



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

TRIAL COURT LOCAL AND WIDE AREA NETWORK ARCHITECTURE

Version 4.0
Final: September 18, 2001

**PROPOSALS DUE BY:
OCTOBER 16, 2001, 5:00 P.M.**

Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Invitation To Respond	1
II.	Project Description.....	4
III.	Business Requirements.....	10
IV.	Technical Guidelines	12
V.	Timeline.....	30
VI.	Proposal Requirements	31
VII.	Administrative Rules	34
VIII.	Appendices	43
	A. Trial Court Regional Structure	
	B. Telecommunications Architecture Relationships/Dependencies	

I. INVITATION TO RESPOND

You are invited to respond with a proposal to assist the Judicial Council, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) and the trial courts of California in defining and implementing a statewide Local and Wide Area Network standard architecture for the trial courts. Your response will be submitted to the AOC. Please use the information contained within this document as the basis for your response.

A. Background

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency to the Judicial Council of California, the governing body for the judicial branch of government in California. The Judicial Council's Strategic Plan (<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference>) establishes the broad statewide goals for judicial branch information technology efforts for Planning, Court Management Systems, Infrastructure, Information Standards and Communications. These objectives provide the framework for managing judicial branch technology resources. The objectives specific to this RFP are Infrastructure and Communications:

- **Infrastructure:** Design and put into place an infrastructure that will provide the staff, hardware, software, and technology management necessary to support the computing services and telecommunications required to meet the information technology needs of the branch.
- **Communications:** Establish communication links that meet the needs of the judicial branch, its partners in the justice system, the public and others with legitimate needs through implementation of technology outreach programs.

The Information Services Division (ISD) of the AOC is responsible for supporting these objectives by coordinating branch-wide technology planning, developing and serving as advocates for technology funding requests for the branch, monitoring the expenditure of technology funds allocated to the courts, and recommending and supporting judicial branch technology standards.

B. Project Description

Consistent with the Infrastructure and Communications objectives outlined above and other related initiatives that are underway in the State, there is now an opportunity to create a unified network architectural standard for all 58 of the Trial Courts. The objective of this project will be to determine what this standard is and how it will scale across the different courts. Implementation will proceed with the eleven courts within the Bay Area Region.

Essential to the success of this project will be the formation of a strong partnership between the selected vendor team and the AOC. As described below, the process to achieve the project's objective will be highly interactive with the AOC, the trial courts and project teams who are working on related projects.

The following is a brief description of each phase of the project:

1. Phase 1: Discovery

A significant amount of work has been accomplished laying the groundwork for this project, the most important of which is a report documenting the Business Requirements, Information Flows and Communication Models relevant to the work of the Courts. The vendor will become familiar with this document and the work of other relevant technology initiatives that will contribute and influence the final design.

The vendor will conduct site assessments of selected trial courts to investigate individual Court technical issues to which the network architecture is to respond. The network architecture standard for all 58 trial courts will be developed with input gathered from the site assessments from the eleven courts within the Bay Area Region in addition to requirements stated above. Thus, in this phase, site assessments will be limited to eleven courts.

Interviews with the Administrative Office of the Courts as well as other judicial partners will also be required.

2. Phase 2: Architecture Analysis and Design

The vendor will analyze the information gathered in Phase 1; create design models for the network architecture based on the business models and technical issues, and present design options to the Trial Court Telecommunications Committee (TCTC) for acceptance.

This phase will be highly interactive with the AOC and the project teams, who will be ready with regional and statewide requirements that will influence the network architecture. Concurrence from the TCTC will be required to move into Phase 3.

3. Phase 3: Implementation – Bay Area Region

Upon acceptance of the network architecture, the vendor will develop and execute an implementation plan for the eleven Bay Area Courts. The extent of the implementation is not known at this time except to say that each of the eleven Bay Area Region courts will be involved. Once the costs for implementing the designs are understood in Phase 2 and an analysis of

available State funding has been completed, the full extent of implementation can be defined.

4. Phase 4: Architecture Review

Once the first region has been completed, a follow up review will be required in order to reaffirm the original architectural design. “Lessons Learned” during this first implementation can then be incorporated into the planning for the remaining regions.

Note: Site assessments and an implementation plan for the remaining three regions (47 courts) are not included in the scope of this project.

C. RFP Organization

The RFP consists of six major sections.

1. Project Description - provides information on the scope, expectations, deliverables and information sources for this RFP.
2. Business Requirements – describes the trial court environment, business model and communication models that must be supported.
3. Technical Considerations – describes the trial court technical considerations and potential regional opportunities for the local and wide area network architecture.
4. Timeline – describes the expected timeframe for completing the project.
5. Proposal Requirements – presents proposal requirements that must be satisfactorily addressed in order for the agency to consider the proposal and to compare submissions.
6. Administrative Rules – outlines the responsibilities of the vendor and those of the AOC in the administration of the RFP and provides a general description of the evaluation and notification process.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Introduction

The focus of this project is to develop a local and wide area network architecture standard that can be adapted to each of the 58 Trial Courts. Although each court is in the same “business,” they are all individual. Differences exist in terms of the number of cases processed and tried, thereby influencing the number of employees and number of locations. Some courts are spread out across large geographical areas and some are not. Some are located in highly urban areas with services readily available and some are not. Some have shown a great deal of technical innovation and others have not had the resources available to accomplish this. Thus, one of the primary challenges of the project will be to create unity in the networks available to each court, their judicial partners and the public.

The fundamental requirement to be met by the architectural standard is the business of the court. This is well documented in the report, Trial Court Requirements for a Telecommunications Architecture, Phase I, created as the predecessor to this project. Coupled with this will be the emerging requirements at the regional and statewide level that are being developed in tandem with this project.

In order for this project to be successful, a strong partnership must be created between the vendor team, the AOC and the Courts. Cooperation, education, innovation and inclusion must be fostered in addition to bringing expertise in technical areas required to meet the project’s objectives. The AOC will look to the vendor for leadership in all of these areas throughout the project.

This project is divided into four sequential phases. Beginning with a discovery phase, the vendor will become familiar with the requirements of the Courts and will assess the technical conditions within the courts. This data will be analyzed, regional and statewide requirements will be added and designs will be created. Once approved, the vendor will begin implementation. Finally, a formal review will take place in order to incorporate what was learned into the next regions’ implementation plan.

The Vendor will become involved with the Trial Court Telecommunications Committee (TCTC). This group has been meeting for approximately a year and includes representatives from the AOC and all four of the Trial Court regions. During this project, there will be additional representation from the Bay Area Region due to the fact that they are directly involved in the first implementation of the new network architecture.

On occasion, the vendor may be asked to attend the Court Technology Advisory Committee (CTAC) or other policy committee meetings held to discuss technical policies affecting the Judicial Branch.

B. Scope of Work

1. **Phase 1: Discovery**

The intent of this phase is twofold: to familiarize and understand the business and operation of the trial courts and to gather all technical requirements from which the local and wide area network architecture can be developed.

The business and operational requirements can be found in the Requirements document listed above. *Refer to Section III for a summary of these requirements.*

The vendor will need to assess technical requirements at individual courts. These assessments will be done from at least two perspectives: the general information flow of the court, inclusive of intra court communication, inter court communication, and court to all judicial partners communication, as well as the application flow for applications specific to the courts. It is important to understand the existing environment of applications, yet at the same time be aware of significant changes that will be implemented in the near term. The major changes will be identified through interaction with project teams on related projects as outlined in part C within this section.

During the site assessments the vendor will also need to become familiar with the local technology initiatives and projects that are underway or scheduled to begin in the near term. The network architecture standards should not inhibit the ability of local applications or technological innovation; it should be flexible enough to support them.

Specific data gathering will be done in the eleven (11) courts that make up the Bay Area Region. Five of these courts have recently been assessed in detail; thus, the selected vendor may benefit from the results of this work. However, given the comprehensive scope of data gathering required for this project, some level of assessment will be required at each court. The courts in this region are as follows:

BAY AREA REGION

COURT	SUGGESTED DATA GATHERING
Alameda	Detailed Site Assessment
Contra Costa	Detailed Site Assessment
*Marin	Detailed Site Assessment
*Napa	Detailed Site Assessment
*Sacramento	Detailed Site Assessment
*San Francisco	Detailed Site Assessment
San Mateo	Detailed Site Assessment
Santa Clara	Detailed Site Assessment
Santa Cruz	Detailed Site Assessment
Solano	Detailed Site Assessment
*Sonoma	Detailed Site Assessment

* Courts that have, within the last year, gone through detailed site assessments

The vendor will propose a plan for gathering the necessary data and what data they will be looking at. At a minimum, the vendor must do the following:

- a) Visit each of the eleven courts
- b) Review and become familiar with all background material available
- c) Assess all networks in use at the court, Local, Wide Area and any Metropolitan or "Campus" networks
- d) Assess:
 - Network Management
 - Network Security
 - Existing Application Architecture and information flows
 - Cabling System
 - Technology Infrastructure Support Systems
 - Raceways
 - Equipment Rooms
 - Power and Ventilation
 - Etc.
 - IP Design
 - Internet Access
 - Imaging
 - E-Mail System and Access
 - Video Use
 - Court - County network integration
 - Local technology initiatives and projects
 - Location configuration of the Court
 - Staff Support for networks

- e) Meet with the AOC project managers of related technology initiatives to understand additional requirements
- f) Meet with representatives of key judicial partners to discuss network compatibility issues.

To conclude the assessments, the vendor is to assemble all raw data gathered and provide a summary narrative of what they have found.

2. **Phase 2: Architecture Analysis and Design**

The intention of this phase is to analyze the data gathered in Phase 1, incorporate information developed from the related statewide initiatives and design a local and wide area network architecture appropriate for the trial courts. This phase will, at a minimum, be divided into the following tasks:

- a) Analysis
 - Analyze all of the data gathered in Phase 1.
 - Determine impact of the related Statewide Initiatives listed in Appendix B on the network architecture as well as other projects identified as impacting the architecture.
- b) Design
 - Develop a statement of requirements and objectives agreed upon by the TCTC.
 - Design a network architecture agreed upon by the TCTC, which responds to all requirements stated.
 - Create network security policy and procedures agreed to by the TCTC, which are consistent with the CTAC network security policies.

As part of the design presentation, the vendor will be prepared to address the following issues related to each option presented:

- Responsiveness to requirements
- Connectivity to Judicial Partners including the Public
- Scalability of the design
- Adaptability of design to various types of courts
- Network Security
- Financial Impact
- Risk assessment
- Operational and Support Requirements
- Hardware and software lifecycle expectations
- Future product strategies

3. **Phase 3: Implementation – Bay Area Region**

The intention of this phase is to install and have operational the new network architecture within the Bay Area Region. The vendor is to develop a plan for

implementation along with a detailed budget for all costs associated with the implementation. There will be no RFP process as part of this phase. Thus, the selected vendor or vendor team will have a hardware and software component in place.

The extent of implementation will be determined during this phase based on the anticipated cost, as defined during Phase 2, and available funding from the State.

Particular attention will be given to integrating the new technology into the Court's environment without any business interruption. Implementation risks and system dependencies are to be identified. All possible impacts to the Court's environment are to be reviewed and addressed as part of this plan.

The implementation plan is also to address:

- a) Migration Issues
- b) Troubleshooting tools
- c) Procurement
- d) Disposal of unnecessary equipment
- e) Vendor resources
- f) Court support resources
- g) Maintenance

Finally, the plan is to include a transition strategy for ongoing operation of the network. At a minimum, this would include knowledge transfer, development of operational policies, training and complete documentation.

4. **Phase 4: Architecture Review**

The intent of this final phase is to assess the success of the first implementation of the trial court Local Area and Wide Area Network Architecture. All aspects of the design and implementation are to be reviewed to determine whether any modifications to the process or architecture are to be made prior to beginning implementation in the next region.

The vendor will be responsible for contacting the eleven courts to solicit their input, as well as drawing upon their direct experience. From this information, the vendor will develop recommendations for any alterations to either the network architecture or implementation plan for the next region. Specific implementation planning and site assessments for the remaining regions are not part of the scope of this project.

C. Related Technology Projects

The Telecommunications Architecture project is one of the major statewide strategic initiatives currently underway at the Judicial Branch. The other relevant projects are:

1. Strategic Technology Planning
2. Data Integration
3. Court Management Systems
4. E-Filing
5. Service Bureau

The relationships/dependencies between these initiatives and the Telecommunications Architecture initiative are shown on the information flows in the diagram in Appendix B. Also shown are the relationships with policies and standards that affect the telecommunications architecture. Estimated dates for key deliverables for these projects are indicated, and where no date has been determined, a “?” is indicated. It is anticipated that as the work progresses on these strategic initiatives and policies and standards, regional and statewide telecommunications requirements will emerge. These requirements can then be incorporated into Phase 2: Architecture Analysis and Design.

Distance Education is another strategic initiative of the Judicial Council that includes projects that are currently in the implementation phase. Distance Education includes delivery via satellite broadcast, the web, videoconferencing, and from the desktop. This project is being supported by the current implementation of a separate satellite network. Integration of the satellite broadcast network with the LAN/WAN architecture is not anticipated in the near term future, however, the need to accommodate media such as audio and video in web based training products will impact the LAN/WAN architecture.

As noted with the other initiatives listed above, the vendor will be required to meet with the project manager assigned to this initiative and evaluate and incorporate requirements into the network architecture as appropriate.

In addition to the statewide initiatives, there are local technology initiatives that the trial courts are directly involved with. These are to be assessed in the eleven courts that are part of Phase 1 and their requirements incorporated into the final design.

III. BUSINESS REQUIREMENTS

The predecessor project to the development of the network architecture was a study entitled Trial Court Requirements for a Telecommunications Architecture, Phase I. This document, which is available on the Judicial Council web site (<http://www2.courtinfo.CA.gov/rfp>), describes the basic business requirements of the trial courts and identifies the means of constructing a communication model at each court.

The local and wide area network architecture that will be designed as a result of this project must support the business functions of the trial courts and include solutions specific to the variations identified through the communications model.

The report concludes that all trial courts provide the same business functions, and therefore share the same business model. However, the implementation of those functions varies from court to court based on many factors, some of which are driven by local policies and procedures, county relationships and funding.

The analysis of the information flow within and through the court was done from a “court-centric” perspective. Information flows were identified within the court, between courts and with other justice system partners. Needless to say, the information flows are the same in each court given that they support the business of the court.

In order to distinguish the courts, their differences were analyzed. These differences, once understood, formed the basis for the communication models that were developed. The communication model is based on three elements:

1. Business Model – as described within the report.
2. Anchor Variable – this is the key attribute that was used to distinguish the courts and was identified as the number of Authorized Judicial Positions (AJPs). The number of AJPs within a court is calculated from a complex formula incorporating key business factors of the court: case volume in total, case volume by type, and the amount of time and resources required to process each type of case.
3. Influencing Factors. These factors include: Case Load, Number of Locations, Number of Staff, Number of Personal Computers, Number of Case Management Systems and Geographic Isolation.

The formula used to determine the communication model is as follows:

Communication Models = Business Model + Anchor Variable
+ Influencing Factors

A. Assessment Variables

In concluding the report, it was acknowledged that an important step was missing to complete the communication models for each court. The missing step was a detailed assessment of each individual court. This step is now included in Phase 1 of this project under Discovery.

IV. TECHNICAL GUIDELINES

The TCTC met for a daylong workshop to outline general technical guidelines for inclusion in this RFP. This section represents the *results of this workshop* and is to serve as high-level general guidelines. These guidelines do not supersede any of the business requirements that the network architecture must meet, for the network architecture must, above all, support the business of the Courts.

It is incumbent upon the vendor to come up with the final architectural design and standards. Thus, the vendor will be required to evaluate and respond to these guidelines and at the same time will have the freedom to propose alternatives.

Within each subsection is a description of the technical guidelines. Actual connectivity requirements, i.e., what network connections are required, would be the same for each network or application described below. Refer to Business Flow diagrams within the Trial Court Requirements for a Telecommunications Architecture, Phase I report for a complete description of the connectivity that will be required.

This section is divided into the following five areas:

1. Local and Wide Area Network
2. Internet/Web
3. E-Mail
4. Video
5. IVR

A. Local and Wide Area Network

1. Introduction

This section will provide general industry best of practice requirements deemed essential for the California Trial Courts. The requirements are also to fulfill court needs and requirements set forth in the *Telecommunications Survey Response* document (Appendix A in the Trial Court Requirements For A Telecommunications Architecture, Phase I).

2. Requirements

- a) The court LAN/WAN infrastructure must be scalable to meet current and future needs based on the application, security, and access.
- b) It is important for the courts to have an equal voice in the LAN/WAN infrastructure inclusive of the governing security and access policies.

Given the highly integrated relationship that exists between the courts and their counties, it is desired that this be accomplished through a spirit of cooperation and strong partnership.

- c) An Internet connection, over which the court has authority, is important.

3. Guidelines

The Local and Wide Area Network guidelines are organized in the following way:

- a) Local Area Network
 - Access Methods
 - Cabling Standards
 - Network Equipment
 - Wiring Closet
 - Network Design
 - IP Network Addressing
 - Redundancy and Availability
 - LAN Protocols
 - LAN Security
 - LAN Connectivity to other Agencies
- b) Wide Area Network
 - WAN Connectivity
 - WAN Access Technologies
 - WAN Protocols
 - WAN Redundancy
 - WAN Security
- c) Internet Connectivity
 - Features
 - Internet Access Technologies
 - Public Key Infrastructure (PKI)
- d) Remote Access / VPN
 - Users
 - Technology
- e) Network Management
 - Inventory/Distribution Management
 - LAN/WAN Management Tools
- f) Desktop, Servers, PCs, and Applications

Note: This section is included due to its essential relationship to the network and is included for information only. The standards set forth here are not universally accepted by the trial courts; decisions regarding this equipment are governed individually by court. Network standards that are developed will need to accommodate the variations in desktop and server platforms that exist.

- Server Platform
 - Desktop Platform
 - Printers
 - Applications
 - Support/Help Desk
 - Directory and User Administration
 - Backup
 - Redundancy, Availability, and Performance
- a) Local Area Network (LAN) Infrastructure for Local Node-to-Node Connectivity
- Access Methods
 - Required*
 - Network is switched Ethernet, IEEE 802.3 CSMA /CD.
 - Fast Ethernet (IEEE 802.3u 100BaseT) to desktops and servers over copper Unshielded Twisted Pair (UTP) cabling.
 - Gigabit Ethernet over fiber uplinks between switches: 1000BaseSX for up to 500 meters, 1000BaseLX/LH for up to 5-10km.
 - Desired*
 - Wireless LAN (WLAN, IEEE 802.11b) with 128-bit wired equivalent privacy (WEP) encryption for sites not conducive to LAN wiring because of building or budget limitations, such as older buildings, leased space, or temporary sites. In addition, this offers an alternative to costly trenches, leased lines, and right of way issues. Max Range: 18 Miles (30km). IPSEC encryption should be employed if extra security is needed, as the 802.11b standard is not proven to be secure as of this writing.
 - Option: Gigabit Ethernet over CAT5 copper UTP (IEEE 802.3ab 1000BaseT) for servers and switch uplinks up to 100 meters. This will become a viable option as Gigabit Ethernet gear becomes more prevalent and prices drop.
 - Cabling Standards
 - Required*
 - *Category 5E* copper Unshielded Twisted Pair (UTP) cabling is *minimum*, for a maximum distance of 100 meters.

Desired

- *Fiber Optic Cabling:*
 - 62.5-micron multimode fiber for up to 200m (1000BaseSX)
 - 50.0-micron multimode fiber for up to 500m (1000BaseSX)
 - 9-10 micron single-mode fiber for up to 5-10k (1000BaseLX/LH)
- Certified and tested by installer with printed test data.
- Color-coding to designate function. For example, blue fiber for active links and gray fiber for backup redundant links.

▪ Network Equipment

Desired

- Closet edge switches should be stackable for cost effectiveness and scalability.
- Core backbone and server farm switches should be chassis based to utilize a faster back plane in the aggregation of edge switches and servers.
- Chassis switches should be deployed in high port density areas. It is easier to manage a single large switch than a stack of smaller switches.
- Routers should be IPV6 capable for future IPV6 deployment.
- In line power on every switch port to power appliances such as IP phones.
- Voice-Over-IP service in switches.

▪ Wiring Closet

Required

- 19" rack with vertical or horizontal built in power strips.
- UPS (Uninterruptible Power Supply) for all network equipment, servers, and critical staff. The UPS must have software that will shutdown the server and desktop operating system gracefully.
- Each patch panel port must be labeled with its corresponding office/cubicle number. The patch panel should have physical guides for proper cable organization.

▪ Network Design

Required

- IP Multicast (IGMP) must be enabled on all switches and routers to facilitate the network delivery of video conferencing, court communications, distance learning, software distribution, and news. IP Multicast is a bandwidth-conserving technology that delivers a single stream, rather than multiple streams, of data to many users.
- Collapsed switched backbone design. Switches from different wiring closets must be aggregated by a single or dual core switched fabric.
- VLANs (Virtual LANs) deployed for Ethernet traffic segmentation and broadcast containment when needed.
- Routers deployed as needed for inter VLAN connectivity and for Layer 3 routing and segmentation. Multi-layer switching (MLS) is a desired feature, which optimizes inter VLAN connectivity through Layer 3 Switching. Layer 3 Switching off loads routers from forwarding unicast IP data packets.

▪ IP Network Addressing

Required

- Court LANs shall assign and allocate *internal* IP addresses in the *Reserved* range based on Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) RCF 1597. This will prevent the exhaustion of allocated globally unique IP addresses while providing an additional layer of security. The Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) has reserved the following three blocks of the IP address space for private networks:

10.0.0.0 - 10.255.255.255
172.16.0.0 - 172.31.255.255
192.168.0.0 - 192.168.255.255

- The reserved allocated range will be dependent on court size.
- Globally unique IP addresses are assigned on the external side of the court's LAN border with *Network Address Translators*.

▪ Redundancy and Availability

Required

- IEEE 802.1d Spanning-Tree Protocol (STP) enabled in all switches for network loop detection and link redundancy. This protocol will allow for redundant links and switches to exist in an Ethernet network.

Desired

- In large switched environments, dual backbone switches with STP can be deployed for uplink and backbone redundancy. When one core switch fails users are connected via the other core switch.
- In large routed and switched environments, dual backbone multi-layer switches with STP and Hot-Standby-Routing Protocol (HSRP) can be deployed for uplink and backbone redundancy. When one core router/switch fails users are connected via the other router/switch.

▪ LAN Protocols

Required

- TCP/IP.
- SNA Connectivity if needed.
- Novell IPX/SPX if needed.

▪ LAN Security

Required

- Firewall appliance for security between court and external networks. The firewall must also be a Network Address Translator.
- User name and password authentication for server, workstation, and network gear access.
- Passwords should not go across the network in clear text, but be preferably encrypted.
- Unauthorized or unsupported gear should be prohibited (e.g. hubs).
- Remote access sessions from external networks must be authenticated and encrypted. The IPSEC protocol with 3DES encryption is the preferred VPN protocol for remote access from external networks.

Desired

- Deployment of network Intrusion Detection appliances to detect, report, and terminate unauthorized activity (e.g. hacking) throughout a network.

- LAN Connectivity to Other Agencies

Required

- County
- Other agencies as needed

b) Wide Area Network (WAN) Infrastructure for LAN-to-LAN Connectivity

- WAN Connectivity

Required

- County network and resources.
- Satellite courts.
- State agencies such as DMV as needed.

- WAN Access Technologies

The type of WAN access technology deployed is dependent on bandwidth requirements, availability, and cost. As such, we can only suggest the types of WAN technologies that can be deployed. Bandwidth requirements are derived from an estimated number of users and types of applications that will traverse the court WAN link. Technologies for deployment are:

- T-1 leased lines or Frame Relay lines to connect LANs.
- Wireless (WLAN, IEEE 802.11b) bridging of LANs within 18km of each other.
- Satellite WAN (e.g. VSAT-Very Small Aperture Terminal). Satellite can be deployed where terrestrial links are not possible, or for use as a backup link for the primary terrestrial link.
- ATM (Asynchronous Transfer Mode) may be deployed as an alternative to Frame Relay or T-1. This is particularly applicable when an ATM infrastructure is already in place.
- DSL (if available) can be deployed to connect LANs via a VPN. Courts connected via DSL VPNs must have a firewall on each link end point to prevent exposure from public IP based networks.

- WAN Protocols

Desired

- Routers connecting LANs are to deploy a scalable routing protocol (e.g. OSPF) so that route updates and WAN link redundancy functions are fulfilled.

- WAN Redundancy

Desired

- Frame Relay: Additional PVC (Private Virtual Circuit) per existing Frame link. An alternate option is ISDN or satellite as backup per Frame link.
- T-1: Additional T-1. An alternate option is ISDN or satellite as backup per T-1 link.

- WAN Security

Required

- Access list from router.

c) Internet Connectivity

- Features

Required

- Fast and direct connection to the Internet and not through the county network.
- Ability for court to control user and application access to the Internet.
- Firewall as security appliance to protect and segment court network from external networks (including the county). The firewall must be able to function as a Network Address Translator.
- Court Demilitarized Zone for inbound traffic to access court information and data. This zone can be at an ISP or local.

- Internet Access Technologies

Required

- Same as WAN. Dialup 56K is also possible for very small courts.

- Public Key Infrastructure (PKI)

Required

- Statewide court PKI infrastructure should be in place to facilitate and secure e-commerce functions via *digital certificates*. PKI digital certificates provide for secure data transactions over the public Internet via secure VPN channels using encryption such as SSL and with public/private keys. The PKI infrastructure should accommodate efficient approval of certificate requests along with a certificate management solution that meets statewide court needs.

d) Remote Access / VPN

- Users

Required

- Authorized court personnel should be able to access e-mail and documents remotely based on policy set by the court.
- Remote access can be defined from a home PC, another court or another business location.
- Business partners should be able to connect and have a secured VPN channel to the court for the duration of the business project or transaction. The VPN should have the ability for quick assembly and disassembly of these secured virtual business links.

- Technology

Desired

- VPNs via an ISP. Users will select from local numbers provided by the ISP for local toll charges. VPN tunneling sessions will use the IPSEC protocol with ESP header and 3-DES encryption. Authentication can be RSA Secure-IDs, RADIUS, or local user accounts database.

e) Network Management

- Inventory/ Distribution Management

Required

- Management software that will perform hardware inventory, software inventory and metering, software distribution and installation, and remote troubleshooting.

- LAN/WAN Management Tools

Required

Visual SNMP based management software(s) that can perform node status polling, process SNMP *traps*, perform *syslog* functions, and generate alarms and notifications. The software(s) should have additional capabilities to perform network switch/router management, report network topology changes, and generate utilization reports so that proper bandwidth can be allocated.

- f) Desktop, Servers, PCs, and Applications

Note: This section is added due to its essential relationship to the network.

The trial courts do not universally accept the standards listed within this section. Decisions on desktop devices, servers, and applications are individually governed by the court.

All variations on the desktop and server platform will need to be accommodated within the network standards.

- Server Platform
 - MS Windows 2000® Server for general file and print services. This platform is suited as an application server as well.
 - MS Windows 2000® Advanced Server for applications that require high-end reliability features such as 2 node clustering, support up to 8 CPUs, and load balancing.
 - UNIX for applications that run on this platform.
 - Novell NetWare® for legacy NetWare® based apps.
 - Networked storage appliances.
 - Hardware platform is open.
- Desktop Platform
 - MS Windows 2000 Professional®.
 - Hardware platform is open.
- Printers
 - Networked Printers.
 - Local attached printers for high profile staff such as judges and court management.

- Applications
 - Microsoft® Office 2000.
 - Access to case management system.
 - E-mail and web access.

- Support/Help Desk
 - End user support is to be provided by local court IT staff. If the court does not have an IT staff then this support function will be provided by an outsourced solution.
 - Help Desk software must have features to log, track, report/search, and archive incidents. It should have the ability to have prioritization features along with detailed incident description.

- Directory and User Administration
 - User administration is to be centralized at the local court. Accounts are to be managed via an LDAP compatible directory. The LDAP compatible directory will have the ability to communicate with other LDAP compatible directories from other courts.

- Backup
 - A court backup scheme is required for routine backup of servers and other end stations. The scheme must have provisions for storing tapes at an external secure site.
 - The backup software shall have backup agents for Open Files in addition to routine backup and restore functions. It is desired that the software have Storage Area Network (SAN) capability.
 - Optional: Storage Area Networks (SAN) based on Fiber Channel technology to interconnect servers and storage via a separate high-speed network dedicated for backups only.

- Redundancy, Availability, and Performance
 - Server clustering if the application warrants it.
 - Server load balancing implemented at the OS level if the application warrants it. If one server fails, another can assume the load so the application keeps running. Load balancing allows the distribution of network traffic across many servers (32 on Windows 2000®) to increase availability and performance.
 - Server load balancing from the switch if the application warrants it. Network sessions and server load conditions are tracked in real time by the switch, directing the session to the most appropriate server.

- RAID5 server hard disk redundancy for all MS Windows® based servers. For Windows® 2000 the OS partition is mirrored and the rest is layered with RAID5.
- Server with a VLAN Ethernet Adapter if the application warrants it. Such an adapter enables the server to be a member of multiple VLANs via a single trunk link. Inter VLAN traffic to the server can then bypass routers, which are often bottleneck choke points. The server becomes a member of multiple VLANs.
- Options for increasing throughput and fault tolerance for server Ethernet adapter cards are as follows. Again, this is if the application warrants it:

-Adapter Fault Tolerance (AFT): If the primary Ethernet adapter fails, the second adapter takes over. This is for link, adapter, and switch/hub port failures.

-Adaptive Load Balancing (ALB): Enables balancing the transmission data flow among multiple Ethernet adapters, and AFT is included.

-Fast EtherChannel (FEC): Enables the aggregation of multiple adapters for greater throughput.

B. Internet/Web

1. Introduction

Internet/web access should be available to perform a wide variety of functions throughout the Courts and the Judicial Branch.

2. Guidelines

The following are some of the specific applications that may utilize the Internet:

- a) Courts
 - E-Mail/ListServ
 - Case Management Systems
 - Human Resources Systems
 - Fiscal Systems
 - Calendaring
 - Data sharing of documents and application data
 - Data access (query, submit, retrieve)
 - Software and application support
 - Voice over IP
 - Internet Faxing
 - Virtual Private Network (VPN)
- b) Judicial Branch and Other Agencies
 - Distance learning
 - Data sharing
 - Image records sharing
 - Video/Web conferencing
- c) Public and Vendors
 - Streaming video
 - Vendors access information
 - Schedules and fee information
 - Tentative rulings
 - E-commerce
 - E-filing
 - Interactive forms
 - Juror information

3. Requirements

- a) Access
 - Each court requires internet/web access at all of their locations.
 - Access will be limited to authorized personnel as designated by each court.

- b) Required Features
 - Direct connection to the Internet, not via the county or other agency network.
 - Bandwidth sufficient to handle downloading of largest available file
 - 24/7 Accessibility
 - Accessible by all court personnel at each desktop computer
 - Security to prevent access to LAN/WAN (firewall)
 - Ability to set access and content policy regarding Internet access.
 - Redundancy of system in case primary link fails
 - Ability to maintain control over Internet applications
 - Ability to expand bandwidth as more applications become Web-ready
- c) Desired Features
 - Secure remote access to LAN through Internet for vendors and IT Staff (VPN)
 - Ability to stream video in real time
 - Ability to accommodate E-Commerce

C. E-Mail

1. Introduction

E-mail has become a critical means of communication in the courts and functionality is essential. The e-mail system will be court hosted providing messaging and mail capabilities within all branches of the court and through the Internet.

2. Guidelines

E-mail is directly related to the WAN and Internet communications infrastructure within the Court. Each court would need a minimum of one server that served all locations. Individual servers at each site are not required. If a regional approach were identified, Directory Network Services would need to be set up the same way for all Courts within the region and managed regionally.

3. Requirements

a) Required features

- Ability to send attachments with messages
- Directory Integration and Replication
- LISTSERVE access
- Remote access (from home, conferences, etc.)
- Archive sent/received mail
- Mail Database backup strategy
- Redundancy to ensure 24/7 access
- Ability to provide e-filing notice to parties
- Ability to provide notice to jurors
- Consideration of the volume of mail, i.e., number of users, locations, messages, etc.
- Dial-in access
- Meets standard e-mail protocols: SMTP/POP/IMAP
- MIME compliant

b) Desired Features

- Unlimited attachment size
- Audio announcement of "mail"
- Wireless – PDA access to e-mail

D. Video

1. Introduction

Video should become as easy to use and as available as the telephone to perform a wide variety of functions throughout the Courts and the Judicial Branch. Discrete delivery solutions may be required for carrying video data until computer network technology supports the required quality of service. Long-term scalable solutions should be recommended as a result of this RFP.

Video may include a variety of different types of solutions. It is not anticipated that all of these possible solutions must be available immediately, and depending upon the function being provided, may be required (now) or desired (future). In partnership with AOC, the vendor will assess requirements and recommend short and long term scalable solutions. For the purpose of this document, "Video" is defined in the list below. The use of this list does not preclude expansion of these definitions during the Discovery phase of the work to be performed as a result of this RFP:

- a) Videoconferencing
 - To and from and between courts
 - To desktop
 - To courtrooms
 - To training or meeting rooms
- b) Streaming audio and video
 - Over a network to the desktop
 - Over a network to training room PCs
 - Over the Internet to home PCs (staff and general public)
- c) Video and audio from CD on workstation
- d) Satellite video and audio uplinked and downlinked
 - For presentations in training rooms
- e) Legacy video systems, (i.e. microwave from jails to courthouses for arraignment)

2. Requirements

All of the functions and availability listed below will be required now or in the future, but the use of the various "video" solutions defined above may be "desired" (future) rather than "required" (now). The vendor will be expected to partner with AOC and court staff to determine the final list of "required" versus "desired" solutions for delivering the following functions.

- a) Functions
 - Video Arraignment/Appearances
 - Education for Staff and Judges
 - Meetings/Administrative communications

- Interviews
 - Collaborative work (two way)
 - Legal Research
 - Self Help Kiosks
 - Remote interpreters
 - Remote Witness Testimony (i.e. child victim witnesses, experts)
- b) Availability
- As needed
 - On demand/no notice
- c) Connectivity
- Video data carries different types of information that will be used for a wide variety of purposes. So, a variety of different systems will be required to carry video data in different formats to and from multiple locations (within the state and within buildings) for a wide variety of purposes.

The number of users and the amount of use will affect the requirements by requiring greater bandwidth and greater connectivity. The scale of need for video is statewide and all people in the judicial branch will be using it in some of the various forms described above. The scale would change if video were used more between sites or if there was an increase in the number of users. Should these changes occur, the requirements could be affected.

E. IVR

1. Introduction

It is desirable to have an IVR system in place at each Court to allow the public 24/7 access to the Courts. Currently, the only time the public has access to the Courts is during normal business hours. IVR, in addition to internet/web access, will enable the Courts to better serve the public.

2. Guidelines

This system should be available 24/7, thus giving the public access after hours and on the weekends to allow them to conduct court business when most convenient.

3. Requirements

The following functions represent the desired level of functionality.

- Court information (directions, location, hours of operation, informational messages for different departments)
- Ability to query the Case Management System for status of cases for Civil, Criminal, Small Claims and Traffic
- Ability to inquire about bails
- Ability to process traffic citations, automated traffic school enrollment and extensions
- Ability to access the court calendar at any time without going to the court
- Ability to query system for status by juror number, messages and information for jurors
- Ability to conduct E-commerce (automated credit card payments for bail, traffic school, and trials). Online approval of credit cards. Possible fax-back of receipts.
- Automatic call distribution and ability to populate PC with customer information before answering telephone. This would enhance customer satisfaction.
- Possibly have the court phone directory as an option
- Ability to have multiple interfaces to multiple databases (mainframe, unix, etc.)
- Have no more than 3 layers of menu picks to go through. If there are more than 3 layers, users tend not to use system. It would defeat the purpose of the IVR if the public still calls operators
- Ability to have access to system statistics and reporting. The amount of dropped calls, length of call, amount of calls, etc.
- Access for disabled users. Possible ADA implications
- TDD for the disabled
- Multilingual (different languages depending on the demographics of court customers)
- Network access (possibility to run on the network using TCP/IP)
- Ability to interface with related systems
- Ability to have security controls consistent with court security policies

V. TIMELINE

The plan for the telecommunications architecture covers a three year period, beginning with the definition of the business and communication models in the first year, followed by two implementation years covering three of the four regions. The components by fiscal year (July 1-June 30) are:

FISCAL YEAR 00-01	FISCAL YEAR 01-02	FISCAL YEAR 02-03	FISCAL YEAR 03-04
Develop models for telecommunications architecture based on court characteristics.	Implement telecommunications architecture models in the 11 courts of the Bay Area Region	Implement telecommunications architecture models in the 41 courts of the Northern and Central Regions.	Implement telecommunications architecture models in the 6 courts of Southern Region.

The first phase is complete and the result described in Section III. The vendor is expected to provide services for Fiscal Year 01-02 activities, as described in Section II, Project Description. The scope of this project does not include Fiscal Year 02-03 or 03-04.

A. Key Dates

Key target dates for this project are as follows:

1. Vendor Selection

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| a) RFP Issued | September 18, 2001 |
| b) Bidders' Conference | October 2, 2001 <i>10 am – 11:30 am</i> |
| c) Questions Due | October 4, 2001 |
| d) Questions/Answers Posted | October 5, 2001 |
| e) RFP Responses Due | October 16, 2001 |
| f) Vendor Selection | November 15, 2001 |
| g) Contract Execution | December 21, 2001 |

2. Project Plan

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| a) Project Kickoff | January 2, 2002 |
| b) Phase 1 Completion | February 1, 2002 |
| c) Phase 2 Completion | March 1, 2002 |
| d) Phase 3 Completion | TBD |
| e) Orders Placed | April 1, 2002 |
| f) Phase 4 Completion | TBD |

VI. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

A. Overview

This section presents information regarding proposal requirements that must be satisfactorily addressed in order for the AOC to consider the proposal and to compare submissions. Within each section of your response, indicate all assumptions you have made pertaining to your proposal.

B. Cost Breakdown

Proposals must include a detailed cost breakdown and itemization clearly indicating the estimated total consulting cost and time for all phases, including the vendor's rate structure. Within each phase, the cost should be broken down by the deliverables specified in Project Scope. Costs related to administrative, operating and travel expenses should also be estimated.

Spreadsheets to structure the vendor's response will be provided as an addendum to this RFP. Posting of this addendum will be done no later than October 5, 2001, at the same website where the RFP is located.

C. Contract Types

Two types of contractual arrangements are possible: "fixed bid" and "time and materials not to exceed." The vendor must ensure responses are as complete as possible so the agency can compare bids.

D. Work Plan

Proposals should include a statement of how the vendor plans to execute the project including initial preparation work, project management, phase deliverables and signoff, and project close. Include a description of special tools the vendor plans to use such as the Web, CAD, etc. The vendor will be expected to provide industry-standard project management practices, including a team approach, a single point of contact and weekly meetings with the AOC and written monthly status reports.

Include within the work plan a description of what is expected of the AOC during the project. Estimate the time and resource commitment that will be required.

E. Sample Deliverables

Include samples of deliverables the team would expect to see from the vendor during each phase of the project.

F. Project Schedule

Proposals must include a project schedule with a work breakdown structure (WBS) and required resources for each step. The project schedule should clearly indicate the start and end dates, number of days for each step, and resources required at each step. This schedule must clearly map to the work plan and cost breakdown.

G. Vendor Project Team Qualifications

Proposals should include a list of the proposed project team members, their specific roles, their relevant qualifications and their availability. Resumes for each proposed team member are preferable, identifying relevant qualifications and length of experience, not previous work assignments. If there are multiple vendors or subconsultants involved in the proposal, then relevant partnership experience is also to be provided.

H. Resources

Proposals should include an assumption for the provision of AOC and trial court resources: hardware, software, workspace, and agency staff. Please provide a breakdown by each phase.

I. References

Proposals must be accompanied by three customer references of previous or current relevant work. Two of the three references must be from public sector work. This information must include:

1. Company full name
2. Project name or description of services provided
3. Contact individual (must be currently employed at above Company)
4. Contact telephone number

5. Description of how this previous or current project is similar in scope to the project outlined in this RFP document.

J. Business Qualifications

Proposals must be accompanied by a statement of qualifications for each company presented including:

1. The number of years in business
2. Total annual sales for the previous two fiscal years
3. Total number of employees (exclusive of subcontractors)
4. Total number of similar projects (including those referenced above).

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

A. Overview

This section outlines the responsibilities of the vendor and those of the Administrative Office of the Courts in the administration of the RFP, and it also provides a general description of the evaluation and notification process.

B. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation team will evaluate proposals on the basis of the following criteria:

1. Assessment, Design and Implementation approaches/plans
2. Qualifications of the vendor team
3. Cost of proposed services
4. References and relevant experience
5. Vendor's financial strength

C. General Information

A vendor's proposal is an offer irrevocable for a minimum of six (6) months following the deadline for its submission. Any contract based on a proposal responsive to this RFP must include the state's standard terms and conditions, including a nondiscrimination clause. The state's Standard Agreement (STD 2) is available at:

http://www.osp.dgs.ca.gov/default.asp?mp=../Services/FormsMgmt/series_1-99.asp.

Submission of any proposal indicates a vendor's acceptance of the conditions in this RFP unless clearly and specifically noted otherwise in the proposal.

D. Bidders Conference

A non-mandatory bidders conference will be held on October 2, 2001 at the following location:

Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
3rd Floor, Catalina Room
San Francisco, California 94102-3660

The conference will be held from 10 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

The vendor may bring questions to the conference. All questions and answers will be posted on the Judicial Branch web site (<http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/rfp/>) on October 5.

E. Errors in the Solicitation Document

If a vendor submitting a proposal discovers any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or other error in this solicitation document, the vendor shall immediately provide the state with written notice of the problem and request that the solicitation document be clarified or modified. Without disclosing the source of the request, the state may modify the solicitation document prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by issuing an addendum to all vendors to whom the solicitation document was sent.

If, prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals, a vendor submitting a proposal knows of or should have known of an error in the solicitation document but fails to notify the state of the error, the vendor shall bid at its own risk, and if the vendor is awarded the contract, it shall not be entitled to additional compensation of time by reason of the error or its later correction.

F. Questions Regarding the Solicitation Document

Vendors requiring clarification of the intent or content of this solicitation document or on procedural matters related to it should contact Ms. Kathleen Clancy at:

Kathleen Clancy
KC/future planning, inc.
526 Washington Street
San Francisco, California, 94111
kclancy@futureplanning.com
(415) 765-6575
Fax: (415) 765-6571

All questions must be submitted in writing if not asked during the bidders conference. Questions received by October 4 will be posted with their answers on the Judicial Branch web site (<http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/rfp/>) on October 5. Questions will not be entertained after October 4, 2001.

Vendors are specifically directed NOT to contact any Court personnel for meetings, conferences or technical discussions that are related to this RFP. Unauthorized contact of any government personnel may be cause for rejection of the vendor's response.

If a vendor's question relates to a proprietary aspect of its proposal and the question would expose proprietary information if disclosed to competitors, the vendor may submit the question in writing, marking it as "CONFIDENTIAL." With the question, the vendor must submit a statement explaining why the question is sensitive. If the state concurs that the disclosure of the question or answer would expose proprietary information, the question will be answered, and both the question and answer will be kept in confidence. If the state does not concur regarding the proprietary nature of the question, the question will not be answered in this manner and the vendor will be notified.

If a vendor submitting a proposal believes that one or more of the solicitation document's requirements are onerous or unfair, or that it unnecessarily precludes less costly or alternative solutions, the vendor may submit a written request that the solicitation document be changed. The request must set forth the recommended change and vendor's reasons for proposing the change. Any such request must be submitted to Ms. Patricia Yerian at the Administrative Office of the Courts **by 5 P.M. on October 4, 2001.**

G. Proposal Submission

Responses to the solicitation document must be received before 5 p.m. on October 16, 2001. This is the date the responses must be physically at the addresses noted below and not the postmark deadline. Responses not physically received by this time will be rejected.

Responses (4 hard copies and 1 soft copy) should be addressed to:

Patricia Yerian
Director, Information Services Division
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
(415) 865-7487
pat.yerian@jud.ca.gov

Responses (1 hard copy and 1 soft copy) should be addressed to:

Kathleen Clancy
KC/future planning, inc.
526 Washington Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 765-6575
kclancy@futureplanning.com

Proposals may be mailed or delivered personally. A receipt should be requested for hand-delivered material.

H. Vendor Costs

Costs for developing proposals are entirely the responsibility of the vendor submitting the proposal and shall not be chargeable to the state.

I. Evaluation Process

An evaluation team headed by the RFP Manager will review in detail all proposals received to determine the extent to which they comply with the solicitation document requirements. The names, titles, locations, and experience of each member of the team are not available to the vendors.

The details of the evaluation process are not available to vendors. However, the evaluation team will evaluate proposals on the basis of the criteria listed earlier.

If a proposal fails to meet a material solicitation document requirement, the proposal may be rejected. A deviation is material to the extent that a response is not in substantial accord with solicitation document requirements. Material deviations cannot be waived. Immaterial deviations may cause a bid to be rejected.

A bid may be rejected if it contains any alterations of form or irregularities of any other kind.

Proposals that contain false or misleading statements may be rejected if, in the state's opinion, the information was intended to mislead the state regarding a requirement of the solicitation document.

Cost sheets will be checked only if a proposal is determined to be otherwise qualified. All figures entered on the cost sheets must be clearly legible.

The following provision shall govern the resolution of errors in a bid. It is absolutely essential that the vendor submitting a proposal carefully review cost information in the bid, since change in the information will not be permitted after the bid has been submitted to the Administrative Office of the Courts.

If inconsistencies or other errors are found in a proposal, the state may reject it. However, the state may, at its sole discretion, retain the proposal and correct arithmetic or transposition errors on the premise that the lowest level of detail will govern the resolution of any discrepancy. The total price of unit-priced items will be the product of the unit price and the quantity of the item. In case of a discrepancy between the unit price and total price of an item, the unit price will govern. If the unit price is ambiguous, unintelligible, uncertain for any cause, or omitted, it shall be the amount obtained by dividing the total price by the quantity of the item. If an item described in narrative form is omitted from the cost data, the omission will be interpreted to mean that the item will be provided by the vendor at no cost. If a minor item is not mentioned at all in a proposal and is essential to satisfactory performance, the proposal will be interpreted to mean that the item will be provided at no cost. If a major item is omitted and the omission is not discovered until after the award of a contract, the vendor shall be required to supply the item at no cost. If re-computations or interpretations applied in accordance with this part result in significant changes in the total cost of items quoted or in a requirement that a vendor supply a major item at no cost, the vendor will be given the opportunity to promptly establish the grounds legally justifying relief with regard to changes.

During the evaluation process, the state may require a vendor's representative to answer questions with regard to the vendor's proposal. Failure of a vendor to demonstrate that the claims made in its proposal are in fact true may be sufficient cause for deeming a proposal non-responsive.

J. Selection Procedures

The evaluation team will examine all proposals received. The name, units, or experience of the individual members will not be made available to any vendor. It is the intent of this team to select two or more proposals and to invite the vendors submitting them to a question-and-answer presentation. After the presentations, the evaluation team will negotiate with the respondents who have presented, in the opinion of the team, the best proposal in an attempt to reach an agreement. If no agreement is reached, the evaluation team can negotiate with the other respondents or make no award under this RFP. At any time, the evaluation team can reject all bids and make no award under this RFP. Moreover, the AOC reserves the right to reconsider any proposal submitted at any phase of the procurement. It also reserves the right to meet with vendors to gather additional information.

K. Rejection of Bids

The state may reject any or all proposals and may or may not waive an immaterial deviation or defect in a bid. The state's waiver of an immaterial deviation or defect shall in no way modify the solicitation document or otherwise excuse a vendor from full compliance with solicitation document specifications. The AOC reserves the right to accept or reject any or all of the items in the proposal, to award the contract in whole or in part and/or negotiate any or all items with individual vendors if it is deemed in the AOC's and court's best interest. Moreover, the AOC reserves the right to make no selection if proposals are deemed to be outside the fiscal constraint or against the best interest of the government.

L. Award of Contract

Award of contract, if made, will be in accordance with the solicitation document to a responsible vendor submitting a proposal compliant with all the requirements of the solicitation document and any addenda thereto, except for such immaterial defects as may be waived by the state. Award, if made, will be made within forty-five (45) days after the selection of the vendor. However, a vendor may extend its offer in writing beyond forty-five (45) days in the event of a delay caused by a protest of the intended award. The state reserves the right to determine the suitability of proposals for contracts on the basis of a proposal's meeting administrative requirements, technical requirements, its assessment of the quality of service and performance of items proposed, and cost.

The RFP does not constitute a contract or an offer of employment. The awarding of any contract pursuant to this RFP is contingent upon funds being made available by the State in the appropriate fiscal year for the purposes of this project. In addition, any contract awarded as a result of this RFP is subject to any additional restriction, limitation or condition enacted by the Legislature or established by the Judicial Council of California that may affect the provisions, funding or terms of the contract in any manner. The AOC reserves the right to make one award, multiple awards or reject all proposals submitted in response to this RFP.

The State also reserves the right to modify or cancel the solicitation document in whole or in part.

M. Decision

Questions regarding the state's award of any business on the basis of proposals submitted in response to this solicitation document, or on any related matter,

should be addressed to Ms. Patricia Yerian at (415) 865-7487 or at pat.yerian@jud.ca.gov.

N. Execution of Contracts

The state will make a reasonable effort to execute any contract based on this solicitation document within forty-five days of selecting a proposal that in its sole determination best meets its requirements.

O. Protest Procedure

The Administrative Office of the Courts intends to be completely open and fair to all vendors in selecting the best possible team within budgetary and other constraints described in the solicitation document. In applying evaluation criteria and making the selection, members of the evaluation team and of the Information Systems Division will exercise their best judgment.

A vendor submitting a proposal may protest the award if it meets all the following conditions:

1. The vendor has submitted a proposal which it believes to be responsive to the solicitation document
2. The vendor believes that its proposal meets the state's administrative requirements and technical requirements, proposes items of proven quality and performance, and offers a competitive cost to the state, and
3. The vendor believes that the state has incorrectly selected another vendor submitting a proposal for an award.

A vendor submitting a proposal who is qualified to protest should contact:

Stephen Saddler
Senior Contract Specialist
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
(415) 865-7989

If Mr. Saddler is unable to resolve the protest to the vendor's satisfaction, the vendor should file a written protest within five working days of the contract award notification. The written protest must state the facts surrounding the issue and the reasons the vendor believes the award to be invalid. The protest must be sent by certified or registered mail or delivered personally to:

Ronald Overholt
Chief Deputy Director
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

A receipt should be requested for hand-delivered material.

P. News Releases

News releases pertaining to the award of a contract may not be made without prior written approval of the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Q. Disposition of Materials

All materials submitted in response to this solicitation document will become the property of the State of California and will be returned only at the state's option and at the expense of the vendor submitting the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and become a public record. However, any confidential material submitted by a vendor that is clearly marked as such will be returned upon request.

R. Payment

Payment terms will be specified in any agreement that may ensue as a result of this solicitation document. Note that the State of California does not make advance payments.

S. Indemnification

The vendor agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the State of California Court System, its officers, employees, and agents, from and against all claims, damages, losses and expenses arising out of the submission of its bid and any possible subsequent contract. This indemnification obligation shall not be limited in any way by any limitation on the amount or type of damages, compensation or benefits payable for or by the vendor or any agent of the vendor under the Workers' Compensation Act, disability benefit acts or other employee benefits acts.

T. Exceptions to the RFP

Exceptions shall be clearly identified and written explanation shall include the scope of the exceptions, the ramifications of the exceptions for the AOC, and the description of the advantages or disadvantages to the AOC as a result of exceptions. The AOC, in its sole discretion, may reject any exceptions within the proposal.

VIII. APPENDICES

- A. Trial Court Regional Structure (from Telecommunications Business Requirements)
- B. Telecommunications Architecture Relationships/Dependencies Diagram

The trial courts have been grouped into four regions based on the Tactical Plan for Court Technology¹. These regions and their associated courts are as follows:

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA	BAY AREA
1. Los Angeles	1. Alameda
2. Orange	2. Contra Costa
3. Riverside	3. Marin
4. San Bernardino	4. Napa
5. San Diego	5. Sacramento
6. Ventura	6. San Francisco
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	7. San Mateo
1. Amador	8. Santa Clara
2. Butte	9. Santa Cruz
3. Calaveras	10. Solano
4. Colusa	11. Sonoma
5. Del Norte	Central, Coastal and Desert (CCED)
6. El Dorado	1. Alpine
7. Glenn	2. Fresno
8. Humboldt	3. Imperial
9. Lake	4. Inyo
10. Lassen	5. Kern
11. Mendocino	6. Kings
12. Modoc	7. Madera
13. Nevada	8. Mariposa
14. Placer	9. Merced
15. Plumas	10. Mono
16. Shasta	11. Monterey
17. Sierra	12. San Benito
18. Siskiyou	13. San Joaquin
19. Sutter	14. San Luis Obispo
20. Tehama	15. Santa Barbara
21. Trinity	16. Stanislaus
22. Yolo	17. Tulare
23. Yuba	18. Tuolumne

¹ Adopted by the Judicial Council on January 26, 2000.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ARCHITECTURE RELATIONSHIPS/DEPENDENCIES

