TO:	POTENTIAL PROPOSERS
FROM:	Administrative Office of the Courts Information Services Division
DATE:	August 24, 2007
SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO:	To issue Addendum Number 1 to ISD2007ETMS-SS to publish the AOC's Responses to Vendors' Questions, for those questions received by the deadline.
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/enttestmgmt-rfp.htm Project Title: Enterprise Test Management Suite RFP Number: ISD2007ETMS-SS
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. (PST) on August 16, 2007.**
PROPOSAL DUE DATE AND TIME:	Proposals must be received by **1:00 p.m. (PST) on September 14, 2007.**
SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL:	Proposals should be sent to: **Judicial Council of California** **Administrative Office of the Courts** **Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. ISD2007ETMS-SS** **455 Golden Gate Avenue** **San Francisco, CA 94102**

AOC Responses to Vendors' Questions

Question 1.

I would like to know if there is a location for the pre proposal teleconference (or is it only via phone?)

AOC Response to Question 1:

The proposal teleconference is only via phone. The RFP document specifies the Pre-Proposal teleconference numbers to dial on page 16, Table 6.1.1 Key Events and Dates.

Question 2.

Will you be contracting with an independent, third-party quality assurance auditor to conduct oversight and risk management for the AOC as it implements the Enterprise Test Management Suite (ETMS)?

If so, we would like to submit a proposal for that part of the work.

AOC Response to Question 2:

The AOC does not plan to contract an independent, third-party quality assurance auditor to conduct oversight and risk management for this project.

Question 3.

Concerning the ETMS RFP, are any tools currently being used for Test Management, Defect Tracking and Source Control? If so what tools, data volumes and hardware are dedicated to these systems?

AOC Response to Question 3:

The RFP document specifies current tools used in Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.4, and 1.3.4. The RFP document specifies estimated data volumes for each tool in Sections 10.19.3, 10.29.3, and 10.39.3.

The RFP document does not specify hardware dedicated to these systems because the hardware is not in scope for this RFP. The RFP document specifies Proposals should clearly define any expectations vendor has of the AOC or the courts to provide any hardware in Section 10.16.9.

Also, for each tool's implementation plan, the RFP document specifies that vendors should recommend hardware for the Development and Production environments for each proposed tool in Sections 10.20.5.1, 10.30.5.1, and 10.40.5.1.

Question 4.

The RFP states that vendors can respond to all or part of the tools required by the Courts. It also states that vendors must submit a bid for consulting services with whatever tools they propose.

Can a "services" vendor submit a bid for the consulting services and implementation/deployment services without proposing a tool. The first part of the proposal would include an un-biased evaluation and recommendation of tools in each category and then the services required to implement the solution.

There was no statement in the RFP which indicated a "services" only proposal would be accepted.

AOC Response to Question 4:

No. RFP Section 2.4 specifies that the RFP is structured so tools may be evaluated individually as a best of breed tool and set of consulting services for the AOC. Proposing both tool and consulting services is required in order to fairly evaluate side-by-side best of breed tools as discussed in Sections 12.8 and 12.9. If a vendor only proposes consulting services and no test tool, the proposal would be considered unresponsive as a best of breed tool proposal and not evaluated.

RFP Sections 2.5.2 and 10.5 encourage vendors to leverage partnerships with one another to provide a single-vendor solution and proposal to the AOC.

Question 5.

Does the AOC adhere to any specific methodologies for IT or testing? (Examples: ITIL, SEI/CMMi, Catalysts, Method 1, etc) If yes, does our proposal need to reflect the appropriate deliverables, approach and plans?

AOC Response to Question 5:

No. The AOC adheres to different test methodologies for the various types of applications with use cases, test scripts and the legacy products discussed in RFP Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.4, 1.3.4, 10.19.3, 10.29.3, and 10.39.3. Vendors may propose a specific IT methodology with the proposed deliverables, approach or plans in order to structure responses to the RFP and / or give examples in order to communicate recommended methodologies or concepts to adhere to as indicated in the following RFP Sections 10.20.1 through 10.20.2.4, 10.30.1 through 10.30.2.4, 10.40.1 through 10.40.2.4.

Currently, the AOC creates use cases and test scripts in Microsoft® Word and Excel that are manually executed by Engineers, Quality Assurance Analysts and Subject-Matter-Experts. Also, the AOC uses automated scripts developed with HP Mercury tools for load, stress, performance testing, etc., as described in the workbooks of Appendices A, B and C. Please refer to the Test Category Definitions worksheet in each Appendix workbook that defines the AOC's test categories and presents a typical order of how the tests are executed.

Question 6.

From Appendix A, Test Management Tool Requirements, User Interface, Item No. 11: "Proven 99% uptime. Guarantee proposed solution will perform with a variety of technical platforms, plug ins, and should commit to java, html codes, etc., that may be used with the test tool, including various Java and Crystal Reporting versions." – Can it be clarified what exactly is being asked for beyond 99% uptime?

AOC Response to Question 6:

The AOC requests proven 99% uptime for the proposed solution to mean the solution will be reliable and available for at 99% of the time based on the proposed solution's quality and performance. The proposed tool must be a proven, mature product that will not easily fail or require extensive troubleshooting with a variety of industry standard technical platforms and types of code, and run on vendor's recommended hardware configuration that will provide for 99% uptime.

Question 7.

Since the RFP addresses converting test assets from HP Mercury LoadRunner and WinRunner, we presume the intent is to execute those converted scripts on another test tool. Do you intend for us to propose those test tools as well even though that was not stated in the RFP? We intend to propose IBM Rational Functional Tester and IBM Rational Performance Tester.

AOC Response to Question 7:

Vendors should propose test tools that will meet the requirements detailed in RFP Appendix A, Test Management Tool Requirements to address functionality currently provided by HP Mercury LoadRunner and WinRunner products.

RFP Sections 1.1.4.7 and 1.1.4.8 state the AOC's expected outcome from soliciting proposals is to purchase software and services from vendor(s) who best meet the ETMS requirements, and to install and configure, complete data conversions, train resources, and implement the selected best of breed test tools. Each vendor needs to determine and propose the suite of tool(s) required in order to meet the requirements.

Question 8.

How many concurrent users of Test Management, Defect Tracking, and Source Control software are expected? This is necessary information for us to determine cost.

AOC Response to Question 8:

RFP Section 1.2.4 provides an overview of the types of AOC testing roles, and estimates 50-100 concurrent users statewide.

Question 9.

How many users need to be trained in the use of Test Management, Defect Tracking and Source Control software? This is necessary information for us to determine cost.

AOC Response to Question 9:

The AOC will not have a total number of users to train for each tool until the final scope of the selected tool(s) and consulting services is determined as discussed in RFP Section 12.10. RFP Section 1.2.4 provides an overview of the types of AOC testing roles, and estimates 50-100 concurrent users statewide.

RFP Sections 10.14.6, 10.18 through 10.18.5, 10.24.6, 10.28 through 10.28.5, 10.34.6, 10.38 through 10.38.5 discuss the AOC's training requirements and request vendors to make the appropriate training recommendations for each proposed tool.

For the Attachment 6 – Cost Submission Matrix, vendors need to indicate the cost of the proposed or necessary training course(s) on a per person basis, for each proposed tool. Vendors are to complete Column F - Fee Per User/Employee for each proposed tool, as applicable, in order to explain costs.

Question 10.

The RFP is for the training and tool provisioning of AOC personnel for data conversion and test moving mostly from an HP Mercury environment to "selected" tools. Our response will be based on using IBM Rational tools for Test Management, Defect Management, and SCM, specifically ClearQuest, ClearQuest TestManager, and ClearCase. Does this meet the requirement?

AOC Response to Question 10:
Vendors should propose test tools that will meet the requirements and the test category definitions detailed in RFP Appendices A – C to address functionality currently used in the HP environment.

Additional RFP Sections for product details (i.e. RFP Sections 10.12 through 10.21.2, 10.22 through 10.31.2, 10.32 through 10.41.2) will also expand on the AOC's requirements. The AOC is unable to specifically state if the named products will meet the AOC's requirements until the vendor's proposal is reviewed and evaluated.

Question 11.
All software provided is IBM commercially available and as such its use and licensing in governed by the IBM standard license agreement. AOC has previously procured IBM software under that licensing agreement. Does this meet your requirement?

AOC Response to Question 11:
The AOC requires a current software license agreement to be submitted with each proposed tool. RFP Section 2.8.1.9 states that vendors must submit vendor's standard software license agreement for each proposed tool as well as any proposed changes to Attachment 2.

Question 12.
Deliverables include Use Cases. Is there a preferred tool or format at AOC?

AOC Response to Question 12:
RFP Appendix A, Test Management Tool Requirements, Section *II. Test Planning,* # 9 and # 11 specify both test cases and requirements are written in Microsoft applications (e.g. Excel, Word).

Ideally, the proposed tool will provide enhanced capability/functionality so that users will not have to use separate tools for modeling, documentation, and execution, etc., and will simply access the proposed tool for use case development regardless of their various levels of expertise.

Question 13.
How large and how many files of each type are estimated to be converted?

AOC Response to Question 13:
The AOC does not have the size of the files readily available for the data volumes given in the RFP. RFP Sections 10.19.3, 10.29.3, and 10.39.3 describe how many files for each type are estimated for conversion as of March 2007.

Question 14.
How much historical source code needs to be converted from PVCS?

AOC Response to Question 14:
The AOC will not have a total scope of historical source code to convert until the final scope of the selected tool(s) and consulting services is determined as discussed in RFP Section 12.10. RFP Section 10.39.3.1 gives an estimate of 14,100 files in PVCS as of March 2007.

Question 15.

What is the estimated award date?

AOC Response to Question 15:

RFP Section 6.1.1 states Q4 2007 as an estimated Key Date. The same RFP section has Key Event No. 7, Finalists Product Demonstrations / Interviews scheduled to occur October 15-19, 2007.

Question 16.

With regard to the project requirement, are Open-source Tools acceptable, as long as the deployment and supporting options meet expectations?

AOC Response to Question 16:

Open-source Tools are acceptable provided the license of these open source tools are reviewed and approved by the AOC as part of the vendor's response as described in RFP Sections 10.1.3. Vendor must provide an official vendor description of open source distribution restrictions, if any, costs, etc., as requested in RFP Sections 10.12.12 through 10.12.13, 10.22.12 through 10.22.13, and 10.32.12 through 10.32.13, as well as in the Attachment 6 – Cost Submission Matrix for each proposed tool.

Question 17.

Can we understand the timeframe given replacing the current legacy system with the new systems? We would like to understand duration given across all the existing sites and central location of the repositories. We are looking at the following break-up as provided in the document

1. 8,300 test cases in TestDirector™
2. 9,560 defects in TestDirector™ (if applicable to tool)
3. 200 issues in TestDirector™ (if applicable to tool)
4. 100 requirements in TestDirector™
5. 54 Mercury LoadRunner® scripts
6. 71 WinRunner® scripts

AOC Response to Question 17:

RFP Sections 10.20.1, 10.30.1, and 10.40.1 state the timeframe given for replacing the current legacy system is 60-90 days upon contract execution. An estimate of four (4) locations (Burbank, Newark, Sacramento, and San Francisco, as outlined in Attachment 2, Exhibit M) and possibly a third-party vendor site in Santa Ana have legacy systems and repositories.

The AOC will determine the final scope and sites to be replaced after the final scope of the selected tool(s) and consulting services are determined as discussed in RFP Section 12.10.

Question 18.

The important information would be to provide information regarding how many test cases are in these scripts. For example 71 scripts can have 1000 test cases each or 10 test cases which could effect the overall deliverable duration and resources enormously. Can we have some idea of

average number of test cases in the functional testing areas and performance testing areas.

AOC Response to Question 18:
The AOC can not provide the exact number of test cases for Mercury LoadRunner® or WinRunner® scripts until the AOC determines the final scope and sites to be replaced after the final scope of the selected tool(s) and consulting services is determined as discussed in RFP Section 12.10.

Question 19.
Can we know interface of the following applications? It would be great if the contractors can be given opportunity to view sample applications on the following. If it is not possible, can we request for three major aspects of these applications. Please provide us the Operating System, Browser/Client-Server Mode, Number of Users and protocol details relevant for

1. California Case Management Systems (CCMS)
2. Appellate Court Case Management Systems (ACCMS)
3. Web Development
4. Enterprise Resource Planning applications
5. Computer Aided Facilities Management System (CAFM)
6. Data Integration / Information Systems Backbone (ISB)
7. Information Exchange Standards
8. Custom Developed Applications
9. New commercial-off-the-shelf acquisitions
10. Technical Infrastructure & User Support
11. Technology Center Shared Services.

It makes architectural differences for designing test management and test suite design based on the above parameters.

AOC Response to Question 19:
To expand on RFP Section 1.1.3, the AOC has both custom developed and commercial off the shelf applications. The AOC uses TIBCO for Data Integration/Information Systems Backbone, SAP for the Enterprise Resource Planning using the SAP Graphical User Interface, TRIRIGA for the Computer Aided Facilities Management System, and details technical infrastructure and system requirements, as well as technology center shared services requirements in each Appendix A, B, and C workbook that should be reviewed in addition to the RFP product details sections.

The Operating System is Solaris 9, Browser/Client-Server Mode is Microsoft® IE 6.0 and later, and the protocol is mostly the secure hypertext transfer protocol (HTTPS). RFP Section 1.2.4 provides an overview of the types of AOC testing roles, and estimates 50-100 concurrent users statewide.

Question 20.
How many users will require access to the defect tracking tool?

AOC Response to Question 20:
RFP Section 1.2.4 provides an overview of the types of AOC testing roles, and estimates 50-100 concurrent users statewide.

Question 21.

How many users will require access to the source repository?

AOC Response to Question 21:

RFP Section 1.2.4 provides an overview of the types of AOC testing roles, and estimates 50-100 concurrent users statewide

Question 22.

How many users by job description are in the QA/CM department; Or perform these job functions.

AOC Response to Question 22:

The AOC does not have the total number of users by job description for the QA/CM department because this information is managed by third party consultants.

RFP Section 1.2.4 provides an overview of the types of AOC testing roles, and estimates 50-100 concurrent users statewide.

Question 23.

Please provide as much detail as possible on the legacy data that needs to be converted into the defect tracking tool and the source control tool. This could include the number of records, the specific data elements and the source applications and formats.

AOC Response to Question 23:

RFP Section 10.29.3 lists estimates of legacy data types and volumes to be converted into the defects tracking tool. RFP Section 10.39.3 lists estimates of legacy data types and volumes to be converted into the source control tool.

Question 24.

Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Appendix B, User Interface, Item # 4: Adhere to section 508 standards for disabilities. Standards shall apply to both test repository output and to the solution interface used by administrators and content developers (1194.21 and 1194.22). Where can we find information about 508 standards for disabilities?

AOC Response to Question 24:

Several internet sites will provide you with information about 508 standards for disabilities, e.g. http://www.section508.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=Content&ID=3 .

Question 25.

Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, User Interface, Item # 6: The tool must accept attachments created with Microsoft Excel, Word, PowerPoint, Screenshots, HTML, PDF or any other commonly used desktop software application. Is it acceptable if these are created and attached using links (URL) and stored in the database?

AOC Response to Question 25:

The AOC will review and evaluate the vendor's response to the tool requirement in side-by-side comparison as outlined in RFP Sections 12.8 through 12.10. Vendors may add requirement comments to the specific tool requirement as specified in RFP Section 5.2.

Question 26.

Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, User Interface, Item # 7: Provide ability to modify/update multiple defects in transactions. We are assuming that once the defects are created and stored in the database then the application will allow a user(s) to update any information that are associated with the defect. Please confirm if this is acceptable? Please validate our assumption.

AOC Response to Question 26:

This requirement is addressing the need for multiple defects being modified or updated in a parent/child relationship, showing all defects related to the initial defect or parent. As part of the development process, sometimes the need exists to update the status of multiple defects. Also, the update or modification operation has to behave like a database transaction; either all succeed or fail.

Question 27.

Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, User Interface, Item # 10: Provide ability to split or consolidate defects. Please elaborate upon your definition of split or consolidate defects. Currently we rated this item as item 2 which we can customize once we understand the requirements.

AOC Response to Question 27:

Ideally a defect logged should just document one defect. At times users enter multiple defects into one defect. This requirement is the ability to split such a defect into multiple individual defects. Similarly, sometimes multiple testers log the same issue with slightly different descriptions. Consolidation of these defects into one is the requirement.

Question 28.

Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, User Interface, Item # 11: Provide ability to establish dependencies between defects. We are assuming that this item is stating that the application should have the ability to categorize defects thus all the defects can be grouped. Please validate our assumption.

AOC Response to Question 28:

Fixing some defects in the application may depend on addressing another defect in the system first. This requirement is to establish such dependencies between defects, as well as group them to assign to a single developer.

Question 29.

Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Defects Tracking, Item # 6: Provides rule-based escalation of notifications for defects. Please elaborate on rule-based escalation of notifications for defects.

AOC Response to Question 29:

As an example: potentially each defect will be assigned a duration for fixing. If the defect is not fixed in time, or the developer has an unplanned absence, an escalation rule may notify the supervisor of the delays and the need for addressing the defect. The requirement's assumption is that the tool provides the rules and they can be configured.

Question 30.

Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Workflow, Item #1: Provide out of the box workflows. Please elaborate on the purpose/functionality of the workflows.

AOC Response to Question 30:
A typical defect has a defined workflow in an organization. This workflow involves creation, prioritization, assignment, fix, fix verification and finally closure. If not exact, most of the organizations follow a similar workflow. At each of the steps there will be notifications to proper people, and escalation to proper people under certain conditions. The workflow defines where the defect gets routed and proper notifications and escalations at each of the steps. Some products come with out of the box workflows which can be customized to the needs of the organization.

Question 31.
Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Customization, Item #1: Allow for customization of labels, fields and pull down menus in the defect creation and defect search forms. We are assuming that the application should have the ability to dynamically relabel a fields name, pull down menus, etc. Please validate our assumption.

AOC Response to Question 31:
In addition to relabeling the fields, the product should have the ability to add custom items to the pull down lists as well.

Question 32.
Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Customization, Item #2: Provide ability to add additional fields and pull down menus on the forms as well as repositories. This item is very similar to Item #1. Please validate our assumption.

AOC Response to Question 32:
While the Customization Item #1, above, concerns modifying and relabeling of items, this requirement is about the ability to customize the forms in the defect tracking tool itself. This includes adding additional fields to the form and associating any actions and workflow logic, described in the workflow section above. The fields may involve adding additional database columns to the existing tables.

Question 33.
Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Customization, Item #3: Custom entries for statuses, versions, testing cycles, and applications. Please elaborate and give some examples

AOC Response to Question 33:
If the defect tracking tool does not provide the fields to accommodate the items mentioned in Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirement workbook, *Section IV. Customization,* # 3, the proposed tool needs to have the ability to add new drop down lists with custom entries into these fields. For example, the defect status list item descriptions should be changeable, likewise for application versions that produce the defect, and so on.

Question 34.
Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Reporting, Item #2: Provide access to view data and statistics across multiple projects, vendors, implementation sites, and applications etc., "slice-n-dice" as needed (ad hoc reporting). Please elaborate on view data and statistics across multiple projects, vendors, implementation sites. What is the meaning of "slice-n-dice" and ad hoc reporting? Please give some examples.

AOC Response to Question 34:

As mentioned in Attachment B – Defects Tracking Tool Requirement workbook, Section *VII. System Requirement* # 5, the AOC envisions this tool to be deployed in multiple AOC locations and vendor locations on different projects in a master/master and or master/slave configuration. This reporting requirement is to provide interactive reports across all projects, all instances of deployment, which can be drilled down to various levels. The key metrics (defects outstanding, etc.) of the reports should have the capability to drill down by vendor, application, developer, location, tester, release version of the application and so on. Ad-hoc report is a report that a user can create on the fly.

Question 35.

Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Reporting, Item #3: Include robust reporting capability (with the majority of reporting needs covered with canned reports) and the capability to create and publish custom reports to cover AOC specific needs.
Please provide examples of the top 5 critical reports

AOC Response to Question 35:

The following are some examples of reports, in no particular order of importance:

1. **Defects Outstanding by project, by criticality of the defects;**
2. **Defects Outstanding by functional area by criticality of the defects;**
3. **Count of Defects by Project by functional area by descending order;**
4. **Defect statistics by developers by project; and**
5. **Defect statistics by testers by project.**

Question 36.

Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Reporting, Item #5: Provide ability to create reports based on any point in time (current or past). We made an assumption on this item. We are assuming that the ability to create reports based on any point in time is the timestamp on the defects. Our application uses timestamp to log the defects. Please validate our assumption.

AOC Response to Question 36:

The AOC will review and evaluate the vendor's response to the tool requirement in side-by-side comparison as outlined in RFP Sections 12.8 through 12.10. Vendors may add requirement comments to the specific tool requirement to expand on assumptions as specified in RFP Section 5.2.

Question 37.

Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Reporting, Item #6: Be capable of producing an audit trail. Our application uses timestamp to log the defects, can this be consider as an audit trail?

AOC Response to Question 37:

Audit trail is the information a system provides to reconstruct the sequence of important update events happened to a record in the database. This is typically storing of all historical modifications of important columns of key entities in the database.

Question 38.

Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Reporting, Item #8: Provide the ability to create "WHAT - IF" scenarios. Please elaborate and give some examples.

AOC Response to Question 38:
An example of a what-if scenario is defect work load distribution. If the developer's defects work load rate is changed, what would be the affect on release date of a version?

Question 39.
Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Reporting, Item #10: Provide dashboard reporting. Please elaborate on the term dashboard reporting. Give some examples.

AOC Response to Question 39:
Ideally, the proposed tool will provide a dashboard application that is used for hosting mini-applications that appear as widgets to select. It is a semi-transparent layer that is invisible to the user unless activated by a hotkey, which can be set to the user's preference, modified, etc.

From the defect tracking tool perspective a dashboard report is a summary report that captures key metrics (application, version, outstanding defects, average defects addressed per day, per week, and their criticality) of all the projects housed in the tool.

Question 40.
Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Reporting, Item #11: Describe the level of expertise required to create custom or ad hoc reports. Please elaborate on this item. We made an assumption that what this item means is that the application should provide a friendly and easy to use user interface that does not require a lot of training. Please validate our assumption.

AOC Response to Question 40:
The AOC will review and evaluate the vendor's response to the tool requirement in side-by-side comparison as outlined in RFP Sections 12.8 through 12.10. Vendors may add requirement comments to the specific tool requirement to expand on assumptions as specified in RFP Section 5.2.

Question 41.
Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Reporting, Item #13: Create build notes using comments from fixed defects. We made an assumption on this item, our application uses a field in the database to store a resolution for defects. Can we assume that this will meet the requirement for this item? Please validate our assumption.

AOC Response to Question 41:
The AOC will review and evaluate the vendor's response to the tool requirement in side-by-side comparison as outlined in RFP Sections 12.8 through 12.10. Vendors may add requirement comments to the specific tool requirement to expand on assumptions as specified in RFP Section 5.2.

Question 42.
Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, System Requirements Item #5: Configure to support master/master - master/slave repositories where projects can create their own remote repository that periodically can be synchronized to the main enterprise repository. We are assuming that the item is referring to the ability to sync offline items with the master database. Please validate our assumption.

AOC Response to Question 42:
As indicated in requirements there will be one or more repositories at different locations of the AOC or its vendors' offices. The defect tracking tool's repository should be able to be setup in master/master or master/slave type of configuration. This configuration helps in replicating the contents of the repositories at different locations.

For example, both the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) and the Southern Regional Office may have a master repository in each location. Both master repositories need to have the ability to sync offline items from multiple slave repositories throughout the State of California. Both master repositories need to be in sync as well.

Question 43.
Appendix B, Defects Tracking Tool Requirements, Enterprise Infrastructure and Security, Item #6: Provide test console encryption for all communications not related to the test execution. Please elaborate on the definition of test console encryption. Give some examples.

AOC Response to Question 43:
The communication between the test console (stress or regression testing) and the test server, whether related to or not related to the testing, should be encrypted.

End of Form