



Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts

Finance Division
455 Golden Gate Avenue ♦ San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
Telephone 415-865-7960 ♦ Fax 415-865-4325 ♦ TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

WILLIAM C. VICKREY
Administrative Director of the Courts

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
Chief Deputy Director

CHRISTINE HANSEN
Director
Finance Division

TO: POTENTIAL BIDDERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts
Information Systems Division

DATE: January 27, 2003

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
WEB ACCESS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposals ("RFP"):
Project Title: Web Access Management System
RFP Number: IS-03-01

DEADLINE: **Proposals must be received by 5 p.m. on February 28, 2003**

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals should be sent to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:

NAME:	TEL:	FAX:	E-MAIL:
Mark Yuan	415-865-7470	415-865-7496	mark.yuan@jud.ca.gov

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Background

The Judicial Council of California, chaired by the Chief Justice of California, is the chief policy making agency of the California judicial system. The California Constitution directs the Council to improve the administration of justice by surveying judicial business, recommending improvements to the courts, and making recommendations annually to the Governor and the Legislature. The Council also adopts rules for court administration, practice, and procedure, and performs other functions prescribed by law. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency for the Council and assists both the Council and its chair in performing their duties.

1.2 Information Services Division

The AOC Information Services Division coordinates court technology statewide, manages centralized statewide technology efforts, optimizes the scope and accessibility of accurate statewide judicial information, and supports statewide coordination of judicial branch technology.

System environment:

- Unix platform, Sun Solaris, OS 5.6
- Novell Netware 5.1 file server OS
- Cold Fusion 5.0
- Oracle 8, Oracle 9i
- Microsoft Windows 2000 desktop
- Microsoft Exchange
- Apache web server 1.3.37

2.0 PURPOSE OF THIS RFP

The AOC Information Services Division seeks an enterprise-wide web access management solution. This solution will provide authentication services for both internal and outward-facing web applications, allowing for single sign-on, personalization and the safeguarding of restricted pages and files from unauthorized access.

3.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES

3.1 Web Access Management Overview

The AOC requires a web access management system, initially, for up to 10,000 licenses.

3.2 Requirements

3.2.1 Multiple Authentication Capabilities

The selected solution must be able to authenticate in more than one fashion. Specifically, the solution must be able to authenticate using at least the following methods:

3.2.1.1 UserID/Password

The ability to authenticate using UserID/Password combinations is a requirement. The ability to specify password policies is desirable, but not essential. Some delay imposed after a specified number of failed attempts is required.

3.2.1.2 Certificate

The ability to authenticate using digital certificates from trusted third-party certificate authorities is a requirement.

3.2.1.3 Token

The ability to authenticate using tokens which provide a changing code, in combination with a UserID/Password combination is a requirement.

3.2.1.4 Custom/Form-based

The ability to construct our own custom authentication screen which may or may not incorporate other information beyond a UserID/Password combination is a requirement. This implies the ability to use a user-constructed custom authentication routine which can be called by the access management system, that is, an API to the access management system must be available.

3.2.2 Single Sign-On

The access management system must provide for single sign-on. A single authentication challenge will be provided and access to multiple systems must be possible.

3.2.3 Password and Access Management

3.2.3.1 Ability to delegate to local authority for local administration of access

The system should provide for remote administration which can be delegated by a central authority. For example, a central Los Angeles facility can authorize a San Francisco authority to manage local San Francisco users.

3.2.3.2 Ability to reset password without HelpDesk intervention

The ability to have passwords e-mailed to users without HelpDesk intervention is required. User will specify the answer to a previously entered query or hint, then the password will be e-mailed to the e-mail address previously entered upon setting up the password.

3.2.4 Architecture

3.2.4.1 Runs in Unix and Microsoft environments

The ability to run on Solaris is a requirement, but the ability to run either on Solaris or Windows 2000 server is desirable, as is the ability to run under Linux.

3.2.4.2 Extensible architecture

The ability to have multiple authentication servers for scalability or redundancy is a requirement. The ability to run simultaneously with multiple policy stores (e.g., Active Directory and Netscape LDAP and Oracle) is a requirement

3.2.4.3 Ability to assign privileges by role

Roles must be assigned to UserIDs. These roles will differ between systems. That is, a User may have multiple roles within a single system, and multiple roles in many systems. That User would use a different UserID to gain access to the privileges for each distinct role in each system.

3.2.4.4 Cannot require client-side software except for a browser (Netscape and Internet Explorer)

No client software will be required for the web access management system at the client, beyond a browser (IE 5.0+).

3.2.5 Performance

3.2.5.1 Scalability to tens of thousands of users

It's not anticipated that our needs will go beyond the 10-30 thousand user range, at least for some time, but the system should be able to scale to 50,000 users.

3.3 Hardware and Software

3.3.1 The vendor's proposal must include specifications for all hardware requirements to implement the web access management solution.

3.4 Staff Training

A list training included with the purchase of the product must be included. In addition, a list of training courses available and price schedule must be included. Consultant fees for installation and/or training must also be listed.

3.5 Completion Date

Assuming a mid-March decision, an estimated installation/deployment date should be included, along with assumptions as to the number of consultants and/or training required to do the installation. Assume the hardware and network resources are available.

4.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL

The following information shall be included in the proposal:

- 4.1 Name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and social security number or federal tax identification number.
- 4.2 Five (5) copies of the proposal signed by an authorized representative of the company, including name, title, address, and telephone number of one individual who is the responder's designated representative.
- 4.3 Resumes describing the background and experience of key staff, as well as each individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities.

- 4.4 Describe key staff's knowledge of the requirements necessary to complete this project.
- 4.5 Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of five (5) clients for whom the consultant has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the consultant.
- 4.6 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.
- 4.7 Overall plan with time estimates for completion of all work required.
- 4.8 Method to complete the Project:

Work plan should include descriptions of the following:
 - 4.8.1 Proposed system utilizing the basic format outlined in this RFP.
 - 4.8.2 Necessary hardware and software solutions and costs needed to create and maintain this system.
 - 4.8.3 Proposed installation and deployment plan
 - 4.8.4 Time estimates for installation, testing and deployment of the system

5.0 COST PROPOSAL

The AOC requires a web access management system, initially, for up to 10,000 licenses. A price schedule for 1,000, 5,000, 10,000, 20,000 , 30,000 and 50,000 licenses, along with maintenance fees must be provided.

Submit a detailed line item budget showing total cost of the product(s), licenses and services. Fully explain and justify all budget line items in a narrative entitled "Budget Justification."

The total cost for consultant services will not exceed \$10,000.00 inclusive of personnel, materials, computer support, travel, lodging, per diem, and overhead rates. The method of payment to the consultant will be by cost reimbursement.

6.0 RIGHTS

The AOC reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, as well as the right to issue similar RFPs in the future. This RFP is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract and in no way is the AOC or the State of California responsible for the cost of preparing the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and becomes a public record.

Only written responses will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered or certified mail or by hand delivery. The RFP respondent may send the AOC an advance copy by facsimile to the Project Manager at the fax number listed in Section 7.0, below. However, sending an advance copy by fax does not satisfy the submission requirements of paragraph 4.2.

7.0 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Project Manager for this RFP process is:

Mark Yuan
Information Services
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
(415)865-7470
(415)865-7496
mark.yuan@jud.ca.gov

8.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals will be evaluated by the AOC using the following criteria:

- a. Quality of work plan submitted
- b. Experience on similar assignments
- c. Credentials of staff to be assigned to the project
- d. Ability to meet timing requirements to complete the project
- e. Reasonableness of cost projections
- f. Total cost of the proposal
- g. Degree to which the product meets the requirements

9.0 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

It may be necessary to interview prospective service providers to clarify aspects of their submittal. If conducted, interviews will likely be conducted by telephone conference call. The AOC will notify prospective service providers regarding the interview arrangements.

10.0 PROPOSED CONTRACT TERMS AND ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Contracts with successful firms will be signed by the parties on a State of California Standard Agreement form and will include terms appropriate for this project. Generally, the terms of the contract will include, but are not limited to: (1) completion of the project within the timeframe provided; (2) no additional work authorized without prior approval; (3) no payment without prior approval; (4) funding availability subject to Legislature; (5) termination of contract under certain conditions; (6) indemnification of the State; (7) approval by the State of any subcontractors; (8) national labor relations board, drug-free workplace, nondiscrimination, and ADA requirements; and (9) minimum appropriate insurance requirements.

Incorporated in this RFP, and attached as Attachment A, is a document entitled "Administrative Rules Governing Requests for Proposals. Service providers shall follow these rules in preparation of their proposals.

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES GOVERNING REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS

A. General

1. This solicitation document, the evaluation of proposals, and the award of any contract shall conform with current competitive bidding procedures as they relate to the procurement of goods and services. A vendor's proposal is an irrevocable offer for 30 days following the deadline for its submission.
2. A nondiscrimination clause will be included in any contract that ensues from this solicitation document.
3. In addition to explaining the State's requirements, the solicitation document includes instructions which prescribe the format and content of proposals.

B. Errors in the solicitation document

1. 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.
2. 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 or time by reason of the error or its later correction.

C. Questions regarding the solicitation document

1. 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, conspicuously marking it as "CONFIDENTIAL." With the question, the vendor must submit a statement explaining why the question is sensitive.

Attachment A

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.

2. If a vendor submitting a proposal believes that one or more of the solicitation document's requirements is 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 **Mark Yuan** at the Administrative Office of the Courts by **5:00 p.m. PST** on February 14, 2003.

D. Addenda

1. The State may modify the solicitation document prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by faxing an addendum to the vendors to whom the solicitation document was sent. If any vendor determines that an addendum unnecessarily restricts its ability to bid, it must notify **Mark Yuan** at the Administrative Office of the Courts no later than one day following the receipt of the addendum.

E. Withdrawal and resubmission/modification of proposals

1. A vendor may withdraw its proposal at any time prior to the deadline for submitting proposals by notifying the State in writing of its withdrawal. The notice must be signed by the vendor. The vendor may thereafter submit a new or modified proposal, provided that it is received at the Administrative Office of the Courts no later than **5:00 p.m. PST** on February 28, 2003. Modification offered in any other manner, oral or written, will not be considered. Proposals cannot be changed or withdrawn after **5:00 p.m. PST** on February 28, 2003.

F. Evaluation process

1. An evaluation team will review in detail all proposals that are received to determine the extent to which they comply with solicitation document requirements.
2. 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.

3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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 nonresponsive.

G. Rejection of bids

1. 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 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 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.

H. Award of contract

1. 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.
2. 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.

I. Decision

Attachment A

1. 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 **Mark Yuan at the address provided above.**

J. Execution of contracts

1. The State will make a reasonable effort to execute any contract based on this solicitation document within 30 days of selecting a proposal that best meets its requirements.
2. A vendor submitting a proposal must be prepared to use a standard state contract form rather than its own contract form.

K. Protest procedure

1. The Administrative Office of the Courts intends to be completely open and fair to all vendors in selecting the best possible system within budgetary and other constraints described in the solicitation document. In applying evaluation criteria and making the selection, members of the evaluation team will exercise their best judgment.
2. A vendor submitting a proposal may protest the award if it meets all the following conditions:
 - a. the vendor has submitted a proposal which it believes to be responsive to the solicitation document;
 - b. 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
 - c. the vendor believes that the State has incorrectly selected another vendor submitting a proposal for an award.
3. A vendor submitting a proposal who is qualified to protest should contact the Contract Officer at the Administrative Office of the Courts at the address given below or call him at 415-865-7989.

Stephen Saddler
Contracts Officer
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

Attachment A

4. If the Contract Officer 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:

Grant Walker
Business Services Manager
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

A receipt should be requested for hand-delivered material.

L. News releases

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

M. Disposition of materials

1. 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 was clearly marked as such will be returned upon request.

N. Payment

1. Payment terms will be specified in any agreement that may ensue as a result of this solicitation document.
2. **THE STATE DOES NOT MAKE ANY ADVANCE PAYMENT FOR SERVICES.** Payment is normally made based upon completion of tasks as provide in the agreement between the State and the selected vendor. The State may withhold ten percent of each invoice until receipt of the final product. The amount of the withhold may depend upon the length of the project and the payment schedule provide in the agreement between the State and the selected vendor.