

## **Administrative Office of the Courts State of California**

### **RFP for Financial and Implementation Services Enterprise Financial System**

1. What is the maximum number of concurrent users for the initial implementation at the AOC headquarters?

Answer: 25 concurrent users. It should be noted that the initial implementation at the AOC will be a non-production, temporary environment used for the purposes of software configuration, verification, testing, and demonstrations for trial court personnel.

2. The RFP indicated that the AOC is interested in pursuing an ASP relationship and in possibly becoming an ASP for the other trial courts in the future. Please explain this further in regards to the technical resources that the AOC would have for providing ASP support.

Answer: Currently, the AOC is not interested in becoming an ASP for the trial courts. Vendors should assume using a preferred ASP to deliver their software. Please review the schematic in the RFP (Page 10) showing the various technical deployment models that the software will need to accommodate. Also see item C in Addendum A for additional information regarding ASP requirements.

3. The proposal indicates on page 17 that the due date is March 1<sup>st</sup>, and elsewhere that the due date is March 6<sup>th</sup>. Please clarify the actual due date.

Answer: March 6, 2001 at 4:00p.m. Pacific time

4. Does the AOC have a listing available of eligible DVBE businesses that can be provided?

Answer: No, this information is maintained and administered by the California Department of General Services (DGS).

In accordance with PCC § 10115.2(b)(3), bidders must advertise in trade and focus publications unless all DVBE goals are satisfied. The advertisement must be published at least 14 days prior to the bid opening unless the requirement is waived due to time constraints. The California Department of General Services (DGS) Office of Small Business Certification and Resources (OSBCR) publishes a list of trade and focus publications to assist bidders in meeting these contract requirements. To obtain this list, please contact OSBCR and request the "State Contracting Resource Packet" or download the packet from the RFP website at <http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/tcfsrpf/>

The OSBCR may be contacted at:

Office of Small Business Certification Resources  
1531 I Street, Second Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814-2016  
Receptionist: (916) 323-5478  
FAX: (916) 442-7855  
Internet address: <http://www.dgs.ca.gov/osbcr>

5. Does the cost proposal need to be bound separately or just included as one of the sections of the response?

Answer: The cost proposal should be submitted simply as one of the sections of the response.

6. Page 18 indicates submission of a full electronic (CD-Rom) copy of the proposal, and also indicates that the MS-Excel files for the technical requirements and cost proposal are to be submitted. Should the Excel files also be included on the CD-Rom? What exactly should be submitted on the due date?

Answer: The AOC prefers that everything be submitted on a single CD-Rom (proposal, spreadsheets, references, etc.), as well as 1 original and 7 hard copies.

7. Will the AOC provide a vendors list indicating those vendors that were sent the RFP?

Answer: Yes, the original vendors list provided at the pre-bid conference will have been updated to include additional vendors from the pre-bid conference and is currently posted on the AOC's website for this project: <http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/tcfsrjfp/> It should be noted that the RFP was posted on the DGS website, so additional interested vendors may be unknown at this time.

8. If an implementation partner is used to provide implementation assistance is there a maximum amount of implementation partner participation that you will allow during the validation phase?

Answer: No, there is no maximum percentage of partnership between the vendor and an implementation partner.

9. Will you provide a copy of your Tactical Plan for Court Technology referred to on page 11 of the RFP?

Answer: A copy of the plan can be obtained from the AOC's website for the project at <http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/tcfsrjfp/>

10. For accounting purposes, what is the fiscal year that the AOC operates under?

Answer: The AOC operates under a July 1 – June 30 fiscal year, however it should be kept in mind that some grants operate under other fiscal years (i.e. calendar).

11. Page 23 of the proposal, section 2-19 indicates that vendors provide a narrative response regarding Hardware Environment, Network Environment, Operating System and Database Platform. It is the vendor's responsibility to identify the recommended or optimal configuration in each area. Other than the Database Platform, does the AOC have any preferences in the areas of Hardware Environment, Network Environment, or Operating Systems, and if so, what are they?

Answer: No, the AOC does not have any preferences in the areas of Hardware Environment, Network Environment, or Operating Systems. Vendors should indicate platform/operating systems available, indicating the primary one used by the majority of users.

12. Which 6 courts will be part of the proof-of-concept?

Answer: The AOC has not determined which courts will participate yet. See item B in Addendum A for additional information regarding Phase II – Software Implementation.

13. Explain exactly which entities and/or the number of entities that will specifically be involved in Phase I and then a goal for the further Phases that all vendors should use in pricing to insure apples to apples comparisons. Some gray area exists around who would be included in Phase I.

Answer: Phase I will include the validation/configuration of the software at the AOC, which will include 25 concurrent users. The AOC has not determined exactly which courts will be included in the further phases of the project -- including the proof-of-concept phase and continued rollout to additional courts. AOC staff (finance, accounting, business services, audit), implementation services, along with representatives from the courts will be the intended participants in Phase I. See item A in Addendum A for additional information regarding the Software Validation Process at the AOC.

14. Does the AOC want a separate implementation for (1) implementing at the AOC and (2) implementing the 6 proof-of-concept courts?

Answer: Yes, the implementation for these two phases are separate. This RFP includes implementation at the AOC as part of the validation/configuration of the software in preparation for rollout. The RFP also includes licensing for all courts. See item A of Addendum A for

further clarification of the Software Validation Process at the AOC. Future implementation will depend upon the deployment model being used. Currently, it is anticipated that the 6 proof-of-concept courts will include relatively small courts with an estimated average of 3 users per court (18 total users). Additional rollouts may include all size courts. For simplicity purposes, vendors should assume that the 58 courts are comprised of 33 small courts (average 3 users/court); 10 medium courts (average 10 users/court); 14 large courts (average 40 users/court); and 1 extra-large court (300 users/court).

15. Will the results of Phase I be rolled into production for all or some of the participating courts?

Answer: Yes. During Phase I, the AOC will validate and configure the software, which will be rolled out to the proof-of-concept courts and other rollout phases.

16. How many full-time accountants will be committed to the project?

Answer: Currently, the AOC has dedicated 2 staff (Accounting and IS) to work on full-time on the project. Additional resources have been committed to the project to aid with the implementation. Three accountant positions have been internally redirected to support this project immediately. Twelve positions, 8 accounting and 4 IS staff, have been requested in the current budget process to aid with Phase I and to prepare the software for rollout in Phase II (effective 7/1/01).

17. What is the anticipated budget for Phase I? How much for Hardware and Software specifically? How much specifically for this ERP implementation?

Answer: The AOC has dedicated funds to complete the requirements of this RFP. Additional funds have been earmarked for this project to continue the rollout.

18. The RFP indicated that the pre-bid conference held on Friday, February 16, 2001 at the AOC in San Francisco was mandatory. If vendors did not attend, are they precluded from bidding on the RFP?

Answer: The AOC has required that a representative of the software firm been in attendance at the pre-bid conference in order to submit a bid for this project.

19. What is the AOC's preference regarding a single contract or separate implementation contract and statewide license contract?

Answer: The AOC may choose to sign joint or separate licensing and implementation services agreements (i.e. one license and one implementation contract) for the verification process. If a

software vendor partners with an implementation firm when responding to the RFP, the software firm will be considered the primary bidder and engagement manager. Thus, if the AOC is not satisfied with the implementation firm proposed, it reserves the right to ask the software vendor to propose a different implementation partner at any time during the process. All firms submitting proposals, by virtue of doing so, are recognizing that the AOC retains this option.

20. Will the AOC extend the due date for the RFP from March 6, 2001?

Answer: No.

21. Which two trial courts are running their own financial system? Of the two trial courts that already have their own systems, what financial systems are they running?

Answer: Two trial courts are no longer receiving fiduciary services from their counties and therefore, are not using their county financial systems. However, the remaining 56 courts are still using their county financial systems. For simplicity purposes, the AOC is assuming that all 58 trial courts may desire the selected system. The submission of license pricing should include all 58 trial courts.

22. References have been requested of the software and ASP firms. Does the AOC want references from the implementation firm?

Answer: No, this information will be requested when the software will be rolled out to the trial courts in Phase II. See item A of Addendum A regarding additional information on the Software Validation Process.

23. Has the AOC identified any mandatory interfaces for the trial courts?

Answer: There are no planned interfaces for this RFP (Phase I). The rollout of the software (Phase II) will contain interfaces (i.e. transmission of financial data to the AOC or other state agencies) which will be identified for each court implementation; however, Phase II requirements have not been determined yet.