

Court Case Management Systems for the Superior Courts of California
RFP No: TCAS-2017-05-JU

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
POSTED OCTOBER 12, 2017

The following are the questions that have been submitted regarding the above referenced Request for Proposal and the corresponding answer for each question.

Question #	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
1	Exhibit 6, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS)	Exhibit 6 (JBSIS) has effective date of December 2009; what do you do if this conflicts with the functional requirements in Exhibit 1 (CMS Business and Functional Requirements)?	This is the judicial branch's statistical information system requirements and this exhibit describes how data is collected; these requirements are currently still in effect.
2	Exhibit 3, CMS Implementation and Deployment Requirements	Regarding Exhibit 3, will the judicial branch be contributing change management resources or will this burden be on the vendor?	Change management process and procedures are at the sole discretion of the trial court. If the vendor believes that additional change management resources are needed, that process should be discussed during negotiations with the trail court and included as part of the court-vendor participation agreement.
3	Exhibit 1, CMS Business and Functional Requirements, section 1.2.9	Clarify section 1.2.9 of Exhibit 1 Functional Requirements; what do you mean by allow multi select parties in batch?	If your system has a function to merge parties one by one, for example if one party has 50 records, you can multi-select all and merge in one batch.
4	Exhibit 1, CMS Business and Functional Requirements, section 1.1.8	Clarify section 1.1.8 of Exhibit 1.	This means to turn on or off the ability to hyphenate per the court's needs. Some courts have interface or other requirements that do not allow for hyphenations, other courts use hyphens. This requirement asks if the proposers supports either requirement (configurable setting).

Question #	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response																																
5	RFP section 1.2, Case Management Systems' Current Status.	Explain the purpose of the language included in RFP section 1.2?	This information was included strictly as historical background information.																																
6	RFP section 1.2, Case Management Systems' Current Status.	Regarding RFP section 1.2, of the "four courts" and "9 courts" referenced in this section, do these courts currently have agreements in place for case management systems? What is the business opportunity here?	This is information regarding specific courts and the Judicial Council, which is administering this RFP, cannot provide that type of information, only those courts can.																																
7	N/A	In regards to this RFP #TCAS-2017-05-JU, we were on the bidders conference call last Friday and would like to request a list of all the vendors who attended. Or will that be released in conjunction with the questions asked on the call?	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1073 611 1484 646">Vendor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 646 1117 682">1</td><td data-bbox="1117 646 1484 682">Rock Solid Technologies, Inc.</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 682 1117 718">2</td><td data-bbox="1117 682 1484 718">Vertiba</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 718 1117 753">3</td><td data-bbox="1117 718 1484 753">Equivant</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 753 1117 789">4</td><td data-bbox="1117 753 1484 789">Abacus Data Systems, Inc.</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 789 1117 825">5</td><td data-bbox="1117 789 1484 825">Journal Technologies</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 825 1117 861">6</td><td data-bbox="1117 825 1484 861">One Legal</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 861 1117 896">7</td><td data-bbox="1117 861 1484 896">Justice Systems, Inc.</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 896 1117 932">8</td><td data-bbox="1117 896 1484 932">Tyler Technologies, Inc.</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 932 1117 968">9</td><td data-bbox="1117 932 1484 968">Pioneer Technology Group</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 968 1117 1003">10</td><td data-bbox="1117 968 1484 1003">Tech-Net Inc.</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 1003 1117 1039">11</td><td data-bbox="1117 1003 1484 1039">Pegasystems Inc.</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 1039 1117 1075">12</td><td data-bbox="1117 1039 1484 1075">Thomson Reuters</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 1075 1117 1110">13</td><td data-bbox="1117 1075 1484 1110">Conduent</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 1110 1117 1146">14</td><td data-bbox="1117 1110 1484 1146">Propoint Technology, Inc.</td></tr> <tr><td data-bbox="1073 1146 1117 1178">15</td><td data-bbox="1117 1146 1484 1178">Salesforce</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Vendor		1	Rock Solid Technologies, Inc.	2	Vertiba	3	Equivant	4	Abacus Data Systems, Inc.	5	Journal Technologies	6	One Legal	7	Justice Systems, Inc.	8	Tyler Technologies, Inc.	9	Pioneer Technology Group	10	Tech-Net Inc.	11	Pegasystems Inc.	12	Thomson Reuters	13	Conduent	14	Propoint Technology, Inc.	15	Salesforce
Vendor																																			
1	Rock Solid Technologies, Inc.																																		
2	Vertiba																																		
3	Equivant																																		
4	Abacus Data Systems, Inc.																																		
5	Journal Technologies																																		
6	One Legal																																		
7	Justice Systems, Inc.																																		
8	Tyler Technologies, Inc.																																		
9	Pioneer Technology Group																																		
10	Tech-Net Inc.																																		
11	Pegasystems Inc.																																		
12	Thomson Reuters																																		
13	Conduent																																		
14	Propoint Technology, Inc.																																		
15	Salesforce																																		
8	RFP section 3.1, Proposed Procurement Schedule	Would the Judicial Council of California consider extending the RFP due date by 10 business days? The RFP response is rather large and we are concerned that we may not be able to meet the due date of October 23, 2017.	The due date has been extended to October 30, 2017																																
9	Exhibit 4, Court Specific Information	In Exhibit 4 you mention a Full-time Equivalent (FTEs) for each of the eight courts. What is the named user count for each?	The estimated users by court is located in Exhibit 7.1, Summary tab, line 8.																																

Question #	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response																																
10	RFP section 1.2, Case Management Systems' Current Status and RFP section 1.3, Objectives and Process	What systems/databases are these eight initial courts converting data from and which are converting documents from an electronic repository?	<p>The legacy case management systems used by each of the eight courts is listed below:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Amador</td> <td>CourtView2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Colusa</td> <td>Ciber</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contra Costa</td> <td>Civil = ICMS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Criminal = LIIS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>(county mainframe)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Traffic = AMORS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>(county mainframe)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lassen</td> <td>Ciber</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marin</td> <td>Criminal – CJIS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>(county mainframe)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Civil – Beacon</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Traffic – JURIS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Pymts – CA\$H</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mariposa</td> <td>Jalan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mono</td> <td>ISD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shasta</td> <td>Jalan, HTE</td> </tr> </table>	Amador	CourtView2	Colusa	Ciber	Contra Costa	Civil = ICMS		Criminal = LIIS		(county mainframe)		Traffic = AMORS		(county mainframe)	Lassen	Ciber	Marin	Criminal – CJIS		(county mainframe)		Civil – Beacon		Traffic – JURIS		Pymts – CA\$H	Mariposa	Jalan	Mono	ISD	Shasta	Jalan, HTE
Amador	CourtView2																																		
Colusa	Ciber																																		
Contra Costa	Civil = ICMS																																		
	Criminal = LIIS																																		
	(county mainframe)																																		
	Traffic = AMORS																																		
	(county mainframe)																																		
Lassen	Ciber																																		
Marin	Criminal – CJIS																																		
	(county mainframe)																																		
	Civil – Beacon																																		
	Traffic – JURIS																																		
	Pymts – CA\$H																																		
Mariposa	Jalan																																		
Mono	ISD																																		
Shasta	Jalan, HTE																																		
11	RFP section 3.1, Proposed Procurement Schedule	Due to the complexity of the requested RFP response, will the JCC consider a 1-week extension to the final proposal due date?	See response to Question 8.																																
12	RFP section 2.5.2, No Payment Prior to Go Live	Regarding section 2.5.2 (No Payment Prior to Go Live) of the main RFP document, would you confirm our understanding that payment milestones for implementation and deployment services (as outlined in Exhibit 3) are acceptable prior to “Go-Live”?	This provision does not apply to the implementation and deployment services as outlined in Exhibit 3.																																

Question #	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
13	RFP section 2.5.4, Upgrades Due to Changes in Law	Regarding section 2.5.4 (Upgrades Due to Changes in Law) of the main RFP document, would you clarify the scope of potential changes “required due to changes in the law or regulations”? For example, would this include potential changes to the Manual of Accounting, JBSIS Implementation Manual, data exchanges with statewide justice partners (e.g., DMV, DOJ, etc.), and/or data exchanges with local justice partners (e.g., Sheriff/Mail, etc.)? Are there any potential mandated statewide or local changes/standards not intended to be covered by this provision?	This would include changes in legislation, the Manual of Accounting, JBSIS Implementation Manual, changes required by statewide justice partners such as DMV and DOJ.
14	RFP section 2.5.5, Non-Scope Upgrades	Regarding section 2.5.5 (Non-Scope Upgrades) of the main RFP document, would you confirm our understanding that “additional fees” refers to additional software licensing or subscription fees and not to fees related to additional deployment services, which may be required for each additional Participating Entity?	This provision relates to a participating entity not paying for the development cost of a “non-scope upgrade” a second time where the development cost have already been paid by another participating entity.
15	Exhibit 3, CMS Implementation and Deployment Requirements	Regarding Tabs 3, 4 and 5 of Exhibit 3 (Implementation and Deployment Requirements), would you clarify the instructions for filling in the “Issue” and “Proposed Solutions/Rationale and Benefit to the Court” columns? For example, should the “Proposed Solution” column be filled out for all rows, or only if needed to provide clarification or identify an Issue with the task description/terms. For the “Issue” column, should an “X” be entered if there is an issue with the task description/terms, or do you want a narrative response in this column?	The Proposed Solutions/Rationale and Benefit to the Court column only need to be completed if the proposer has identified an issue with the requirement. Please use narrative response for issue column.

Question #	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
16	Exhibit 4, Court Specific Information	<p>For each of the 8 Courts identified in Exhibit 4, please provide the following information for each legacy system that requires data migration/conversion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Name and description of each legacy Case Management System (CMS). <input type="checkbox"/> The case types stored in each legacy CMS. <input type="checkbox"/> The approximate number of cases in each legacy CMS. <input type="checkbox"/> The Database Management System (DBMS) and Operating System (OS) used by each legacy CMS. <input type="checkbox"/> If the legacy system has corresponding documents/images that require data migration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name and description of the legacy Document Management System (DMS) used by each legacy CMS. • The approximate number of documents that need to be migrated from each legacy DMS. 	See response to Question 10. All case types are included unless specified on list.
17	Exhibit 4, Court Specific Information	<p>For each of the 8 Courts identified in Exhibit 4, please provide the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Do you intend to replace an existing DMS, or integrate the new CMS with the existing DMS? <input type="checkbox"/> What local data exchanges currently exist with legacy CMS systems? <input type="checkbox"/> What new local data exchanges are currently anticipated with the new CMS system? 	<p>The assumption should be the courts do not have an existing DMS, and the new CMS should include a DMS.</p> <p>Please provide pricing for each of the local exchanges listed in Exhibit 1, section 15.3, based on court size and criminal/traffic filing statistics provided. This should be provided in your response to Exhibit 7.1, Tab 4 Other Costs</p>
18	N/A	<p>Can the Agency/Court identify all other Solutions that an interfacing is required for?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of entity and system being interfaced to? • One way or both ways? • Specs for format? • Transformation required? 	See response to Questions 10 and 17.

Question #	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
19	N/A	Are all the agency/court local interfaces included as part of the requirements?	Pricing should include interfaces as listed in Section 14 and 15.3 in Exhibit 1. Courts may have additional local interfaces not listed, which may be addressed in individual participation agreements.
20	N/A	<p>How many cases will be converted by agency/court?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What systems are they converted from? • What will be converted from each system? • Number of records, size? • Data converted? • Images converted? 	<p>Each court that selects a MSA vendor and enters into a participation agreement with that vendor will have their own data conversion requirements. For number of records, etc. The 2016 Court Statistics Report is located here:</p> <p>http://www.courts.ca.gov/12941.htm</p>
21	N/A	Can you list the source(s) of data for conversion for the agency/court?	The sources vary by each court.
22	N/A	How many cases are processed annually by agency/court?	<p>The 2016 Court Statistics Report is located here:</p> <p>http://www.courts.ca.gov/12941.htm</p>
23	N/A	Do you have a preference between Hosted or On Premises solution?	Each court which chooses to use the MSA will make their own determination on which hosting option works best for their court.
24	N/A	Does the state have a projected start date?	Each court that selects a MSA vendor and enters into a participation agreement with that vendor will have their own project start date.
25	N/A	What is the expected project duration, start date to go-live date?	The guideline for implementation of a participating court is 18 months unless otherwise mutually agreed upon by the court and the Proposer.
26	RFP section 10, Finalists' Presentations (Solutions	What are the format and script requirements for the oral presentations? What dates and length of each session should we be planning for?	The dates for the demonstrations are November 13, 14, and 15, 2017 in Sacramento, CA. Per RFP section 10, Proposers whose proposed products meet the

Question #	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
	Demonstrations and Interviews)		specifications and requirements set forth in this RFP may be asked to provide a live demonstration of their proposed products and the JCC will notify eligible Proposers regarding the demonstration arrangements.
27	RFP section 3.1, Proposed Procurement Schedule	Will you grant at least a 2 week extension due to pre-committed calendars for October and November? Please also consider making the due date not fall on a Monday.	See response to Question 8.
28	RFP section 6.8, Disentanglement Plan	Could you explain what you are expecting us to propose as our Disentanglement Plan? Is the court defining a Disentanglement plan as a plan to get the project back on track if it goes off course? Please clarify your expectations of the disentanglement plan, in the context of the contract status. Where should the associated costs be entered on the cost sheet?	Proposer to describe how it plans to unwind or transition the proposer's CMS to another product at the end of the contract term. Any associated costs should be provided in section 7.1 of Exhibit 8.
29	N/A	Would the JCC be willing to work with the chosen vendor to streamline/unify case workflows for various court types which standardizes case processing for multiple counties? The configurations for each County can be unique, but it will be beneficial, especially for the smaller counties, to standardize the case workflows and business procedures.	The Judicial Council does not have authority over the trial court's business processes. Each trial court has sole discretion on their business processes and court operations.
30	Exhibit 1, CMS Business and Functional Requirements, sections 14 and 15	Please provide a specific set of interfaces for each county. The business and functional requirements matrix currently provides a generic set of interfaces in section 14 and 15; however, in order to arrive at the pricing model for each county we need to know which specific interfaces are required for each of them.	There is no comprehensive listing of the interfaces used by each of the 58 trial courts in California. See response to Question 17.
31	RFP section 1.2, Case Management Systems' Current Status and RFP section 1.3, Objectives and Process	Please provide additional details about the legacy system in each individual county including the number of individual databases, number of tables, and number of records that need to be migrated to the new system.	See response to Question 10.

Question #	RFP Reference (Page-Section)	Question	Response
32	RFP section 6.2, Company Overview and Financial Information	Given the length of our audited financial statements, can Bidders provide these documents in electronic format only?	Yes, we would accept audited financial statements in electronic format.
33	N/A	Is a Bidder allowed to add its company name to the footers on the required response documents such as Exhibit 8, RFP Vendor Response Template?	Yes
34	N/A	Provided all RFP text and formatting is preserved and all responses are readable, can Bidders use their own font types and sizes to provide our responses within our proposal responses (i.e., larger font size for paragraph headings or smaller font size for table text and graphic captions)	Yes
35	N/A	Please confirm that it is not necessary to respond to sections of the RFP that are clearly informational such as 1. Background Information, 2. Description of Goods and Services, 3. Timeline for this RFP, etc. as the structure and format of Exhibit 8 Response Template would not support every RFP Section. Rather, please confirm that the intent of the sentence "Proposers should respond to every section, of this RFP..." refers to all submission requirements for the Non-Cost Proposal Contents and Cost Proposal Contents including all applicable RFP Attachments and Exhibits.	Yes
36	N/A	Can you please tell us what the volumes are for each court for scanning and other services? There is no reference to the volume.	For caseload/court filing statistics, see http://www.courts.ca.gov/12941.htm