

**RFP #FIN122210CK Judicial Branch Enterprise Document Management System Questions and Answers
1/27/2011**

Q#	Short Name	Full Question	Responses
1	Will an extension be considered?	Justification: From the date the RFP was released 1/14 to delivery 2/8 is approximately 3 weeks. Given that questions are not due to the AOC until 1/28 with an assumed response date of 1/31, it leaves less than 1 week to incorporate answers into the RFP response, format response, seek internal legal and pricing approvals, produce physical copies of the response and post for delivery. It seems that responses will be somewhat rushed and the quality of the responses received may display this rush.	We feel there is adequate time to prepare a competitive response. Questions regarding the RFP should not be held until the Jan 28. Jan 28 is the last opportunity to ask questions but questions should be submitted as soon as possible and they will be answered as they arrive. Additionally, at the mandatory pre-proposal conference, we provided suggestions for prioritizing areas of concentration based upon the published scoring matrix. Potential respondents should remember that responses to Appendix B and Appendix C should focus on how their products and services will excel or be challenged in addressing the requirements, not on implementation.

2	Procurement Scope SCSC	While the RFP seems to address all the court requirements and the desire to establish an AOC standard, this procurement is only for the Santa Clara Superior Court and is a medium sized court - is this accurate?	The RFP represents the requirements of the entire California Judicial Branch. Santa Clara Superior Court will be the initial pilot for the selected solution. An enterprise purchase agreement based on this RFP will be negotiated for the entire branch.
3	Volume Pricing (Some Courts already have a DMS.)	While the RFP indicates the desire for volume pricing based on the size of the courts, the RFP also indicates that some courts already have systems in place (which may or may not require migration) and that only 14 courts plan to procure a solution in the next 12-36 months. How should vendors accommodate for existing deployed software in their pricing proposal? Can you provide a list of which courts own which software components?	Vendors should propose a migration conversion solution from legacy Document Management systems. Vendors should also cite examples of where they have undertaken these conversions in the past. We will not be posting the list of DMS software components that are in use by the California court.

4	MSA	Will the result of this RFP result in an MSA like document to be used as a procurement method for all courts without the need to go out to RFP or bid? Therefore, will any courts other than Santa Clara be purchasing at this time?	The RFP will result in an MSA document that can be used as a procurement method for all courts without the need to go out to RFP or bid. The Superior Court of Santa Clara will do the initial procurement to pilot the selected DMS solution. Our intent is to establish an enterprise licensing agreement for the DMS software. However, some courts may not want to wait for that process to conclude and may procure DMS software prior to the MSA.
5	Why SCSC for Pilot?	What is the compelling need causing Santa Clara to be chosen for this pilot?	A detailed business analysis was conducted at Santa Clara. The large volume of documents processed manually was one of the main factors for piloting at that court. The pilot also contributes to the Court's overall automation and re-engineering goals.

6	Cost for Migration	<p>Vendors are requested to provide a cost for a reliable, cost effective and straight forward migration process from existing repositories to the selected standard. Not enough information is provided to provide an accurate costing mechanism for this requirement. Many common migrations have been performed previously but the courts may have unfamiliar or proprietary repositories which may prove to be more difficult. Could this/these questions be more specific and include type of repository, metadata format & volumes as well as if document conversion is required?</p>	<p>Part of this RFP process is to evaluate the capabilities of proposer's products and services for migrating from other products. We ask that vendors list and describe their abilities to migrate from other existing products. At this point we are only looking for high level cost estimates for migrations, not detailed individual costs for each task during the migration. (See Section 8.7.2.6 and 8.6.3.7).</p>
---	--------------------	---	---

7	Minimum contract Terms	Minimum Contract Terms: If a proposer proposes changes to the minimum contract terms does this minimize their ability to fully participate in the opportunity? Or will only bidders accepting minimum contract terms be moved on to technical solution evaluation?	Changes to the minimum contract terms may minimize a bidder's chance to be moved on to the technical solution evaluation.
8	Modularity of Features in Cost Matrix?	The RFP indicates the desire for modularity and yet not all users will have a need for all modules and not all courts will choose to implement all modules. How does the AOC wish for the bidders to accommodate for this flexibility in the pricing section? Can the user community be further broken down in to which functions they would use.	Respondents should itemize their pricing as much as possible. Appendix A documents the expected features and categorizes them into "Core", "Desired", and "Optional". Responses which identify the category of the module being priced will help in the evaluation.

9	Hosted Solution & Security	For a hosted solution, how does the AOC propose to handle the security model of multiple court locations utilizing the assumed Oracle Security service?	<p>The co-located security service at the hosting site of the hosted solution will be the security provider.</p> <p>Identity management is currently centralized at the hosting location, although federated identity management may be implemented some time in the future.</p>
10	Vendor consortium	For teaming responses, is it necessary to provide the 8.6.3 information for the software vendor if the prime vendor is acting in the capacity of a reseller?	Yes.

11	Rating code "No Configuration Required"	The Response Key on page 18 indicates for a rating scale of "5" - no configurations or customized code will be required. We would submit that "some" configuration is required to implement ANY system, to identify document types, storage locations, metadata values. However, we still consider this level of configuration to be out-of-the-box functionality while the steps in a workflow design would be considered "4" configurable. Could you more clearly define these definitions?	In the example provided, we would consider that to be similar to data entry rather than configuration. Therefore, those features would be considered a "5 - Supported (Out of the Box)". Workflow design, as mentioned would be considered a "4 - Configurable".
12	Support of Software Sold	Must the responding vendor be the first line of support for software sold? In other words must they be a certified support provider? Or may the terms of the procurement allow for the software support contract to be held by the software vendor?	Responding vendors do not have to be the first line of support. Vendors can partner with other vendors and the software support contract can be held by the software vendor.

13	Section 9.2.6 and 9.2.7	Section 9.2.6 & 9.2.7 indicates that costs are not revealed until after demonstrations. Is this accurate?	An addendum will be published to correct section 9.2.7 which should read as follows: “After the initial technical proposal scores have been calculated, the price proposals will be evaluated and scored. After the demonstrations are concluded and a final technical score is calculated, evaluators will then prepare a grand total score for each Proposer.” (Section 9.2.6 is correct as published).
14	Procurement Scope (similar to question #2).	It appears vendors are being requested to provide costs by number of users at all courts even though not all courts will be purchasing, and not all users in all courts will be leveraging all the modules. Could this expectation be discussed further? Additionally how should vendors subtract for pre-existing licensing in the individual courts already using software?	The intent is to have pricing available for all courts so that individual purchase decisions can be made. Pervasive deployments will be highly influenced by attractive pricing and ease of implementation /migration. Vendors should not subtract cost for any pre-existing licenses.

15	Scanning Hardware & Software	There appears to be an expectation that scanning hardware and software should be included in cost however subsequent technical questions indicate the need to integrate with existing Kofax, Captiva, Teleform, technologies. Can you explain this disconnect?	The request for scanner hardware and peripherals pricing is not pertinent to the requirement that the DMS software inter-operate with industry 3rd party capture software addressed in Appendix D.
16	Duplicates in Appendix D	Appendix D FEAT 889/890 and FEAT 860/861 appear to be duplicates can you explain?	They are duplicates and we will be issuing Addendum 1 to resolve it.
17	Appendix A - FEAT199	Please provide some Use Case scenarios that describe the desired needs that would be fulfilled by a federated search?	The use case scenarios given in the RFP are the only scenarios that will be provided.
18	Appendix A - FEAT199	Is the desire for a County repository to be available to the federated search engine for a real-time search or would a more controlled incremental update of the search repository be desired?	<p>The general intent for federated search is across co-located document repositories, not geographically dispersed repositories.</p> <p>The vendor should use their specialized document management domain knowledge to recommend an appropriate search solution that balances performance against practical considerations.</p>

19	Appendix A - FEAT199	Federated Searching traditionally requires that other repositories be available to be searched? Please provide names and versions of the other repositories that could possibly participate in a federated search and interfaces that will be available for a federated search engine to call?	<p>Proposers should only consider federated search among homogenous DMS installations, or using CMIS or other interoperability standards.</p> <p>The names and versions of other repositories in the landscape are not available.</p>
20	Appendix A - FEAT199	FEAT199 - Is there a desire for the external repositories to be searched real-time by the federated search OR for the repositories to participate in a push/pull of metadata to a central search engine?	Please Refer to 19.
21	Appendix D - FEAT878	FEAT878 - Will solutions that do NOT support Apache web server be considered?	Proposals that do not support Apache will be scored as described in the RFP.
22	Appendix D - FEAT877	FEAT877 - Please provide a Use Case where format transformation between supported storage mechanisms would be required?	The solution should support transformation between online, near-online and offline storage.

23	Appendix D - FEAT403	FEAT403 - Please verify that the desired system will store the documents in non-proprietary file formats, the native file format of the documents?	Yes with most case related documents stored as PDF/A.
24	Appendix D - FEAT808	FEAT808 Is there a desired archival file format or should the document remain unmodified from the version the document was received electronically or scanned?	Documents should remain in original form.
25	Appendix D - FEAT808	FEAT808 - Are there preferred storage mediums that would require a specific conversion to be supported?	No.
26	Appendix D - FEAT899 - FEAT910	FEAT899 -FEAT910 Please describe the desired security solution (Independent DMS security, LDAP, Single sign-on, etc.) for a centralized solution at the CTCC, and a solution that is distributed with instance being housed within the Counties infrastructure?	The solution should support both independent stand-alone security when required; and support for an external security service provider when one is available.

27	Appendix D - FEAT899 - FEAT910	FEAT899 -FEAT910 Is there a current security approach for internet (eFiling or Public Access) based applications that the DMS would need to participate?	No.
28	Appendix D - FEAT844	FEAT844 - Is it a desire that the programmers at the State will utilize the API to integrate the DMS into existing applications?	Yes. The preferred integration is web services.
29	TC1 - Document Flow	Please elaborate on if document level security will be through the eFiling application, DMS, or other?	Document level security shall be enforced at the DMS.
30	TC1 - Document Flow	Please describe the DMS's desired role in managing the security access for documents accessed through the internet applications (eFiling, etc.) or if this would be a function of the internet application? Please describe the Fees that may be assessed for access to documents and the desired role (if any) of the DMS in managing the fee collection.	We expect the DMS to have inherent granular configurable security capabilities as documented in the "Security & Encryption" section of "Appendix A - DMS Features List". The DMS should enforce its own security policy and rules when being accessed by end-users as well as applications. We do not expect the DMS to manage any fee collections.

31	TC1 - Document Flow	Please describe the Fees that may be assessed for access to documents and the desired role (if any) of the DMS in managing the fee collection.	Fees (if any) will be collected outside of the DMS. Once collection has been performed and verified, the person will be able to access the desired document.
32	TC1 - Document Flow	The Use Case mentions a retention schedule. Is there retention schedule that is available or should be referenced for the pilot implementation	Government Code Section 68152 outlines the retention schedules that the courts will follow. Different types of documents within the Court will have different retention periods and rules that must be adhered to.
33	TC1 - Document Flow	The diagram indicates that the this repository will contain documents going forward from 2010, please verify?	Each individual court will determine whether or not they will be back scanning existing files.
34	TC2 - <i>Courtesy Notice Processing</i>	Is it the desire for the DMS to 'create' and 'archive' the Courtesy Notices or to archive the Courtesy Notices created by another application?	Courtesy Notices will be created by the Case Management System and may be archived by the Document Management System.

35	TC2 - <i>Courtesy Notice Processing</i>	If the DMS will not be generating the Courtesy Notices, please provide what software will be utilized to use the template and merge date to create the Courtesy Notices? What file format will the document be available before being converted to PDF?	The original file format will be different depending on the Court. Standard document formats should be supported (i.e. Microsoft Word, XML, text).
36	TC2 - <i>Courtesy Notice Processing</i>	Please confirm that Case Number and other required index information would be available during the archival?	Yes.
37	TC3 - <i>Microfilmed Records</i>	Is the desire for the solution to allow internal staff to perform the conversion from the microfilm to PDF and perform the associated indexing? Or is the desire for an external service to do this conversion?	This will vary from Court to Court.
38	TC4 - <i>Jury Summons Responses</i>	What jury system or application is currently being utilized? Is it a vendor application or internally built?	This will vary from Court to Court, but the software package Jury Plus is used in many Courts throughout California.

39	TC6 - Courtroom Use	Are calendars currently being managed within the CMS? If so, does that interface provide the calendar clerk an interface that displays all the cases for a specific calendar?	Yes, calendars are managed by the CMS and the calendar clerk can see all cases scheduled to appears on a specific calendar.
40	AOC 3 - <i>Digital Assets Management</i>	Will the desired solution allow for specialist to utilize external video authoring software to create a final product (video) that is then archived in the DMS. The a video is then available for searched and retrieved by authenticated staff and downloaded from the DMS for viewing?	Yes.
41	AOC RFP Submission Guidelines	In regards to section 8.6.3.6 (Submission) May we send our audited financials in a separate envelope marked “confidential” so it is not co-mingled with our proposal? If this acceptable may I have the name and address of whom to send to, for our CFO and Controller?	Financial information should be included in the Technical Response. You may mark your financials as confidential.

42	RFP Date Extension	Regarding the Request for Proposal, FIN122210CK (Enterprise Document Management Solution), we request a two week extension of the current due date of February 8th. In order to provide the most comprehensive and accurate response to the AOC, we require this time to properly finalize elements of our solution and proposal document.	We feel there is adequate time to prepare a competitive response. Questions regarding the RFP should not be held until the Jan 28. Jan 28 is the last opportunity to ask questions but questions should be submitted as soon as possible and they will be answered as they arrive. Additionally, at the mandatory pre-proposal conference, we provided suggestions for prioritizing areas of concentration based upon the published scoring matrix. Potential respondents should remember that responses to Appendix B and Appendix C should focus on how their products and services will excel or be challenged in addressing the requirements, not on implementation.
43	Attachment 4 Payee Data Record	Attachment 4: Payee Data Record reads like this form would be required from both the prime and subs – (ref. 8.6.3.1: The tax ID number of the proposed prime and sub-contractors (provide via Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form). Can you please confirm either way?	Yes, both are required.

44	Section 15.0	RFP Section 15.0, Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Participation Goals: Is DVBE participation a mandatory requirement for Bidders? If yes, is the minimum DVBE utilization 3 percent. And, if DVBE participation is committed to by a Bidder, do the State of California Executive Branch reporting and utilization requirements apply to the Bidder for bid submittal and during the contract term (Bid submittal Forms: GSPD-05-105, Bidder Declaration Form; and, Commercially Useful Function Worksheet).	The DVBE does not apply as this is not a Judicial Branch requirement. Per Section 10335.7 of the Public Contract Code "State agency," as used in this article, means every state office, department, division, bureau, board, or commission, but does not include the Legislature, the courts, or any agency in the judicial branch of government. Thus Section 2050-2057 of the Public Contract Code regarding the certification for minority, women, disadvantaged and small business enterprises is not required for this RFP.
45	Mandatory Requirements	Mandatory Requirements. The AOC indicates that Mandatory Requirements are scored on a Pass/Fail basis. If a Bidder fails to provide the details required in any mandatory requirement, such as malfeasance details for 8.6.3.6, will its bid be eliminated from evaluation by AOC?	Yes.