TO:	POTENTIAL PROPOSERS
FROM:	Administrative Office of the Courts Information Services Division
DATE:	December 22, 2006
SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO:	To issue Addendum Number 1 to ISD2006ECM-SS and, as set forth in the attached documents: (1) to publish the AOC's Responses to Vendors' Questions, for those questions received by the deadline; (2) to replace section 6.0, *Assumptions Pertaining to Project Scope*; (3) to replace Section 9.8.4, *Third-Party Products/Optional Software*; (4) to replace Section 10.5.1, under 10.5, *Finalist Presentations*; (5) to replace Appendix A, *Functional Requirements, Document* Management; (6) to replace Appendix F, *Functional Requirements, Enterprise Search*; (7) to replace Appendix J, *Technical and Administrative Requirements*; and (8) to replace Attachment 6, *Cost Submission Matrix*.
ACTION REQUIRED:	You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposal ("RFP") as posted at http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/: Project Title: Enterprise Content Management RFP Number: ISD2006ECM-SS
SOLICITATIONS MAILBOX:	solicitations@jud.ca.gov
DUE DATE & TIME FOR SUBMITTAL OF QUESTIONS:	Deadline for submittal of questions pertaining to solicitation document was: **1:00 p.m. (PST) on December 11, 2006**.
PROPOSAL DUE DATE AND TIME:	Proposals must be received by **1:00 p.m. (PST) on January 16, 2007.**
SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL:	Proposals should be sent to: **Judicial Council of California** **Administrative Office of the Courts** **Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. ISD2006ECM-SS** **455 Golden Gate Avenue** **San Francisco, CA 94102**

AOC Responses to Vendors' Questions

Question 1.
We would like the opportunity to bid on this state contract. What are the steps to doing this?

Or

This is with reference to the Agency bid number: ISD2006ECM-SS titled: "Enterprise Content Management", We are interested in bidding for the project. With regards to the Agency bid number mentioned above we would like to receive a detailed RFP with all the information. Also it would be great to get specific contact information for the bids so that I can get in touch with someone related.

AOC Response to Question 1:
The RFP ISD2006ECM-SS may be found at
http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/ecm-rfp.htm

The RFP document specifies contact information. Additionally, RFP sections 8.0, Submission Guidelines, and 9.0, Specifics of a Responsive Proposal, outline the steps required to submit a proposal for this contract.

Question 2.
I am inquiring about RFP No. ISD2006ECM-SS - Enterprise Content Management Solution. Where will funding for the Project come from and how much has been budgeted?

AOC Response to Question 2:
The AOC cannot provide specific budget numbers. However, the project does have an allocated, state funded budget and support of the AOC and appellate courts.

Question 3.
Does pricing need to address all software and hardware required to implement the staging a development environments? For example, if the software requires a specific database or application server on the back-end, should pricing for the database be included?

AOC Response to Question 3:
The AOC would like for all costs associated with implementation of a solution to be presented in the cost proposal, including backend databases, application servers or other infrastructure required to establish the development and staging environments (as requested in Schedule 6 of the Cost Submission Matrix, Attachment 6).

Question 4.

At the Pre-Proposal Conference, a participant asked if an attendee list would be distributed. At that time, you had not yet made a determination whether that information would be disclosed. Have you arrived at a determination that a list will be provided to participants?

AOC Response to Question 4:
The AOC cannot provide an exact attendee list as we did not take roll call for those attending via teleconference. However, the following companies registered for the pre-proposal conference for RFP ISD2006ECM-SS on Wednesday, December 6:

Anacomp, Inc.
Burntsand
DataBank IMX, Inc.
Datamaxx Group Inc.
Deloitte
eDocSecure
EIM
EMC² | documentum
Filenet
Fillmore Technology Group
General Dynamics
ImageSource, Inc.
Interwoven
INTRESYS
IT Ascent
Kiefer Consulting
Lasselle-Ramsay
Maximum Quest Group
N2 Solutions Inc
OnBase
OpenText
Oracle/Stellent
Purple Squirrel Services, Inc.
Stanley Associates
Stellent
Sustain
Thomson West/Thomson Elite
UNICOM TECHNOLOGY, Inc
Vignette

Question 5.

As per RFP section 6.9, current content size is 1.13 TB. What is the likely content size by Dec-2007?

or

You mentioned scalability is a key consideration, can you provide us the anticipated growth rate of assets you expect to manage?

AOC Response to Question 5:
The AOC anticipates an asset growth rate of 30% in the coming year. Refer to RFP section 6.0, updated in this addendum.

Question 6.
As per RFP section 1.1.2, there are various tools are being used currently to manage the content. These tools may have some unique features or these tools may have been customized to best suit user needs in order to facilitate content creation. From these features there will be some set of features that user may want in the new solution. Are such features identified already? Are these tools developed in-house? If not, does AOC have support agreements with the tool providers? If yes, until what timeframe will these contracts be kept alive?

AOC Response to Question 6:
Examples of tools referred to in RFP section 1.1.2 include: MS Access databases, FTP Sites, MS Excel spreadsheets, paper based tracking systems and internally developed indexes and metadata tracking systems.

Some initial process mapping and capture of current systems has been performed. However, a detailed gap analysis of current and future tool sets and processes has not been completed. Therefore, the AOC has not determined which features of current systems may be applied to a future ECM solution.

Any support agreements or contracts in place for these tools will not impact a ECM proposed solution.

Question 7.
We need more clarification on the following statement in RFP section 6.5. "AOC staff may need to access the documents from CCTC repository from time to time via search, but systems would likely exchange/share little or no data"

AOC Response to Question 7:
To clarify, the AOC anticipates that any ECM repository which would be hosted at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) would be primarily used to manage content associated with the ACCMS and Appellate Courts. AOC staff would need to periodically access the documents stored in the CCTC repository.

If another ECM repository (i.e. a repository dedicated to content generated and managed by AOC staff) was installed at the AOC data center, very little (1%) content integration/exchange would be required between the CCTC and AOC

repositories.

Refer to RFP section 6.7, updated in this addendum.

Question 8.

In reference to Appendix K Requirement K3.2; does the AOC have any version control system for project and/or technical documents?

AOC Response to Question 8:
No, the AOC does not have a current version control system for project or technical documents.

Question 9.

Does the AOC follow any code/solution certification process before deployment of the solution to the production environment?

AOC Response to Question 9:
No, the AOC does not follow a specific code/solution certification process, although solutions are subject to an architectural and internal security review.

Question 10.

Will there be any AOC end user sign-off process involved to facilitate the 'GO' decision for production?

AOC Response to Question 10:
The AOC anticipates inclusion of an end-user testing cycle followed by sign-off by key stakeholders for any ECM solution/module.

Question 11.

What are the security requirements for data transfer between one port to the other? Does it depend on the type of data? If yes, are these classifications defined?

AOC Response to Question 11:
Detailed security requirements have not yet been defined. The AOC anticipates some data types will require encryption at rest and/or in transit. Identification of these data classifications is in process and will be considered during the planning phase of an ECM implementation.

Question 12.

Does AOC foresee that the folder structure of the new solution will change frequently? If yes, will it affect the document security?

AOC Response to Question 12:
The AOC prefers not to speculate on the frequency of folder structure changes in a new solution. Changes to any folder structures may impact document security if

that security has been defined at the folder level and the structure changes.

Question 13.

As per Appendix B, requirement B2.9, System shall provide the ability to migrate content and links to another CMS. What CMS are we targeting to migrate here? Also, Will there be any embedded links in the content that have absolute paths?

AOC Response to Question 13:
Functional Requirement B2.9 refers to the need for an export facility based on open standards to allow for migration of content from one CMS repository to another. The requirement does not relate to a specific target CMS.

There are some pages which currently require absolute paths in order to function properly (interactive forms with pull down lists). If there are other ways to build such forms without the need for absolute paths that the future CMS solution can handle, then the AOC would prefer to set a standard requiring use of relative paths throughout all sites.

Question 14.

Do the current tools have any document and/or folder level security? If yes, does this security need to be migrated?

AOC Response to Question 14:
Folder level security is used to manage folders on the shared file drives. Some of these security assignments may be duplicated if folders are migrated to the ECM solution. Detailed migration requirements will be evaluated during implementation, and should be addressed in the response to RFP section 9.10.1.6, Proposed data migration methods and tools.

Question 15.

Do tools support any user authentication? If yes, do these users from the existing tools need to be migrated?

AOC Response to Question 15:
As outlined in RFP section 7.7, the AOC uses Active Directory and eTrust® SiteMinder® for user authentication, and expects that the ECM solution will integrate with and leverage this authentication framework.

Question 16.

If the existing tools support the folder structure, does the new solution need to replicate this folder structure? Will these folders follow any naming convention? If yes, are these naming conventions defined?

AOC Response to Question 16:
In general, current folder structures will not need to be replicated, although they

may be leveraged when designing the new solution. In some cases, stakeholders have adopted specific folder structures and naming conventions which they may choose to incorporate/carry over into an ECM solution. This should be considered during implementation migration planning.

Question 17.

Appendix F, requirement F1.27, Will there be any user interaction or confirmation of changes prior to the actual change is made?

AOC Response to Question 17:
The AOC would like to enable users to review and confirm the mass change before execution. Functional requirement F1.27 has been updated per this addendum with this clarification.

Question 18.

The RFP discusses many capabilities across technology / functional areas.   In an effort to help prioritize roll-out activities, how would you prioritize the following: Document Management, Web Content Management, Learning Content Management, Collaboration, Digital Content Management, Enterprise Search, BPM, Reporting / Statistics.

or

Can you provide scoring weight assignment for each requirement in appendices A-K? This will help us prioritize our response focusing on higher-value requirements.

AOC Response to Question 18:
The AOC has chosen not to assign priority to the functional areas addressed by the RFP in Appendices A-K, as perceived priority of functional requirements varies by stakeholder group.

Question 19.

For the initial proposal are you expecting a phased approach for implementing a full-scale ECM solution based on the information provided in the RFP and best practices or are you looking for best practices and methodology across the functional areas identified in section 9.10?

AOC Response to Question 19:
The AOC seeks an implementation plan proposal (phased, parallel, big-bang, etc.) which considers the full scope of audiences, functional and technical requirements, and is inclusive of the items identified in RFP section 9.10.1.

Question 20.

Is it possible to get another opportunity to submit additional questions in early January to help refine proposal methodology / phasing?

AOC Response to Question 20:

The AOC will not provide for additional question submittal on this RFP.

Question 21.
Has the project been budgeted for the current fiscal year to start?

AOC Response to Question 21:
Yes, this project has been budgeted to start in the current fiscal year.

Question 22.
Is AOC willing to evaluate alternative options for hosting and maintenance (i.e. outsourced model)?

AOC Response to Question 22:
Yes.

Question 23.
Can we obtain a list of the firms that indicated their intent to submit a response to the RFP?

AOC Response to Question 23:
No. The AOC does not have this information.

Question 24.
Section 11.9 mentioned one of the criteria being "Presented Solution to Use Cases". When reviewing the RFP we did not see a reference to Use Cases. Is it possible to obtain a copy of the use cases to help focus our proposal?

AOC Response to Question 24:
RFP section 11.9 refers to the evaluation of Finalist Presentations. RFP section 10.5.1 states that use cases will be provided to selected finalists to assist in their preparation of a Finalist Presentation. Only those proposers invited to present will be provided with the use cases and other supplementary documentation.

Question 25.
For requirement A.2.14, please provide a list of content types that this requirement applies to (DOC, PDF, PPT, etc.).

AOC Response to Question 25:
The AOC requests that proposers specify which document types are supported by their redline/annotation tool, as reflected in the update to functional requirement A.2.14 included in this addendum.

Question 26.

Please clarify your reference to California Trial Courts being "Indirectly" within scope?

AOC Response to Question 26:
RFP research did not include analysis of California Trial Court ECM requirements. However, the AOC anticipates that some trial courts may choose to leverage any ECM solution adopted by the AOC in the future. Trial court staff also access websites (e.g. Public Site, Extranet and Education site) slated to be supported by the web content management module of the ECM solution, and contribute content per functional requirement B4.2. Refer to RFP section 6.1, updated in this addendum.

Question 27.

Will the majority of the project work be conducted at the AOC in San Francisco?

AOC Response to Question 27:
Yes, the AOC anticipates that the project team will be based in the San Francisco office. However, the AOC also maintains offices in Burbank and Sacramento. In addition to the AOC locations, there are State Courts of Appeal located in San Francisco, Sacramento, Ventura, Los Angeles, San Diego, Riverside, Santa Ana, Fresno and San Jose. The ECM implementation will impact stakeholders at all of the AOC and appellate court locations, and team members may be required to travel to locations throughout the state.

Question 28.

Is there a timeline for replacement of the current ACCMS that should be considered as part of the proposal solution?

AOC Response to Question 28:
The Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS) ACCMS is a newly developed system and is not slated to be replaced. The ECM solution will support document management requirements of the ACCMS as specified in Appendix A of the RFP.

Question 29.

The RFP calls out various components of Enterprise Content Management functional requirements in Appendices A through J.   In section 6.4, it is noted the user base will be 1,500.   Will all of these users require equal access to all modules (this question significantly affects software price).   For example, will only 300 users require WCM access, or perhaps 500 users require BPM access, while all 3,000 users will require ECM functionality?

AOC Response to Question 29:
Users will not require equal access to all modules. Although a detailed assessment of access has not been conducted, proposers can assume the following estimates for pricing purposes:

ECM Module	Estimated percentage of total user base requiring access
Document Management	100%
Web Content Management	20%
Collaboration	70%
Learning Content Management	10%
Digital Asset Management	10%
Search	100%
Business Process Management	20%
Reporting	5%

Refer to RFP section 6.4, updated in this addendum.

Question 30.
Section 6.3 indicates the system may scale up to 20,000 users.   Does AOC require a pricing breakdown in order to budget for those future users?

AOC Response to Question 30:
The 20,000 figure, previously stated in RFP section 6.3, has been stricken in this addendum.

For comparative purposes, pricing should include a breakdown based on a user base of 2000, 5000 and 10,000. The percentages in RFP section 6.5 should be applied to each pricing model. Refer to RFP sections 6.5 and 6.6, updated in this addendum.

Question 31.
If the AOC projects the system will be scaled for up to 20,000 users, do we know if all 20,000 will require access to all modules, or if some other quantity of users will require access to only some modules (Section 6.5 seems to support the assumption that different users will access different systems)?

AOC Response to Question 31:
The 20,000 figure, previously stated in RFP section 6.3, has been stricken in this addendum.

The answer to Question Number 29 addresses the estimated percentage of total user base requiring access to each ECM module. Refer to RFP section 6.5, updated in this addendum.

Question 32.

In section 6.4 of the RFP, you mention that the proposal should consider a user base of 1500 people. To help assist us with planning the change management / training components can you please help us understand how those 1500 people are organizationally aligned (number of different groups, skill sets, etc.)

or

How many business and technical staff are included from the Appellate unit for the project? From the Supreme Court Unit? From the AOC?

AOC Response to Question 32:
The following table breaks down the number of regular, active employees within each of the AOC Divisions and appellate courts. Justices are listed at the end. The AOC estimates that 95% of these employees use computers in their daily work. The remaining 5% use computers in their work to a lesser degree, but may need to access the ECM solution on a limited basis (e.g. mail room staff downloading labels, etc.)

AOC Division or Court	# of employees
AOC Executive Office	13
AOC Appellate and Trial Court Judicial Services	13
AOC Office of the General Counsel	70
AOC Office of Governmental Affairs	14
AOC Center for Families, Children and the Courts	66
AOC Education	81
AOC Executive Office Programs	62
AOC Regional Offices	35
AOC Finance	146
AOC Human Resources	60
AOC Information Services	97
AOC Office of Construction and Court Management	64
Supreme Court	130
1 DCA	108
2 DCA	237
3 DCA	80
Law Library	8
4 DCA	176
5 DCA	62

AOC Division or Court	# of employees
6 DCA	47
Justices	111
Estimated External Content Contributors	320
Total	2,000

Refer to RFP section 6.4, updated in this addendum.

Question 33.

The RFP mentions the desire to have an ECM system that has thin client capabilities. To confirm, does this refer to browser based clients, thin desktop clients (installed clients), etc.

AOC Response to Question 33:
The requirement refers to browser based clients.

Question 34.

Can you further clarify the type of security functionality you're looking for from the ECM product(s) itself?

AOC Response to Question 34:
Appendix H, functional requirement H2 addresses security requirements for the ECM solution. Additional information regarding AOC security infrastructure will be provided to finalists per the update to RFP section 10.5.1 in this addendum.

Question 35.

Should the estimated professional services to integrate the Web Content Management solution into the sites mentioned in the RFP (public site, intranet, extranet, COMET Education Site) be included in the response?

AOC Response to Question 35:
Per RFP section 9.10.1.8, the proposed implementation plan should address methods for migration of existing html web pages to the web content management system.

For the cost proposal, please indicate professional services estimates for migration of the Public site to the web content management solution. RFP Attachment 6, Cost Submission Matrix, has been updated in this addendum to reflect this clarification.

Question 36.

If the answer to the above is yes for all sites, can you please provide more detail around

the application architecture / application functionality provided by each application so that we can better scope the effort?

AOC Response to Question 36:
Professional Services estimates need only address the Public Site (http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/).   Proposers are encouraged to review the public site.

Question 37.

Can you please provide more detail about the existing technology landscape (existing network and application architecture)?

or

Can we get further clarification on the security products we will need to integrate with, their versions, protocol standards established, etc.

AOC Response to Question 37:
Per RFP section 10.5.1 (updated in this addendum), finalists will be provided additional information "to assist in preparation of their Finalist Presentation, including a detailed Summary of Findings outlining the context for stated RFP requirements, detailed Use Case Scenarios for key ECM modules and the CCTC Infrastructure Security Model Executive Summary." No additional information on technology landscape or integration requirements will be provided to proposers prior to finalist selection.

Question 38.

Section 6.5 seems to indicate AOC may require multiple instances of the proposed software product. Is there an estimate as to how many instances, and at what locations that multiple instances may be required?   Also, at each of these locations, will all of the modules (Web Content Management, Learning Content Management be required?

AOC Response to Question 38:
The AOC has not determined the ideal architecture for an ECM solution.   As stated in RFP section 6.0, it is possible that multiple instances will be required. For proposal purposes, assume two instances, one at the CCTC and one at the AOC data center. The CCTC instance will include document management, at a minimum. Attachment 6, Cost Submission Matrix, has been updated to reflect this assumption.

Question 39.

Section 6.7 indicates a Web Content Management solution will be implemented to support all AOC web presences, and these are identified in section 6.6. Although sizes and quantities of files are described in section 6.9, we do not have a clear picture on the number of HTML files, templates, graphic images, and other types of content delivered on the websites. Can AOC please further describe the Web Content Management

volumes to be serviced?

AOC Response to Question 39:
The following table contains rough estimates for file types delivered by each web site.

Site	Rough Numbers of Files
Public Site **www.courtinfo.ca.gov**	**HTML files: 6,085** **Graphic images: 3,013** **Word DOC: 22,767** **Adobe PDF: 29,971** **Excel XLS: 86**
Extranet ("Serranus")	**HTML files: 2,507** **Graphic images: 1,221** **Word DOC: 1,205** **Adobe PDF: 8,787** **Excel XLS: 292**
Intranet	**HTML files: 2,272** **Graphic images: 2,100** **Word DOC: 1,328** **Adobe PDF: 902** **Excel XLS: 36**
COMET Education Site	**HTML files: 2,844** **Graphic images: 3,981** **Word DOC: 20** **Adobe PDF: 367** **Excel XLS: 0**

Refer to RFP section 6.9, updated in this addendum.

Question 40.

Section 6.9 describes numbers of files and sizes by entity.   We request AOC also provide the following if possible: file types and quantities of each (HTML, Microsoft Word (Office), PDF, TIF format image/Fax files, etc).   This will help us understand which files are static and do not change, and which files will require version control (as defined in Appendix A). Finally, for those files subject to version control, how many versions are expected?

or

Section 6 of the RFP includes a breakdown of the overall document set, totaling to about 4.2 million documents. It is broken down by parts of the organization. Is there a

breakdown available by document type? For example, how many of the documents are briefs, legal memoranda, correspondence, policy documents, settlement agreements or other types of content?

or

Regarding RFP section 6.4, please quantify the number of documents and specify the general groups of types (eg. html, office documents, case documents, etc.)

AOC Response to Question 40:
Due to technical limitations, the AOC is unable to provide a breakdown of file drives by document type at this time.

Question 41.
For Section 7.0, can the AOC describe the network that connects the remote locations and current network utilization (is the network 10MBPS, 100MBPS, T1 lines, or some other standard connection).

AOC Response to Question 41:
The AOC has an industry standard WAN redundant hub and spoke design to service the courts. T1 is the minimum direct connection with larger installation using some fraction of a DS3.

Question 42.
Is SharePoint part of your current architecture and what are you using as your current portal?

AOC Response to Question 42:
Microsoft SharePoint is not part of the current AOC architecture. The AOC does not currently have a standard portal.

Question 43.
What is your current reporting tool? Are you using Crystal Reports?

AOC Response to Question 43:
The AOC does not have a standard enterprise-wide reporting tool in place. However, the following are among tools in use by different stakeholder groups: Crystal Reports, Business Objects, MS Access and Hummingbird BI.

Question 44.
The Administrative Office of the Courts solicitation seeks a solution that is capable of being integrated into a Java-based portal. Will the AOC give equal consideration to an Enterprise Content Management (ECM) solution built on a .Net platform as indicated in function requirement J.1.10?

AOC Response to Question 44:

The AOC does not have the staff or infrastructure to support a .Net platform.   In accordance with functional requirement J.1.10, if an acceptable J2EE solution cannot be found, we will consider a .Net solution.

Question 45.

Section 6 also offers information about the size of the user base. What portion of the user base practices law or supports those who do, as opposed to administrative or other functions?

AOC Response to Question 45:
The AOC has updated RFP section 6.0 in this addendum to provide additional detail on the anticipated user base. Specifically, RFP section 6.4 of this addendum outlines the organizational employee breakdown by division and court. This is the most detail the AOC can provide to proposers at this time.

Question 46.

Though not explicitly requested, is there interest is software that enhances the organization's content with information value (e.g., identification and validation of legal citations, categorization by legal subject matter, other "legal-specific" technologies and approaches)?

AOC Response to Question 46:
The AOC will evaluate proposals based on requirements and evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP. Factors not outlined in the RFP will not be considered in vendor selection.

Question 47.

Should a response contemplate access to published and/or third-party content (such as that already on Westlaw)?

AOC Response to Question 47:
The AOC will evaluate proposals based on requirements and evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP. Factors not outlined in the RFP will not be considered in vendor selection.

Functional requirement B4.8 addresses receipt of content from external sources.

Question 48.

Regarding RFP section 9.8.4.1, what is the actual requirement? In some cases, it will not be possible to provide source code of 3rd party products such as the case with including Adobe technology in the product. What are the minimum requirements to illustrate the ability to support the 3rd party products in a manner acceptable to the AOC?

AOC Response to Question 48:
The vendor must provide proof that they have contractual capability of providing long-term support for the third-party software components of their ECM solution, such as VAR agreements or access to third party source code. Refer to RFP section 9.8.4.1, updated in this addendum.

Question 49.
Regarding functional requirement B2.3; this question implies that the AOC requires the CMS platform to also deliver content to end users. Is this the case? If not, what applications are end users interfacing with to access content which is managed in the CMS?

AOC Response to Question 49:
The web content management solution will be used to manage and deliver content for all sites maintained by the AOC and appellate courts. These sites deliver content to internal and external audiences, including "end users."

Functional requirement B2.3 states that the web content management solution shall "provide a link checking utility able to detect, notify, manage and allow maintenance of broken links." This functionality will enable web content administrators to conduct preventative maintenance of site links.

Question 50.
Regarding functional requirement B2.8; which users does this feature target (end users or content administrators)?

AOC Response to Question 50:
Functional requirement B2.8 states that the web content management system shall "provide the ability for users to personalize the look of the entry page (e.g. My Page concept) and choose to add a number of links/services to their customized page." This functionality will allow authenticated users to customize their home page. This functionality may, for example, target extranet users, allowing a Presiding Judge to view different home page content from a Court Executive Officer (CEO) or Family Law Facilitator.

Question 51.
Regarding functional requirement B3.10; what is the content delivery platform used by the CMS?

AOC Response to Question 51:
Functional requirement B3.10 states that the web content management solution "shall support explicit customization of information delivery by user and/or user role. The system shall have the ability to tailor content and content presentation based on data provided by the user, an established/stored user profile or user type (e.g. presiding judge, attorney, AOC Manager) or logged by the system for

anonymous site visitors or guests."

The AOC does not currently have a web content management system. Current sites consist primarily of static HTML pages. Functional requirement B3.10 is intended to allow the AOC to push content to users based on a specified role or profile, allowing for targeted content delivery to help provide audiences the most relevant information possible.

Question 52.

Regarding functional requirement B3.11; please clarify this requirement. Who would the users be (end users or administrators)? Please provide an example.

AOC Response to Question 52:
Functional requirement B3.11 states that the web content management system "shall have the ability to save data entered by users in context of the site or web based program (and associate with user profile, if available)." This requirement would, for example, allow a user to begin entering data into a form, save that data and then return to complete the form at a later time.   This functionality would provide flexibility to AOC web designers when leveraging interactive tools, forms or other web-based programs. Any site visitor might interact with an AOC or appellate court site and need to save partially completed data.

Question 53.

Regarding functional requirement B3.12; is it a requirement to delivery personalized content to anonymous users? What information would be available to target the anonymous user?

AOC Response to Question 53:
Functional requirement B3.12 states that the web content management system "shall provide logging/tracking tools to support customization, e.g. the delivery of tailored or specific information and services to an anonymous site visitor." This functionality would allow for targeted content to be delivered to site visitors based on a specified behavior. For example, an anonymous visitor might identify themselves as a "parent" and receive targeted information based on that identity. Or, a visitor's pattern of browsing might trigger delivery of certain content, etc.

Question 54.

Regarding functional requirement B3.13; this question implies that the AOC requires the CMS platform to also deliver content to end users.   Please clarify the role of the CMS with regards to content delivery. Does this requirement mean that the admin would need to be able to support the ability to create custom URL's for a piece of content for each and every context of the content (eg. site1, page 1 and site 2, page 1 and page 8)?

AOC Response to Question 54:
Functional requirement B3.13 states that the "system shall provide the ability to

generate a plain English URL for key web pages for easy referencing by non-technical end users and search engines." This functionality is intended to support generation of custom URLs. As an example, if a plain English/custom URL were created for a piece of content delivered in five places on a site, the custom URL should appear for each place the content is delivered.

Question 55.

Regarding functional requirement B4.2; please clarify this requirement. Describe the term "non-network" and are the external parties within the AOC or could these be someone not on the AOC network. Is the assumption that these users would not have access to any of the AOC systems?

AOC Response to Question 55:
Functional requirement B4.2 states that the system "shall support content contribution from external (non-network) parties." Some content contributors are not on the AOC network. For example, the Education division often works with individuals outside the AOC when developing and delivering courses. The CMS should provide some mechanism to allow external resources to contribute and manage content.

Question 56.

Regarding functional requirement B4.6; what does the AOC intend to do with these documents? Is the intent to manage these documents within the CMS or is the intent to make these documents available to a user who requests them from a website?

AOC Response to Question 56:
Functional requirement B4.6 states that the "system shall have the ability to integrate with Appellate Court Case Management System for e-filing; system shall support programmatic retrieval of documents via the case management system and document management system." The AOC anticipates that documents stored in the DMS linked to the ACCMS would be retrieved both within the ACCMS interface and via AOC web presences. For example, a court employee may choose to use a web search engine to find and view case documents as opposed to viewing those documents within the ACCMS system interface.

Question 57.

Regarding functional requirement B4.8; what does the AOC intend to do with these feeds? Is the intent to manage these items within the CMS or is the intent to make these feeds directly available to a user who accesses them from a website?

AOC Response to Question 57:
Functional requirement B4.8 states that the "system shall have the ability to receive chunks of content, aggregate and/or present content from external sources (e.g. California Trial Court websites), and make that content available for reuse (via RSS

feeds or other mechanisms).” The AOC intends to both manage this content within the web content management system and to make the feeds available on AOC managed web sites.

Question 58.

Regarding functional requirement B5.1; please quantify the AOC SLAs.

AOC Response to Question 58:
Functional requirement B5.1 states that the “System shall provide a reliable and stable CMS with a proven capability and continuous high levels of up-time based on AOC service level agreement (SLA).” Proposers should refer to Section 3 of RFP Attachment 2, Maintenance and Support Services, when responding to this requirement.

Question 59.

Regarding functional requirement G1.11; does this mean that a single BPM tool would be used across all repositories? Are the identified repositories only repositories provided within the scope of this proposal, or could it include unknown repositories? Please provide an example.

AOC Response to Question 59:
Functional requirement G1.1 states that the system shall have the “ability to review, approve and process content items held in any identified repository, within the software interface.” The AOC expects the business process management tool to support content management components of the ECM solution. It is not a stated requirement within the RFP that the business process management tool support any other/unidentified repositories.

Question 60.

Regarding functional requirement G1.29; because the requirement is listed in the BPM section, it is unclear whether this requirement is specifically focused around the collaboration processes or should be enabled around other processes. If it is the later, please provide an example of how this might work.

AOC Response to Question 60:
Functional requirement G1.29 states that the “system shall support subscription based alerts for content by internal or external users. This shall enable a user to indicate that he/she would like to receive an alert based on specified criteria related to a single piece of content, grouping of content, etc. For example, a user might want to be notified if content within a certain collaborative area changes, if a

document is updated, if a discussion board is updated, etc."

This requirement is not focused on collaboration. The examples listed are examples only. Note that the examples include the ability to generate an alert if a document is updated, which would apply to the document management component. Another example would be generation of alerts when new web content is added to a site, etc.

Question 61.

Regarding the following question in Appendix H:

"How do your products integrate as a product suite? Do my DM rights transfer to the WCM product? Can your products work, out of the box, with commercial single sign-on products such as SiteMinder to provide a comprehensive set of security privileges to be administered from a single console?"

Does this mean, that both systems can leverage SiteMinder, or that they both utilize the same role based permission scheme?

AOC Response to Question 61:
As outlined in RFP section 7.7, the AOC uses Active Directory and eTrust® SiteMinder® for user authentication, and expects that the ECM solution will integrate with and leverage this authentication framework. Narrative question B in Appendix H is intended to provide the proposer an opportunity to explain their authentication and authorization framework for the total ECM product suite/solution, as well as to comment on its integration with SiteMinder® or other products.

Question 62.

Regarding functional requirement H2.5: What is meant by overriding role based security? Who can override the role based security model? Is it expected that security will be implemented in a uniform manner across all repositories (eg. CMS, DM, DAM, LMS, Collab)?

AOC Response to Question 62:
Functional requirement H2.5 states that the "system shall enable individual security to be defined at the folder, subfolder, document and process level. This may override role based security, so that a document might have "default" security which can be restricted at the user or administrator's discretion." Authorized individuals should have the ability to manage security, including changing access from default settings as required. For example, documents created in a specific context may be accessible to A by default. An authorized individual may choose to remove A's access and provide access to B, instead. The AOC does not have any preconceived expectations concerning the exact manner in which security will be implemented across repositories.

Question 63.

Is the ADA 508 requirements only on the delivery side or is it a requirement for the administrative side as well?

AOC Response to Question 63:

Appendix J, narrative question F (as amended in this addendum) states "AOC legal counsel has advised that the AOC and appellate courts adhere to web-related accessibility standards outlined in federal U.S. Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act (as amended). Additionally, the AOC and appellate courts intend to voluntarily adopt an extended set of accessibility standards (specifically, WCAG 1.0 Priority 1 Checkpoints), along with custom privacy and linking policies." The subsequent questions ask vendors to outline adherence for both the product and product's published content. For more detail, refer to the narrative question.

Remainder of page left blank intentionally.

The following section replaces Section 6.0, Assumptions Pertaining to Project Scope.

6.0   ASSUMPTIONS PERTAINING TO PROJECT SCOPE

6.1   This RFP reflects requirements of the AOC and appellate courts of California. Staff within the California state trial courts will be indirect users of the system. RFP research did not include analysis of California Trial Court ECM requirements. However, the AOC anticipates that some trial courts may choose to leverage any ECM solution adopted by the AOC in the future. Trial court staff also access websites (e.g. Public Site, Extranet and Education site) slated to be supported by the web content management module of the ECM solution, and contribute content per functional requirement B4.2.

6.2   The AOC, Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal do not have an organized legacy ECM system in place. The ECM solution outlined in this RFP will replace or compliment stand-alone solutions, manual processes and workarounds.

6.3   ~~Based on the assessment of requirements for identified stakeholders groups, the AOC anticipates a user base of 2,500-3,000. In time, other stakeholders within the California state judicial branch may choose to use the ECM system to meet their independent functional requirements. Therefore, the AOC seeks a fully scalable system that could, if required, support up to 20,000 users across the California state judicial branch.~~ Not used.

6.4   ~~For proposing purposes, assume a user base of 1,500 employees; 10% of those being non-technical content contributors or other power users and the remaining 90% casual users. Document production volume in the appellate courts numbers in the millions of pages per year.~~ The following table breaks down the number of regular, active employees within each of the AOC Divisions and appellate courts. Justices are listed at the end. The AOC estimates that 95% of these employees use computers in their daily work. The remaining 5% use computers in their work to a lesser degree, but may need to access the ECM solution on a limited basis (e.g. mail room staff downloading labels, etc.)

AOC Division or Court	# of employees
AOC Executive Office	13
AOC Appellate and Trial Court Judicial Services	13
AOC Office of the General Counsel	70
AOC Office of Governmental Affairs	14
AOC Center for Families, Children and the Courts	66
AOC Education	81
AOC Executive Office Programs	62
AOC Regional Offices	35
AOC Finance	146

AOC Division or Court	# of employees
AOC Human Resources	60
AOC Information Services	97
AOC Office of Construction and Court Management	64
Supreme Court	130
1 DCA	108
2 DCA	237
3 DCA	80
Law Library	8
4 DCA	176
5 DCA	62
6 DCA	47
Justices	111
Estimated External Content Contributors	320
Total	2,000

6.5   Users will not require equal access to all modules. Although a detailed assessment of access has not been conducted, proposers can assume the following estimates for pricing purposes:

ECM Module	Estimated percentage of total user base requiring access
Document Management	100%
Web Content Management	20%
Collaboration	70%
Learning Content Management	10%
Digital Asset Management	10%
Search	100%
Business Process Management	20%
Reporting	5%

6.6   For comparative purposes, pricing should include a breakdown based on a user base of 2,000, 5,000 and 10,000. The percentages in section 6.5 should be applied to each pricing model.

6.5 6.7 The AOC anticipates that the solution may consist of multiple instances of software able to communicate with one another as needed. For example, the document management system to store appellate court case documents and support Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS) e-filing would seldom be accessed by AOC personnel.   As the ACCMS is house in the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC), the corresponding document management system would also be housed in the CCTC. However, the document management system used by the AOC would seldom be accessed by court staff, and could be housed separately at the AOC main offices. AOC staff may need to access documents in the CCTC repository from time to time via search, but the systems would likely exchange/share little to no data.

6.6 6.8 The AOC and appellate courts maintain the following websites.

Public Site	http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/
Intranet	Internal only
Extranet ("Serranus")	Internal only
COMET Education Site	http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/comet/

6.7 6.9 The web content management solution will be implemented to support all AOC and appellate court web presences. The following table contains rough estimates for file types delivered by each web site.

Site	**Rough Numbers of Files**
Public Site www.courtinfo.ca.gov	HTML files: 6,085 Graphic images: 3,013 Word DOC: 22,767 Adobe PDF: 29,971 Excel XLS: 86
Extranet ("Serranus")	HTML files: 2,507 Graphic images: 1,221 Word DOC: 1,205 Adobe PDF: 8,787 Excel XLS: 292
Intranet	HTML files: 2,272 Graphic images: 2,100 Word DOC: 1,328 Adobe PDF: 902 Excel XLS: 36

Site	Rough Numbers of Files
COMET Education Site	HTML files: 2,844 Graphic images: 3,981 Word DOC: 20 Adobe PDF: 367 Excel XLS: 0

6.8 6.10 Below (Section 6.9 6.11) are current figures for drives on the AOC and appellate court networks. These figures account for all of the data on the network/system, including all shared and individual network drives and excluding non-network drives, such as individual hard drives.

6.9 6.11 The following table contains approximate current volume of files on network drives of the AOC and appellate courts. The AOC anticipates a growth rate of 30% in the coming year.

Entity	Files	Size (GB)
AOC	2,142,572	678.00
1DC	222,609	71.00
2D1	425,084	56.00
2D6	100,185	23.00
3DC	160,688	28.30
4D1	182,807	35.00
4D2	148,143	15.30
4D3	174,665	126.00
5DC	161,862	49.00
6DC	61,232	14.50
SC	461154	42.00
TOTAL	4,241,001 Files	1,138.10 GB

The following section replaces RFP Section 9.8.4.

9.8.4   Third-Party Products/Optional Software. The vendor must explicitly state the name of any third-party products that are part of the proposed solution to the AOC. For each third-party product there must be a statement about whether the vendor's contract will encompass the third-party product and/or whether the AOC will have to contract on its own for the product.

9.8.4.1 Include a description of any products, features or other value added components available for use with the proposed ECM solution that have not been specifically requested in this RFP. The vendor must also provide proof that they have ~~access to the third-party software source code (own or in escrow) and that the vendor has the ability to provide~~ <u>contractual capability of providing</u> long-term support for the third-party software components of their ECM solution<u>, such as VAR agreements or access to third party source code.</u> Consideration of these products, features or other value added components will be given where these may be of value to the AOC.

<u>The following section replaces RFP Section 10.5.1.</u>

10.5.1 Following Steering Committee approval, the highest ranked proposers (hereinafter "finalists") will be invited to present their solution to the ECM Core Team. The finalists will be provided additional information to assist in preparation of their Finalist Presentation, including a detailed Summary of Findings outlining the context for stated RFP requirements ~~and~~<u>, detailed Use Case Scenarios for key ECM modules and the CCTC Infrastructure Security Model Executive Summary.</u>