

Form for Submission of Questions



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

OFFICE OF COURT CONSTRUCTION
AND MANAGEMENT

Request for Proposals Form for Submission of Questions

RFQ Number: OCCM—2011-19-JMG

Your Organization's Name:		eCIFM Solutions Inc	
#	Solicitation Reference	Question	Response
1	CAFMRFPRequirementsForm-2.xlsx	<p>Deliverables Tab is the project schedule. Should we be transferring the contents of this tab to MS Project for final submission?</p> <p>If Yes, is the vendor assigning all resources?</p>	<p>MS Project would be the desired tool for tracking the project milestones and resource assignments. The template was just supplied in Excel format as an example of the required columns to be included in the plan.</p>
2	CAFMRFPRequirementsForm-2.xlsx	<p>Functional Matrix Tab: We would like to insert multiple requirements rows per module to provide sufficient detail for evaluation. Is there a limit to one spreadsheet row per module? Can we insert additional rows?</p>	<p>Yes – the intention is that the rows would be added as required to show all of the functional requirements. The column headers are the minimum required.</p>
3	CAFMRFPRequirementsForm-2.xlsx	<p>Functional Matrix Tab: Description of Business / User Requirement: Are we bringing <u>all</u> existing customizations of the various modules across as is during the upgrade? If yes, what should be done with requirements that are not current functionality?</p>	<p>During Due Diligence it should be clarified with Tarence McCoy what functionality is required. Generally the customizations will be brought over during the upgrade except for the Projects module. There may be some cases where during the due diligence it was identified that the functional requirements are now met without the customizations. It is the desire of the AOC to minimize customizations except where the business process requirements are not met by the out of the box software.</p>

Your Organization's Name:		eCIFM Solutions Inc	
#	Solicitation Reference	Question	Response
4	RFP Page 11, Evaluation of Proposals, paragraph 6.2	Paragraph 6.2 states "Firm Experience ...will not be scored again." Our firm's experience has expanded since March 2012. We respectfully request inclusion of new firm experience in the scoring process.	The RFP explicitly states that "Firm Experience" subject area is being carried forward from this first evaluation. This will not be adjusted.
5	RFP Page 11-12	<u>Total Price:</u> Can AOC provide specifics on the scoring of the Price Proposals?	Yes the exact calculation we use per the JBCM is posted immediately below.
6	Due Diligence Phase	Can the link to the AOC environment as provided April 30, 2012 (https://cafm-stg.tc1.courts.ca.gov) be made active again?	This will be initiated. Please notify Tarence McCoy which user IDs to activate.
7	RFP Page 5, paragraph 3.2.2.2.1 Attachment 4, page 1, paragraph 1, Introduction	It is our understanding that there are no interfaces between the existing system and third party software. Can the requirement ..."document how this new software implementation will interface with other third party software" be defined? What is the third party software? The Introduction key factor indicates ..."there are currently no interfaces to third party applications" Can AOC clarify this requirement?	The only current integration with other applications is with the authentication tool: Siteminder. No other interfaces are in existence today.
8	RFP Page 13, paragraph 7.4	Can AOC define "first productive use of the software upgrade"? What criteria define productive?	Yes. First productive use is when the AOC uses the upgrade to perform any purpose for which the software is used. Basically this is after the 'Go Live' when the users begin to process transactions in the production environment.

Your Organization's Name:		eCIFM Solutions Inc	
#	Solicitation Reference	Question	Response
9	RFP Page 13, paragraph 7.4 RFP Attachment 1, page 5, paragraph 10.B	<p>"AOC will withhold 15% from all invoices submitted for payment"</p> <p>"...AOC may withhold 15% of the each invoice until receipt and acceptance of the final deliverable"</p> <p>There seems to be a conflict here between "will" and "may". Will 15% be withheld from each invoice? If yes, can AOC define the final deliverable?</p>	The Legal Document posted with the RFP (see Exhibit C, Page C-9) states: "Fifteen percent (15%) shall be withheld from all amounts to be paid by the AOC pursuant to the software upgrade work and to any Change Order(s). Contractor will invoice the AOC for release of such retention only on or after the date of the AOC's first productive use of the software upgrade."
10	Attachment 4, Page 2	The List of modules provided in the current configuration does not reflect our understanding of the current scope to only upgrade the application. Can AOC clarify the current configuration?	Just to clarify, the modules listed in the RFP configuration include all of the modules that the AOC would like to have enabled in the upgraded environment. Only the currently active modules will include configuration and customizations for production use of the system. Projects is the only exception where the customizations will not be brought forward. Please ensure final clarification with Tarence McCoy during this Due Diligence period to ensure clear understanding.

Your Organization's Name:		eCIFM Solutions Inc	
#	Solicitation Reference	Question	Response
11	Attachment 4, Page 10-11, A.5	<p>Our understanding is that the scope of work is limited to <u>Upgrading the AOC's TRIRIGA application only</u>. Are the requirements listed in A.5 Tasks 1 and 2 still applicable? These appear to be based on the previous scope; please advise how these apply to the upgrade.</p> <p>If these tasks are not applicable, can the list of deliverables on page 11 be adjusted to reflect the upgrade activity only?</p> <p>If these tasks are applicable, can AOC clarify how these tasks apply to a TRIRIGA application platform upgrade?</p>	<p>All of the work under section A are related to the Due Diligence period.</p> <p>Section B is the Upgrade activities.</p>

APPENDIX A
SAMPLE METHOD FOR ASSIGNING COST POINTS
WHEN EVALUATING RFPs

STEP ONE:

The Bid with the lowest cost is assigned the maximum number of cost points.

STEP TWO:

Use the worksheet below to calculate the number of cost points to be assigned to each of the remaining Bids. The number of cost points to be assigned to the Bid being evaluated is the number in line 6.

- Line 1 Enter the maximum number of cost points..... _____
- Line 2 Enter the dollar amount of the lowest bid..... \$ _____
- Line 3 Enter the dollar amount of the bid you are evaluating. \$ _____
- Line 4 Divide the number in line 2 by the number in line 3,
and enter the resulting number _____
- Line 5 Multiply the number in line 1 by the number in
line 4, and enter the resulting number..... _____
- Line 6 Round the number in line 5 to the nearest whole
number and enter that number..... _____

Example:

A superior court issues an RFP where the maximum number of cost points is 60. The court receives three bids:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Bid Amount</u>
A	\$90,000
B	\$98,000
C	\$80,000

In this scenario, Bidder C submitted the lowest Bid and is assigned the maximum 60 cost points.

Bidder A is assigned 53 cost points, as shown below:

Line 1	60
Line 2	\$80,000
Line 3	\$90,000
Line 4	.8888
Line 5	53.3333
Line 6	53

Bidder B is assigned 49 cost points, as shown below:

Line 1	60
Line 2	\$80,000
Line 3	\$98,000
Line 4	.8163
Line 5	48.9795
Line 6	49