

TO: POTENTIAL PROPOSERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts
Information Services Division

DATE: April 16, 2008

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: To issue Addendum Number 1 to ISD2008DM-CT and, as set forth in the attached documents: (1) to publish the AOC's Responses to Vendors' Questions, for those questions received by the deadline; and (2) to strike requirements A2.15 and A3.12 from Attachment 9, Functional Requirements.

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposal ("RFP") as posted at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/>:
Project Title: Document Management for Appellate E-Filing
RFP Number: ISD2008DM-CT

SOLICITATIONS MAILBOX: solicitations@jud.ca.gov

DUE DATE & TIME FOR SUBMITTAL OF QUESTIONS: Deadline for submittal of questions pertaining to solicitation document was:
1:00 p.m. (PDT) on April 11, 2008.

PROPOSAL DUE DATE AND TIME: Proposals must be received by **1:00 p.m. (PDT) on April 30, 2008.**

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals should be sent to:
**Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. ISD2008WCM-SS
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102**

AOC Responses to Vendors' Questions

Question 1.

RFP section 2.5 refers to the cost being exclusive of hardware, yet 6.2 says to include scanners, specifically 10. Does this mean that there is additional budget for hardware over and above the NTE 500K budget for the response?

or

Paragraph 2.5 states: The AOC anticipates investing an estimated total of between \$300,000 and \$500,000 to procure, implement and maintain a document capture and management solution, not inclusive of hardware, through June 30, 2009. Paragraph 6.2 states: Vendors should include pricing for ten (10) scanners in their cost estimate.

Please clarify which hardware is excepted from the proposed \$300 - \$500K budget as paragraph 6.2 implies that "some" hardware is supposed to be included and proposed as part of the cost proposal.

AOC Response to Question 1:

The DMS system will be centrally hosted at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC). As such, the AOC is only requiring vendors to propose software licensing costs for the document management solution. The AOC has separate budget allocated to support installation and hosting of the document management solution at the CCTC. Vendors should include hardware recommendations for the solution as part of their proposal.

Scanner hardware for the document capture stations are part of the budget for this solicitation and should be included in the cost estimates.

Question 2.

The RFP refers to this acquisition being a pilot for an acquisition price NTE \$500K, yet the scope of the project requires an installation of 10 different capture sites. Please explain.

AOC Response to Question 2:

The pilot referred to in RFP (section 5.3) is that of the E-Filing project, not the DMS project which is the subject of this RFP. The DMS must be in place prior to the AOC embarking on implementation of the E-Filing project. The two are connected, but distinct projects. Commencement of the E-Filing pilot project is dependent upon implementation of the DMS.

The actual installation of the production capture sites is not included in the scope of Attachment 5, Statement of Work.

Question 3.

RFP section 2.5 states the AOC anticipates investing \$300,000 to \$500,000 to procure, implement and maintain the EDMS system through June 30, 2009. 5.3 states this implementation is a pilot system to be completed by September 2008 to support one Court of Appeals. The enterprise system as stated throughout this RFP indicates a large-scale deployment. We are assuming that the initial investment by the AOC of up to \$500,000 is for the initial pilot program, one environment (development) and not the full-scale enterprise deployment. Is this correct?

AOC Response to Question 3:

This assumption is not correct. This solicitation is not for a pilot project. The pilot referred to in RFP (section 5.3) is that of the E-Filing project, not the DMS. The DMS must be in place prior to the AOC embarking on implementation of the E-Filing pilot project. The two are connected, but separate and distinct projects. Commencement of the E-Filing project is dependent upon implementation of the DMS. Section 6.0 of the RFP, Software Scope and Licensing Requirements, outlines the scope of the procurement. Attachment 5, Statement of Work, outlines the specific service Deliverables included in the procurement. The *services* only address implementation of the Development environment. However, the AOC intends to fully license the software solution for subsequent production rollout.

Question 4.

Are the of the filings sent to the Appellate Court forwarded via paper or are you receiving CD's and tiff images, electronic documents (such as FTP or LAN fax), etc?

AOC Response to Question 4:

Case documents are received both electronically and in hard (paper) copy.

Question 5.

Are pages numbered in sequence and stamped on the new assembled file upon receipt at the Appellate Court?

AOC Response to Question 5:

No, they are not. Individual documents are numbered and sequenced, but the overall case file is not.

Question 6.

There is a requirement for 24x7 maintenance coverage. The RFP scope document (Attachment 5) states the initial deployment is for a development environment. Is 24x7 support required for this pilot or is this a future requirement?

AOC Response to Question 6:

The RFP does not specifically state any requirement for 24X7 maintenance coverage. The 24x7 coverage referred to in RFP section 1.1.3 refers to coverage provided to the AOC by the California Courts Technology Center.

Resolution Hours stated in Attachment 2, Section 3.4 (b) are subject to proposal and negotiation.

Question 7.

Regarding Attachment 2, Item 4.3 (b) Please explain the Right of Set-off.

AOC Response to Question 7:

The ‘Right of Set-off’ means that should the vendor owe the AOC any money under a particular contract, the AOC would reduce (set-off) any invoice payment to the vendor, by the amount that the vendor owes the AOC under that specific contract. Contract terms and conditions are subject to proposal and negotiation.

Question 8.

Regarding Attachment 2, Item 4.3(f): Is retention for the period of installation for the development system?

AOC Response to Question 8:

Yes. Contract terms and conditions are subject to proposal and negotiation.

Question 9.

The functional requirements listed in Attachment 9 and Attachment 10 differ from the scope document as stated in Attachment 5. Are vendors required to include the price of all modules to meet the functional requirements of Attachment 9 and 10? Are these future requirements desired by the AOC? Should we provide a cost proposal based on Attachment 5’s (Scope of Work) requirements?

AOC Response to Question 9:

Attachment 5, Statement of Work, outlines Deliverables required by the AOC to implement a development environment for the DM solution. System requirements outlined in Attachments 9 and 10 anticipate overall functional and technical requirements for the DMS. Section 6.0 of the RFP, Software Scope and Licensing Requirements, outlines the scope of the procurement. Cost proposals should address the items outlined in Section 6.0, as well as Deliverables-based estimates for services, AOC project team training, Vendor travel and other costs, as broken out in Attachment 6, Cost Submission Matrix, schedules 1 through 5.

Question 10.

The Scope Document (Attachment 5) requires the installation of a Development environment, apparently to be rolled out to the Production environment by trained AOC staff. Page 3 of 6 makes it clear there will be no Vendor deliverable for the production environment and suggests the AOC team will play an active role in the deployment and roll out of the system. Will the vendor be part of the roll out? If so, what role will the vendor play or is this a different phase?

AOC Response to Question 10:

Attachment 5, Statement of Work, is not a scope document. The Statement of Work covers targeted Deliverables the AOC anticipates requiring for implementation of a DMS development environment.

The AOC anticipates that the work product delivered by the vendor in fulfillment of the Deliverables outlined in the SOW, combined with formal training provided to AOC staff will provide AOC staff with adequate knowledge to complete subsequent phases of the DM implementation (e.g. implementation of Staging and Production environments). As the Vendor will be providing maintenance and support for their solution, the AOC does anticipate some level of ongoing involvement with the project.

Question 11.

Attachment 2, Exhibit C asks for a Knowledge Transfer Rate. As we understand it, this is to transfer knowledge from the vendor partner to the AOC staff so they can move the system from Development to Production. Does AOC want an hourly rate or an estimated total cost to provide this knowledge transfer? In order to accomplish this, we need to know the experience level of the AOC's Project Team members, IT Professionals, etc.

AOC Response to Question 11:

Pricing and payment are subject to proposal and discussion.

Question 12.

Regarding RFP section 1.1.2, has a portal been developed for this applications' web interface?

AOC Response to Question 12:

The ACCMS application as outlined in RFP section 1.1.2 has been built out, but will require some customization to work with the DMS. This development work will be completed by the AOC.

Question 13.

Is this system to integrate with the newly designed Web Content management system from RFP ISD2008WCM-SS?"

AOC Response to Question 13:

Integration will ultimately be required, but is not within the scope of this solicitation.

Question 14.

Regarding RFP Section 1.1.5, are we to assume that the 1000 user estimate is for read-only-access to documents, or will these users be contributors of content into the repository?

AOC Response to Question 14:

The 1000 users referred to in RFP section 1.1.5 are potential users of the ACCMS, not the DMS. This information was provided for contextual purposes only. Section 6.0 of

the RFP, Software Scope and Licensing Requirements, outlines the scope of the procurement. Cost proposals should address the items outlined in Section 6.0, as well as Deliverables-based estimates for services, AOC project team training, Vendor travel and other costs, as broken out in Attachment 6, Cost Submission Matrix, schedules 1 through 5. Note that this includes delivery of documents to (read only) users via the ACCMS and client-facing web sites. These users will never interface directly with the DMS.

Question 15.

Are we to assume that the Document Management System is to be integrated to the new CCMS-V4 System or only the Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS) as stated in the proposal, or should we anticipate both?

AOC Response to Question 15:

The Document Management solution will be integrated with the Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS) only, as stated in the RFP. The California Case Management System (CCMS V4) is a separate system from the Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS) and is outside of scope of this solicitation.

Question 16.

In RFP section 1.3, it is stated that the project will deliver services, but in Section 2.5 it states that the total estimated expenditure will be bounded at \$500k and includes software license fees, and maintenance. Are we to anticipate these costs in addition to the services fees or is this estimate inclusive of all costs?

AOC Response to Question 16:

RFP section 2.5 states that the “AOC anticipates investing an estimated total of between \$300,000 and 500,000 to procure, implement and maintain a document capture and management solution, not inclusive of hardware, through June 30, 2009.” Services are required to implement the solution (as outlined in Attachment 5, Statement of Work.) The AOC’s estimated expenditure includes these services, except that solution maintenance and support extending beyond June 30, 2009 (Years 2 – 5 in the Cost Submission Matrix) are not included in the estimates.

Question 17.

This question is related to RFP section 1.3. Are these estimates to be interpreted as software licensing, maintenance fees only or is this estimate inclusive of consulting services, configuration work and development activities?

AOC Response to Question 17:

Cost estimates must address all items outlined in RFP Section 6.0 as well as Deliverables-based estimates for services, AOC project team training, Vendor travel and other costs, as broken out in Attachment 6, Cost Submission Matrix, schedules 1 through 5.

Question 18.

Has the AOC settled on a Document Management System and if so which one has been selected?

AOC Response to Question 18:

The AOC has not settled on a document management system.

Question 19.

In regard to RFP section 6.2, are these images mostly text only (black and white) legal sized sheets and smaller, or will there be color documents, larger sizes and photographic information?

AOC Response to Question 19:

Case documents referenced in RFP section 6.2 are primarily letter sized paper, black and white typewritten transcripts and briefs and other filed documents, (e.g. copies of type written documents that have notations added). However, support for documents of varying size and paper weight is listed as a requirement in Attachment 9, Functional Requirements, item A1.11.

Question 20.

Which version of Microsoft Office is currently being used: 2003 or 2007?

AOC Response to Question 20:

Microsoft Office 2003 is currently in use, but the agency will be migrating to Microsoft Office 2007 in the coming year.

Question 21.

Regarding RFP section 7.4, the training referred to here seems to indicate standard shared services training and not specifically limited to the Document Management Solution. Is this the proper interpretation? If our interpretation is correct, is there existing documentation on the shared services model that we can draw from for creating our training materials.

AOC Response to Question 21:

The training will be specifically limited to the Document Management Solution.

Question 22.

Is traffic on your leased lines through Cisco encrypted site-to-site are should we include encryption functionality with the Document Management system design?

AOC Response to Question 22:

The AOC mandates that all traffic between the workstations and the CCTC must be encrypted. Rather than handling encryption router to router, we require the protocol

itself to be encrypted (e.g. HTTPS instead of HTTP).

Question 23.

Regarding RFP section 7.10, is TIBCO portal the portal system to be use for the Document management systems web integration?

AOC Response to Question 23:

The Integration Services Backbone will be used to transport documents received via the E-Filing Manager. The ISB is implemented on TIBCO at present, however the DMS will not be directly integrated with the E-Filing Manager. The DMS will be integrated with the ACCMS system.

Question 24.

We would like to confirm that E-Filing is not a component of this RFP procurement - is this correct?

AOC Response to Question 24:

This is correct. E-Filing is not a component of this RFP procurement.

Question 25.

In reference to the diagram in RFP section 5.0: E-Filing is represented in this diagram as "E-Filing Service Provider." Does this imply that the implementation of E-Filing will be handled as a service under a subscription model via an E-Filing Service Provider? Would the AOC also be willing to consider an E-Filing approach that is based upon an in-house implementation hosted by the AOC on behalf of the population of California Courts.

AOC Response to Question 25:

As stated above, E-Filing is not a component of this RFP procurement. The AOC prefers not to speculate on future technology choices or procurements.

Question 26.

In reference to RFP section 5.2: The last sentence of this section implies that participating Courts will each implement their own versions of E-Filing in the future. Is this the intent of the California AOC or will E-Filing be handled by the AOC as a separate procurement in the future?

AOC Response to Question 26:

As stated above, E-Filing is not a component of this RFP procurement. The AOC prefers not to speculate on future technology choices or procurements.

Question 27.

Did the AOC consider seeking a single vendor to provide both document management and E-Filing functionality? If so, should a vendor capable of providing both functions respond to the RFP with its comprehensive offering?

or

If there is no current E-Filing in place, is the court looking for web-based submission, hardcopy scanning and indexing to process and integrate with the existing backbone?

AOC Response to Question 27:

E-Filing is not a component of this RFP procurement. Vendors should only address items stated in scope for this procurement.

Question 28.

Does the AOC anticipate the use of a single E-Filing Service Provider to integrate with the Appellate Court Document Management System?

AOC Response to Question 28:

The DMS should be agnostic to the E-Filing provider. The AOC prefers not to speculate on future technology choices or procurements.

Question 29.

Is there an E-Filing system currently in place? If yes, what is the provider and what is the product? Explain integration requirements.

AOC Response to Question 29:

The DMS will not be directly integrated with the E-Filing Solution. The DMS will be integrated with the ACCMS system. There are no integration requirements for the DMS and E-Filing Service Provider or E-Filing Manager.

Question 30.

Where are the 10 locations that will be requiring capture stations?

AOC Response to Question 30:

Appellate Courts are located in San Francisco (2), Los Angeles, Ventura, Sacramento, San Diego, Riverside, Santa Ana, Fresno and San Jose.

Question 31.

Does the solution need to be on the CMAS contract?

AOC Response to Question 31:

No.

Question 32.

(Is the AOC) planning to purchase 5 years of maintenance support?

AOC Response to Question 32:

Cost Proposals should include five (5) years of maintenance and support for the proposed solution. Note that maintenance and support beyond June 30, 2009 will be funded in future budgets.

Question 33.

(Is the AOC open to) Purchase to lease?

AOC Response to Question 33:

This question is unclear to the AOC. Pricing and Purchase are subject to negotiation and discussion.

Question 34.

Will the court be seeking vendor supplied storage for documents or will they be using the existing Court infrastructure?

AOC Response to Question 34:

The AOC will use existing infrastructure and hardware to be installed at the CCTC for document storage. The vendor does not need to consider this in their proposal.

Question 35.

Regarding RFP Section 6.2, the section provides information on the number of stations and annual image volumes; does the 1.8 Million Images represent pages or documents? If documents, can you provide the average number of pages?

AOC Response to Question 35:

The 1.8 Million is an estimate of pages.

Question 36.

In this same section you mention the desire to use OCR to reduce manual tagging, can you provide a breakdown of the forms/documents you would like to configure for OCR indexing as well as the number and types of fields to extract? Can samples be provided?

or

Attachment 9, Item A1.4 refers to optical character recognition. Is OCR to be completed against a standard form, or “free form” against an entire document?

AOC Response to Question 36:

Although the AOC is not prepared to provide a detailed analysis of documents for OCR, the documents are primarily letter sized paper, black and white typewritten briefs and records. Samples of the briefs can be found at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/supreme/highprofile/> , under “Case Documents.”

Question 37.

Is there a requirement to integrate the proposed solution into the CCMS? The AOC has already invested into integrating a product platform with CCMS and this is in production with multiple Trial Courts. Can you provide any additional information on any plans for this project to integrate with the CCMS or leverage the integrations that are already production today with CCMS?

AOC Response to Question 37:

The Document Management solution will be integrated with the Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS) only, as stated in the RFP. The California Case Management System (CCMS) is a separate system from the Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS) and is outside of scope of this solicitation.

Question 38.

Paragraph 6.3 of the RFP states: "AOC estimates that thirty (30) individuals will be licensed, inclusive of two administrators, to directly interface with the DMS." Are these 30 "named" individuals or concurrent users?

AOC Response to Question 38:

Estimates in the RFP are based on named individuals, but the vendor is welcome to propose on either named or concurrent, or both.

Question 39.

Paragraph 1.1.5 of the RFP states: "Currently, ACCMS has been deployed to all of the Courts of Appeal, with rollout to the Supreme Court to be completed later this year. When the rollout is complete, approximately 1,000 court staff will be using the new system."

Is it the intent of the AOC that these 1,000 court staff have access to the documents contained in the Document Management System? Or will all use of the system be limited to the 30 individuals named in paragraph 6.3?

AOC Response to Question 39:

The 1000 users referred to in RFP section 1.1.5 are potential users of the ACCMS, not the DMS. This information was provided for contextual purposes. Section 6.0 of the RFP, Software Scope and Licensing Requirements, outlines the scope of the procurement. The thirty (30) individuals referenced in RFP section 6.3 include court and systems administrators and developers who may need direct access to the DMS to administer the system.

Cost proposals should address the items outlined in Section 6.0, as well as Deliverables-based estimates for services, AOC project team training, Vendor travel and other costs, as broken out in Attachment 6, Cost Submission Matrix, schedules 1 through 5. Note that this includes delivery of documents to (read only) users via the ACCMS and client-facing web sites. These users will never interface directly with the DMS.

Question 40.

Paragraph 1.1.4 and section 1.2 of the RFP refer to the Integration Services Backbone and the Enterprise Technology Architecture currently in place at the CCTC. It is our understanding that there are certain technology standards and services that comprise these functions including Operating Systems, RDBMS, SSO providers, middleware, etc. Is it necessary for the responding vendors to propose these components along with associated costs, or simply document the prerequisite components? For example, if the DMS requires an underlying Oracle database, is it necessary for the vendor to cost propose the Oracle licenses, or simply document that those licenses are necessary for the solution? Paragraph 9.7.6 implies that simply documenting these third party components in the proposal is sufficient. Is this accurate?

AOC Response to Question 40:

It is NOT necessary for the vendor to propose Oracle or Operating System licenses. It is sufficient that the vendor document that those licenses are necessary to the solution, as required by RFP section 9.7.6, inclusive of requisite third party software included in the proposal.

Question 41.

In regards to RFP section 9.15.1 regarding references – in Prime Contractor/Sub Contractor arrangements, must references belong solely to the Prime Contractor or can Sub-Contractor references also be utilized?

AOC Response to Question 41:

Sub-Contractor references may be utilized, provided they meet the reference criteria outlined in RFP section 9.15.1.

Question 42.

RFP section 6.2 indicates that there are 1.8 Million scanned images per year throughout the AOC. Should bidders assume that these 1.8 million images are evenly distributed among the 10 locations, or can more specific metrics be provided?

AOC Response to Question 42:

Vendors can assume that heavier concentrations of images will be scanned in 1st (San Francisco), 2nd (Los Angeles and Ventura) and 4th district (Santa Ana, Riverside and San Diego) appellate court locations. Specific metrics are not available at this time.

Question 43.

Attachment 9, General Question D refers to external users having access to the ACCMS system to “access, modify, copy and/or print documents” contained in the DMS. Please clarify and quantify these external users. Are the costs associated with these external users provided for in the existing budget?

AOC Response to Question 43:

Attachment 9, General Question D refers to internal and external users. Modification

of documents only applies to internal users. External users will only have access to documents via client-facing web sites. They will never interface directly with the DMS. Per RFP section 6.4, Document Intake and Delivery, the Vendor should propose additional licensing to support delivery of documents via web sites, if required.

Question 44.

Attachment 9, Item A1.1 refers to migration of legacy documents. Is this a migration of physical documents, or are there existing electronic documents which require migration. If electronic, please clarify the type of content and quantity to be migrated.

AOC Response to Question 44:

The AOC may choose to migrate existing paper and electronic documents to the DMS. However, migration of documents is not in scope for this solicitation.

Question 45.

Please expand on requirement A2.15. The business use case is unknown. While our solution is ODBC compliant, it is not understood what is being required of our solution in this requirement..

AOC Response to Question 45:

This requirement (A2.15) is not relevant to this solicitation and has been stricken from the RFP.

Question 46.

Item A3.9 refers to triggering Workflow A. Does the AOC require a workflow solution as part of the DMS proposal, or is this requirement simply an example of where integration might be required with a 3rd party Workflow system? If a workflow solution is required, please indicate the desired workflow capabilities not otherwise addressed in this Attachment 9.

AOC Response to Question 46:

Requirement A3.9 is an example of where integration might be required with a 3rd party workflow system. This solicitation does not require workflow capabilities, but should support workflow integration.

Question 47.

Attachment 10, Item 12 – “System shall support operating systems, browser and productivity applications included in agency SOEs”. Please define these agency SOEs.

AOC Response to Question 47:

The agency and appellate court Standard Operating Environment (SOE) is defined in RFP Section 7.0, Current Networking and Computing Environments.

THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS (A2.15 AND A3.12) HAVE BEEN STRICKEN FROM ATTACHMENT 9, FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS:

A2.15	System shall allow users to build, manage and share database-driven applications (currently use MS Access).		
A3.12	Document management component shall integrate seamlessly with other key modules of the ECM solution, including digital asset management, web content management and learning content management.		