), a division of the AOC based in San Francisco, is responsible for assisting the courts in achieving the Judicial Council technology objectives. ISD coordinates court technology statewide, and supports coordination throughout the judicial branch; manages centralized statewide technology projects; and optimizes the scope and accessibility of accurate statewide judicial information.

1.3. CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

- 1.3.1. ISD is directly responsible for the development, acquisition, implementation, and support of automated systems in the appellate courts, state trial courts, and the AOC. As such, ISD provides a range of services from oversight and program management, to maintenance and technical support for trial court case management systems, including the Sustain Interim Case Management System, the V2 Criminal and Traffic system and the V3 Civil, Small Claims Probate, and Mental Health system and the California Courts Case Management System (CCMS).
- 1.3.2. V3, an interim case management system, will be replaced by the California Case Management System which will consolidate all case types.
- 1.3.3. Currently, a vendor provides maintenance and support for V3, but this initiative will transition maintenance and support to the AOC. Plans are to provide maintenance and support for the Superior courts of San Diego, Orange, Ventura, Los Angeles, San Joaquin and Sacramento without the benefit of major enhancements. Minor enhancements and changes due to legislative updates will continue. It entails procuring the appropriate staff, acquiring needed tools, creating all the development, test, and pre-production environments, and documenting and training for all processes and procedures.

1.3.4. The goal for this project is seamless transition. The impact to the user community must be minimal. To ensure success of the initiative the following will be adhered to:

- A suitable Knowledge Transfer stage will be planned and agreed to by all stakeholders;
- Prior to any enhancements made by the AOC, the V3 application will be deemed stable as per agreement in the SOW with the vendor;
- Prior to any transition cut-off, a number of enhancements will be performed by a newly-formed AOC team before the vendor transitions support of V3 to the AOC;
- The AOC team will perform the code activities and the vendor will perform QA;
- The AOC will perform installation with vendor oversight;
- All requested documentation will be complete; and
- All artifacts used by the vendor in their maintenance of V3 will be delivered to the AOC.

2. TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

2.1. The AOC has developed the following list of key events from the time of the issuance of this RFP through the intent to award contract. All dates are subject to change at the discretion of the AOC.

EVENT	KEY DATE
RFP issued to http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/ :	December 16, 2010
Deadline for questions submitted to solicitations@jud.ca.gov	3:00 p.m. Pacific Time December 20, 2010
Posting of Answers To Questions (estimate only)	December 21, 2010
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted	1:00 p.m. Pacific Time January 4, 2011
Initial Evaluation of proposals Completed by (estimate only)	January 14, 2011
Interview & Testing of top candidates completed by (estimate only)	January 28, 2011
Notice of Intent to Award (estimate only)	February 4, 2011
Negotiations and execution of contract (estimate only)	February 15, 2011

3. PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

3.1. The AOC seeks the services of up to nine (9) Key Personnel, as defined in Exhibit B, Special Provisions of Attachment 2, Contract Terms, as follows:

Developer	– up to 4 Key Personnel
Application Architecture Support	– up to 1 Key Personnel
Quality Assurance	– up to 2 Key Personnel
Infrastructure Architect	– up to 1 Key Personnel
Operations Coordinator	– up to 1 Key Personnel

3.2 The AOC has a need for maintenance and support services relating to the CCMS-V3 application for six (6) courts for approximately three (3) years, however, the initial contract term will be for one (1) year, with the AOCs option to extend a contract for up to two (2) additional consecutive one-year terms.

3.3 The AOC may award up to nine (9) contracts to nine (9) separate firms resulting from this RFP.

3.4 The expected contractual responsibilities and work requirements are set forth in Exhibit D, Work to be Performed, in Attachment 2, Contract Terms.

4. RFP ATTACHMENTS

4.1. Included as part of this RFP are the following attachments:

- 4.1.1. Attachment 1, Administrative Rules Governing Request for Proposals. Proposers shall follow the rules, set forth in Attachment 1, in preparation and submittal of their proposals.
- 4.1.2. Attachment 2, Contract Terms. Contracts with successful firms will be signed by the parties on a State of California Standard Agreement form and will include terms appropriate for this project. Terms and conditions typical for the requested services are attached as Attachment 2, Contract Terms and include: Exhibit A, Standard Provisions; Exhibit B, Special Provisions; Exhibit C, Payment Provisions; Exhibit D, Work to be Performed; Exhibit E, Contractor’s Key Personnel (to be determined); and Exhibit F, Attachments.
- 4.1.3. Attachment 3, Proposer’s Acceptance of the RFP’s Contract Terms. Proposers must either indicate acceptance of Contract Terms, as set forth in Attachment 2, Contract Terms, or clearly identify exceptions to the Contract Terms, as set forth in this Attachment 3.
- 4.1.4. Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form. The AOC is required to obtain and keep on file, a completed Payee Data Record for each proposer prior to entering into a contract with that Proposer. Therefore, proposer’s proposal must include a completed and signed Payee Data Record Form, set forth as Attachment 4, or provide a copy of the form previously submitted to AOC.

5. QUALIFICATIONS

5.1. Proposer's candidates should have the following desired qualifications:

5.1.1. Developer

- Five to Seven (5 to 7) years development experience with a working knowledge of:
 - ✓ J2EE architecture; EJB, JMS, etc.
 - ✓ J2EE based enterprise applications using Oracle/BEA WebLogic
 - ✓ MVC architecture - Struts framework
 - ✓ Developing design artifacts such as Sequence and Activity diagrams and flow charts
 - ✓ IBM Filenet Framework API for both Image manager and Content manager
 - ✓ Quartz API
 - ✓ PL/SQL and store procedures
 - ✓ ADOBE product suite; Document Server, Central Pro, Web output pak, output designer
 - ✓ Business Object XI; Designer and Enterprise
- Understanding of:
 - ✓ Application Architecture
 - ✓ Networking
 - ✓ Security components like SiteMinder, LDAP and Active Directory

5.1.2. Application Architecture Support

- Seven to Ten (7 to 10) years Applications Architecture experience with a working knowledge of:
 - ✓ Design and analytical concepts of J2EE including design patterns like Session façade, Service Locator, Singleton
 - ✓ Object modeling using UML and rational suite
 - ✓ MVC architecture - Struts framework
 - ✓ Oracle/BEA JMS Framework and JMS Server Administration
 - ✓ Quartz Framework
 - ✓ Java LDAP and Active Directory API Framework
 - ✓ Apache Axis Web services Framework
 - ✓ Oracle/BEA Weblogic server set up and configuration
 - ✓ Enterprise Java Beans Architecture - Session and Entity beans design and configuration management

- ✓ IBM FileNet Framework API for both Image manager and Content manager
- ✓ Adobe product suite; Document Server, Central Pro, Web output pak, output designer
- ✓ Oracle/BEA Jrockit JVM and garbage collection tuning methodologies and best practices.
- ✓ JRA Recording and BEA Mission Control.
- ✓ PL/SQL and store procedures.
- ✓ Versioning software such as Subversion
- ✓ Code Build process (ANT scripting)
- Understanding of:
 - ✓ Windows Server and Sun One Web Server, CA SiteMinder, LDAP administration
 - ✓ Oracle Database reports
 - ✓ Mercury/HP Testing Suite; Quality Center, Load Runner, Win Runner, Quick Test Pro
 - ✓ UNIX Servers Administration – Oracle/BEA Weblogic, Sun One Webserver, LDAP, SiteMinder, Database etc.
 - ✓ Rationale Tool Suite

5.1.3. Quality Assurance

- Seven to Ten (7 to 10) years quality assurance experience with a working knowledge of:
 - ✓ V3 Configuration and troubleshooting
 - ✓ Core application design and business rules
 - ✓ Quality Center/Test Director
 - ✓ QTP Script maintenance and trouble shooting
 - ✓ Key QA processes and procedures
 - ✓ Versioning software such as Subversion
 - ✓ Basic SQL and TOAD
 - ✓ Understand how to read an XML schema
 - ✓ Ability to review, manipulate and create XMLs (i.e. - XML spy)
 - ✓ Existing tools: Mercury/HP Testing Suite; Quality Center, Load Runner, WinRunner, Quick Test Pro
- Understanding of:
 - ✓ Architecture Design
 - ✓ Basic UNIX commands
 - ✓ Future tools: Rationale Tool Suite

5.1.4. Infrastructure Architect

- Five to Seven (5 to 7) years infrastructure architecture experience with a working knowledge of:
 - ✓ UNIX (Solaris) Systems Administration
 - ✓ Windows Server Administration; Operating system and Active Directory
 - ✓ Sun One Web Server, Directory Server installation, setup and administration
 - ✓ CA SiteMinder installation, setup and administration
 - ✓ Oracle/ BEA Weblogic server installation, setup and administration
 - ✓ IBM FileNet basic configuration; DB connectivity, Storage setup
 - ✓ ADOBE Product Suite installation, setup and administration; Document Server, Central Pro, jfmerge
 - ✓ Business Objects Reporting server installation, setup and administration
 - ✓ Performance Tuning Capabilities; Oracle/ BEA Application server, Sun One Web Server
 - ✓ PERL/ Shell scripting
 - ✓ Windows batch scripting
 - ✓ Network / TCP/IP stack administration and troubleshooting
 - ✓ Existing tools: Mercury/HP Testing Suite; Quality Center, Load Runner, WinRunner, Quick Test Pro
 - ✓ Desktop administration and setup; BEA Workshop, TOAD, Oracle Client
 - ✓ Basic PL/SQL
 - ✓ Code Build process; ANT scripting
- Understanding of:
 - ✓ Basic Java J2EE
 - ✓ ER Win
 - ✓ Oracle DB reports analysis: AWR, ADDM reports
 - ✓ Firewall setup and rules, Layered security
 - ✓ Future tools: Rationale Tool Suite

5.1.5. Operations Coordinator

- Five to Seven (5 to 7) years application infrastructure experience working the SUN architecture, JAVA and SQL, SiteMinder and IIS; versioning software such as Subversion
- Proven Release Management experience

- Must be a highly technical resource who is able to provide support to all groups in support of the V3 application: coders, testers, project managers, and to operations in the California Court Technology Center (CCTC)

6. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

- 6.1. Proposals will be evaluated by the AOC using the criteria set forth in paragraphs 6.2 through 6.6, below and in the order set forth in Table 1, Evaluation Steps, in paragraph 6.7. If a proposal includes multiple candidates, each proposed candidate will be evaluated on a 100 point scale separately in accordance with these criteria. Proposers must clearly demonstrate how each candidate meets the requirements of the evaluation criterion.
- 6.2. Specialized expertise and technical competence (possible 36 Points). Proposals will be evaluated based on the proposer's demonstrated ability to meet the desired qualifications for the applicable position. Refer to Section 5 above, and Section 7.4 below .
- 6.3. Past record of performance (possible 26 points). Proposals will be evaluated considering candidate's past performance. Refer to Section 7.5 below.
- 6.4. Reasonableness of cost projections (possible 22 points). Proposals will be evaluated in terms of reasonableness of cost, proposed rate structure for the position, including breakdown of salary, overhead and profit. Refer to Section 7.6 below.
- 6.5. Ability to meet requirements of the project (possible 10 points). Proposals will be evaluated in terms of compliance with proposed contract terms and project scheduling. Refer to Sections 7.7 and 7.8 below.
- 6.6. Company Stability and Capabilities (possible 6 points). Proposals will be evaluated in terms of the proposer's demonstrated stability and capabilities. Refer to Section 7.3 below.
- 6.7. Proposals will be evaluated in the following steps which are also illustrated in Table 1, below:
 - Step 1 Evaluation of 6.2, Specialized expertise and technical competence, and 6.3, Past record of performance. Candidates whose scores are 40 or higher will go on to Step 2, testing. **Candidates whose scores are 39 or lower will not go on to Steps 2 through 6 and will not be considered further in the evaluation process.**
 - Step 2 Candidate will be tested to determine their depth of Expertise and Technical Competence and determine the relevance of their Past Record of Performance. See section 9, Testing.
 - Step 3 Following the test, if necessary, the candidate will be re-scored in the categories of 6.2, Specialized expertise and technical competence; and 6.3, Past record of performance; and first-time evaluated and scored in the categories of 6.4, Reasonableness of cost projections; and 6.5, Ability to meet requirements of the project. Top scorers for each position will go on to Step 4, Interviews.
 - Step 4 Candidates will be interviewed to validate or clarify Proposers responses to 6.2, Specialized expertise and technical competence; 6.3, relevance of Past record of performance, 6.4; Reasonableness of cost projections; and 6.5, Ability to meet requirements of the project.

Step 5 Following the interview, if necessary, candidates will be re-scored in 6.2, Specialized expertise and technical competence; 6.3, Past record of performance; 6.4, Reasonableness of cost projections; and 6.5, Ability to meet requirements of the project and first-time evaluated and scored in 6.6 Company Stability and Capabilities.

Step 6 Top scorer(s), become potential candidates for award.

Table 1: Evaluation Steps

Evaluation Categories	Step – 1 Initial Evaluation and Scoring	Step 2 – Testing of High Scorers of 6.2 and 6.3 only	Step 3 – Re-scoring	Step 4 – Interviews of Top Scorers of 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5 only	Step 5 – Re-Scoring	Step 6 – Candidates Selected
6.2 Specialized expertise and technical competence	Evaluated and Scored		If necessary, re-scored based on test results		If necessary, re-scored based on interview	
6.3 Past record of performance	Evaluated and Scored		If necessary, re-scored based on test results		If necessary, re-scored based on interview	
6.4 Reasonableness of cost projections	Not Applicable in Step 1		Evaluated and Scored		If necessary, re-scored based on interview	
6.5 Ability to meet requirements of the project	Not Applicable in Step 1		Evaluated and Scored		If necessary, re-scored based on interview	
6.6 Company Stability and Capabilities	Not Applicable in Step 1		Not Applicable in Step 3		Evaluated and Scored	

7. SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL

- 7.1. **Proposers may submit up to three (3) candidates for consideration for each of the nine (9) Key Personnel positions. Proposals with more than three (3) candidates per position may not be evaluated. If a proposer wishes to submit a candidate for more than one Key Personnel position, the candidate must be specifically submitted separately for each Key Personnel position, and will count towards one of the submissions for each.**
- 7.2. For each candidate, proposers must specifically state which of the Key Personnel positions the candidate is to be considered. The AOC will not make a best fit determination for proposed candidates. A candidate will not be considered for evaluation if the proposal does not specifically state under which position(s) the candidate is to be evaluated.

- 7.3. Company Stability and Capabilities. Provide the following information about your company:
 - 7.3.1. Provide proposer's point of contact, including name, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone and facsimile numbers in a cover letter.
 - 7.3.2. Provide the following information about your firm:
 - 7.3.2.1. Proposer's point of contact, including name, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone and facsimile numbers in a cover letter.
 - 7.3.2.2. Number of years your firm has been in the business of providing technical staffing.
 - 7.3.2.3. Number of full time employees (do not count placed candidates unless they are employees of your firm).
 - 7.3.2.4. Disclose any judgments, pending litigation, or other real or potential financial reversals that might materially affect the viability of the proposer's firm.
 - 7.3.2.5. Annual gross revenue from your most recent audited or reviewed profit and loss statement and balance sheet. State the audit/review year and the annual gross revenue. The AOC may request a copy of your most recent audited or reviewed profit and loss statement and balance sheet.
 - 7.3.2.6. Pre-screening, background checks, testing, and interview procedures.
 - 7.3.2.7. Process regarding replacing a candidate if necessary.
 - 7.3.2.8. Provide a description of what, if any, health benefits, or other benefits your firm provides to your proposed candidates.
- 7.4. Specialized expertise and technical competence. Provide the following information separately for each proposed candidate:
 - 7.4.1. Resume and at least three (3) names, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone numbers for whom the proposed candidate has performed similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the proposer. Proposed candidates must currently have the legal right to work for the full duration of the initial contract period as well as any subsequent option term awarded.
 - 7.4.2. For each candidate, provide a statement that demonstrates how the candidate meets the qualifications for the each applicable position to be considered.
 - 7.4.3. If selected for an interview, a candidate must demonstrate his/her oral and communication skills at a technical as well as non-technical level.
- 7.5. Past record of performance. Discuss the each proposed candidate's record of performance on past projects, especially on work with government agencies or public bodies, including such factors as quality of work, ability to meet schedules, cooperation, responsiveness, and other information technology considerations.
- 7.6. Reasonableness of cost projections.
 - 7.6.1. Provide the fully burdened **total hourly rate** of each proposed Key Personnel, and for evaluation purposes, include the hourly rate, overhead, and profit rate structure

breakdown for the rate using the following formula: **(For this section 7.6.1., do not provide a breakdown of an annual amount!)**

Initial Term:

	Amt Payable to the Key Personnel	\$XX.XX	XX%
+	Amt Allocated to Proposer’s Overhead	\$XX.XX	XX%
+	Amt Allocated to Proposer’s Profit	\$XX.XX	XX%
=	Total hourly rate for Key Personnel	\$XXX.XX	100%

First Optional Renewal Term:

	Amt Payable to the Key Personnel	\$XX.XX	XX%
+	Amt Allocated to Proposer’s Overhead	\$XX.XX	XX%
+	Amt Allocated to Proposer’s Profit	\$XX.XX	XX%
=	Total hourly rate for Key Personnel	\$XXX.XX	100%

Second Optional Renewal Term:

	Amt Payable to the Key Personnel	\$XX.XX	XX%
+	Amt Allocated to Proposer’s Overhead	\$XX.XX	XX%
+	Amt Allocated to Proposer’s Profit	\$XX.XX	XX%
=	Total hourly rate for Key Personnel	\$XXX.XX	100%

7.6.2. The cost proposal should also include separate line items for travel and lodging. Travel expenses, if any, will be reimbursed in accordance with the provisions set forth in Exhibit C, Payment Provisions, in Attachment 2, Contract Terms. For purposes of this RFP, proposers are to assume allowable travel expenses will not exceed \$25,000 for each Key Personnel, for each term as further detailed in Exhibit C, Payment Provisions, of Attachment 2, Contract Terms. In order to achieve travel cost projections for this project, the AOC prefers candidates with a local presence in the San Francisco Bay Area..

7.6.3. For each proposed Key Personnel and for each term, include a total not to exceed amount for the work and allowable expenses considered by this RFP, bearing in mind that:

7.6.3.1. the total annual estimated costs for each Key Personnel’s services shall be within following annual dollar ranges for each twelve (12) month period:

Annual Dollar Ranges	Position
\$174,000 to \$232,000	Developer
\$174,000 to \$232,000	Application Architecture Support
\$150,000 to \$200,000	Quality Assurance
\$174,000 to \$232,000	Infrastructure Architect
\$135,000 to \$180,000	Operations Coordinator

7.6.3.2. the annual amounts are inclusive of personnel, materials, overhead, subcontractor markup, profit, and travel costs and expenses, and

7.6.3.3. the method of payment to the contractor is anticipated to be by cost reimbursement.

7.7. Ability to meet requirements of the project.

7.7.1. Discuss the candidate's availability and ability to complete the work within the project schedule, set forth in Exhibit D, Work to be Performed, in Attachment 2, Contract Terms.

7.7.2. Each Key Personnel will not work more than forty (40) hours per week unless preapproved, in writing, by the project manager. For purposes of this RFP, during each 12-month period, proposers are to base their proposal on 1,896 hours of work for each twelve (12) month period.

7.8. Compliance with Contract Terms.

7.8.1. Complete and submit Attachment 3, Proposer's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms. Also, if changes are proposed, submit a version of Attachment 2, Contract Terms with all tracked changes, as well as written justification supporting any such proposed changes.

7.8.2. Tax recording information. Complete and submit Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form, or provide a copy of the form previously submitted to the AOC.

8. SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

8.1. Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted in Section 7, Specifics of a Responsive Proposal, above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.

8.2. Proposers will submit **one (1) original and three (3) copies** of the proposal, signed by an authorized representative of the company, including name, title, address, and telephone number of one individual who is the responder's designated representative.

8.3. Proposals must be delivered to the individual listed under Submission of Proposals, as set forth on the cover memo of this RFP.

8.4. Only written responses will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered or certified mail or by hand delivery.

8.5. In addition to submittal of the original and three copies of the proposals, as set forth in Section 8.2, above, proposers are also required to submit an electronic version of the entire proposal on CD-ROM.

9. TESTING

The AOC will administer technical tests with candidates that attain Step 2 of the evaluation process set forth in 6.7 to gauge technical proficiency as set forth in the written proposal. If a candidate is invited to take a technical test, the test will likely be conducted at the AOC's offices in San Francisco. The AOC will not reimburse candidates for any costs incurred in traveling to or from the

testing location. The AOC will notify prospective proposers regarding testing arrangements.

10. INTERVIEWS

The AOC will conduct interviews with the top ranked proposed candidates that attain Step 4 of the evaluation process set forth in 6.7 to clarify aspects set forth in the written proposal and to determine the candidate's oral and communications skills. If conducted, interviews will likely be conducted at the AOC's offices in San Francisco. The AOC will not reimburse candidates for any costs incurred in traveling to or from the interview location. The AOC will notify prospective proposers regarding interview arrangements.

11. CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

- 11.1. The Administrative Office of the Courts is bound by California Rule of Court 10.500 (see: <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/rules/amendments/jan2010-2.pdf>) as to disclosure of its administrative records. If the information submitted contains material noted or marked as confidential and/or proprietary that, in the AOC's sole opinion, meets the disclosure exemption requirements of Rule 10.500, then that information will not be disclosed pursuant to a request for public documents.
- 11.2. If the AOC does not consider such material to be exempt from disclosure under Rule 10.500, the material may be made available to the public, regardless of the notation or markings. If the proposer is unsure if its confidential and/or proprietary material meets the disclosure exemption requirements of Rule 10.500, then it should not include such information in its proposal.

END OF FORM