

JUDICIARY OF GUAM

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

NO. RFP 10 – 02

**To Furnish, Deliver and Install Court-Related
Management Information Systems
for the Judiciary of Guam**

Clarification #1

August 12, 2010

1. What is the total budget for this project?

A budget has been established, but the Guam Judiciary is not willing to share this information until contract negotiations.

2. Will you please have a second round of questions with a deadline of 31 August? There are complexities of this RFP that require close study and the assembly of multiple vendors to meet the needs elements that are newly proposed such as ERP requirements. In order to propose the best solution we feel it is imperative to have additional time and to be able to ask clarifying questions.

A second round of questions has been added. See the revised project schedule (below).

Activity	Eastern Time	Guam Time
RFP Issuance	July 23, 2010	July 23, 2010
Initial Questions/Clarifications due	3 A.M., August 6, 2010	5 P.M., August 6, 2010

Notice of intent to propose and register to receive responses to questions/clarifications due	3 A.M., August 9, 2010	5 P.M., August 9, 2010
Responses to initial Questions/Clarifications posted to web site	August 12, 2010	August 12, 2010
Optional pre-proposal telephone conference	7 P.M., August 12, 2010	9 A.M., August 13, 2010
Pre-proposal conference minutes posted to web site	August 20, 2010	August 20, 2010
Final Questions/Clarifications due	3 A.M., August 27, 2010	5 P.M., August 27, 2010
Responses to final Questions/Clarifications posted to web site	September 3, 2010	September 3, 2010
Proposals due	12 A.M., October 1, 2010	2 P.M., October 1, 2010
Notification of finalist Offerors	October 22, 2010	October 22, 2010
Finalist demonstrations on Guam	November 8 to December 9, 2010	November 8 to December 9, 2010
Notification of selection	December 17, 2010	December 17, 2010
Starting date of contract	February 15, 2011	February 15, 2011

3. What is the process of submitting questions seeking clarification on the answers that will be posted in response to vendor questions? Can we ask such questions (that seek clarification on the answers posted by the Judiciary) even beyond the questions deadline (assuming that it is extended beyond the initial August 6th deadline stated in the RFP)?

Such follow-up questions can be asked at the pre-bid conference or in the second round of questions (See Question #2).

4. May we get an editable (Word copy) version of the entire RFP? In order to respond to the RFP effectively we need the ability to search, copy and paste text, collaborate (exchange/share communications and discussions) with several team members across companies without having to retype the text that is in the RFP.

Attachments 1-4 and 9, and Appendices 3 and 4 are available in Microsoft Word or Excel format upon request.

- 5. There are functional requirements for the ERP portion of this project that are not clearly defined. Can you please provide more detail on the functional requirements of the ERP component of the RFP? If that cannot be done, is it ok to respond to the RFP using an approach that discusses the offering in a more generic manner?**

Offerors are to respond to the requirements as published. The Judiciary will entertain specific questions on any of the requirements at the pre-bid conference or in the second round of questions (see Question #2).

- 6. Please describe the Public Guardian’s use of trust accounting.**

The Public Guardian acts as a fiduciary in receiving public assistance funds on behalf of a ward, and in handling a ward’s private funds. The Public Guardian pays bills of all kinds for the ward (e.g., housing, medical, loans/credit cards, caregiver contract services, groceries, utilities), and may disburse an allowance of cash for everyday uses. The Public Guardian must be able to track, view and report on all incoming and outgoing monies on behalf of a ward.

- 7. There are several requirements/capabilities (Attachment 1) that are listed under the DMS category (e.g., 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 on pages 4 and 5 of Attachment 1). Does the Judiciary already own licenses to a DMS product? Does the scope and purpose of this RFP also include the procurement of a DMS product as well as its integration with other systems (we did not see DMS procurement listed under Executive Summary or anywhere else in the RFP).**

Guam has the AS/400-based Vanguard Document Management System, but offerors should propose a DMS that fits their solution set. In other words, there are no restrictions in proposing any EDMS solution. Use of the existing system would be preferred, but only slightly.

- 8. The proposal structures described in Section 3.1 Figures 5 & 6 are confusing. Figure 5 is labeled as “Proposal Structures That Are Allowed”. Since it is labeled as a plural are we to assume there are (3) allowable structures?**

Figure 5 provides three examples of acceptable team structures, but other structures are allowable. Similarly, Figure 6 shows 2 examples of structures that are not allowed.

- 9. It appears the first “allowed structure” of Figure 5 is identical to the 4th “not allowed” structure of Figure 6. Is it the intent of Judiciary to require a separate Systems Integrator or may the lead Offeror provide the role of systems integrator?**

The lead Offeror may be the systems integrator, a provider of one or more applications, or both.

10. Is the following structure allowed? Product Vendor A act as the systems integrator for the entire RFP requirements. Subcontracting would include two subcontractors B & C. Vendor A would implement Product A and manage the implementation of products B&C. (see below)

Product Vendor A (Provide and implement all CMS) also act as and responsible for systems integration.

→Subcontractor: Vendor B (Provide and implement ERP)

→Subcontractor: Vendor C (Provide and implement Jury management)

The structure described above is allowed.

11. Our understanding about the teaming structure is as follows: a company cannot be a prime contractor on one proposal and a subcontractor on another different proposal, but they can be a subcontractor on different proposals. The prime contractor is allowed to submit one or more (alternate) proposals with varying subcontractors, but they cannot also be on a different proposal as a subcontractor. Is our understanding correct?

This is correct.

12. Will the Judiciary reconsider the requirement of a Bid Bond? We do not have difficulty in entering into contracts with our clients or experience delays in negotiations. Obtaining a Bid Bond adds to the cost of the project that we feel is unnecessary. Additionally, the Offerors are not in control of the Judiciary's schedule and cannot insure necessary resources that will be available to negotiate the conditions of the contract. Although we are confident that the Judiciary's best intentions would be to have the resources dedicated to this end there is no way to insure the potential attendance and attention with elements of illness or disaster etc.

The Judiciary is not requiring a Bid Bond or a Performance Bond.

13. Would a Bid Bond be returned to a successful Offeror if (i) a final contract is not executed despite the successful Offeror's negotiation in good faith for such a contract or (ii) if a final contract is not executed because the Judiciary changes the project's scope between the bid and potential final contract?

See Question #12.

14. The Performance Bond requirement of 100% of the contract price on a multi-year project of this size is significant and adds significant additional costs to this proposal. The Judiciary in reality is never in jeopardy to this amount at any time during the implementation process. For example, our implementation payments are only invoiced after a deliverable is completed and the client is satisfied with the progress and performance of our solution. If all customers required a performance bond in the amount equal to the 100% of the contract prices then it would impact our business reporting. We do understand the Judiciary's concern and would suggest a Performance Bond of \$1 Million. We feel the Judiciary will never be in jeopardy of greater than this amount and it is a very large commitment on the part of the bidding companies.

See Question #12.

15. Does the judiciary anticipate mandating electronic filing? If so, when would e-filing be mandated?

The Judiciary does anticipate mandating electronic filing for at least some case types in the future; however, no specific plans have been made or schedule established. No mandate of e-filing will occur during the implementation phase of the project.

16. Does the Judiciary anticipate mandating electronic service? If so, when would e-service be mandated?

The Judiciary does anticipate mandating electronic service in the future; however, no specific plans have been made or schedule established. No mandate of electronic service will occur during the implementation phase of the project.

17. Does the Judiciary only anticipate utilizing a single electronic filing vendor/solution?

Not necessarily. This decision will be made once a new solution has been established.

18. Does the Judiciary foresee any situation where it might review responses that only address certain components (i.e., electronic filing) if the Judiciary does not receive sufficient responses to the whole RFP?

Not under the current procurement. Only complete solutions will be reviewed at this time. Should the Judiciary not identify an acceptable solution, it reserves the right to cancel the procurement and solicit specific components.

19. Attachment 2: E-filing Capabilities and Scenarios under e-Filing system Capabilities there is the following language in Item 1: Use browser technology for e-filing or an email receiving capability with spam filtering and white-listing. Does the Judiciary intend this to

mean that, in the absence of a browser interface, the attorneys or self-represented litigants will be able to email their documents to a specific Court Inbox and those will be considered as electronically filed?

The supposition is incorrect; e-mailing of documents is not e-filing. A filer must go online and have a browser interface provided by the E-Filing System to perform e-filing. Upon reconsideration of the requirement, delete “or an email receiving capability with spam filtering and white-listing.”

20. Attachment 2: E-filing Capabilities and Scenarios. Under e-Filing system Capabilities there is the following language in Item 9: Disable hyperlinks to external papers or websites. Does the Judiciary envision that all hyperlinks in documents will be disabled or should there be the ability to turn that functionality on or off on a per court/case basis?

Once a document is filed with the court, it should not be dependent on anything external. Those external references could change and the court record would be affected. For this reason, hyperlinks should be disabled without the option to restore them.

21. Will the awarded vendor be permitted to recommend and charge fees for additional services beyond the scope of those services covered in the RFP?

That is highly unlikely. The Judiciary’s goal will be to encourage use of e-filing rather than paper filing, so no fee is likely to be charged for e-filing beyond regular filing fees. The same would apply to e-service. The Judiciary will own the court records and formulate policies regarding free or paid access to court records similar to current policies.

22. Can the Prime Contractor for the CMS/ERP RFP 10-02 subcontract to a Canadian Company for one component of the system?

Yes.

23. Does the Guam Judiciary have a Document Management System already? If so, will it be available for the new CMS?

See Question #7.

24. Please clarify “Access to Justice Technology” in the context of the Guam judiciary

Access to Justice (A2J) technology refers to guided interviews and document assembly using software created using National Public Automated Documents Online (NPADO™). Additional information is located at www.a2jauthor.org/drupal/?q=node/200.

25. Attachment 7 – where is the file “Superior Court and Probation Record layouts 2010-04-09.xls” located?

This file is available upon request.

26. If the Vendor would like to have the proprietary information provided kept confidential and the reasons for it, what section would this information be put in the response to the RFP?

Offeror is to mark any pages containing proprietary information with “PROPRIETARY” in red letters at the beginning and end of each page. Also, at the beginning of each page with proprietary information, Offeror is to explain why it is proprietary. The Judiciary will protect this information from public disclosure if it agrees with the reason; otherwise, it will contact the Offeror to discuss. Proposals marked as proprietary in their entirety may be deemed unresponsive.

27. Page 1. Regarding the due date for questions for clarification, will the Judiciary consider extending the due date by an additional week and/or allowing a 2nd set of questions to be submitted?

See Question #2.

28. Page 13. Please describe the tables, fields, and estimated record quantity for the data that will be migrated over to the new ERP system.

Very little data is available to migrate to the new ERP system, as many of the functions to be automated are currently manual. For proposal purposes, the Offeror is to assume that no ERP data will be migrated to the new system. Any necessary ERP data migration will be addressed during contract negotiations.

29. Page 13. In the event the selection committee’s top choice for an ERP system and CMS system are in separate proposals, will the Judiciary reserve the right to create its own CMS/ERP ‘team’?

The Guam Judiciary will select a lead Offeror and enter into contract negotiations with that Offeror. These negotiations may include, at the request of the Judiciary or the Offeror, the replacement of one or more team members. This is stated in RFP Section 3.9, Negotiation and Award of Contract, which states: “Should the highest-scoring Offeror choose to replace one or more of its team members (e.g., the ERP provider), it must propose a replacement(s) during contract negotiations. Any team replacements must be approved by the Guam Judiciary prior to the conclusion of contract negotiations.”

30. Page 13. Does the Judiciary process payroll for anyone who is not considered an employee? If yes, will these people require access to the system for employee self service functionalities.

No, the Judiciary does not process payroll for anyone who is not an employee.

31. Page 13. Does the number of ERP users of 30 include only super users? (Adding up the number of staff positions within Financial Management, Human Resources, Procurement and Facilities, and MIS, the headcount exceeds 50.)

30 ERP users is correct. The remaining 20 employees will not use the ERP system.

32. Section 4.18. Will there be any "option" years? If so, how many and should the option years be quoted?

The Offeror is to quote for the first 10 years only.

33. Page 35. Regarding references, will the Judiciary accept any of the required references provided by a subcontractor identified in the proposal?

Yes, one or more references may pertain to subcontractors. However, the Judiciary is most interested in understanding the lead Offeror's ability to deliver the proposed system and references should be focused on that ability.

34. Atch 1, Page 3, Requirement 17, "Enable maintaining the list of appointed attorneys from the private attorney panel, and rotate the list once an attorney has been appointed." Please clarify this process. Is the panel just a list of private attorneys? Are there any complexities to the rotation or is it sequential?

The private attorney panel is a list of private attorneys, and selection must at least appear to be random, rather than sequential. If one attorney is selected but has a conflict of interest or otherwise declines appointment, the process is simple: select another attorney.

35. Atch 1, Page 5, Requirement 26, "Provide for electronic documents: a) Annotation; b) Redaction, automatic and manual; c) Versioning; d) Access only through the CMS, to enforce security roles". Please describe the level of document versioning (c) the Judiciary requires/desires. Does a new version or sub version need to be created automatically each time a user makes changes to a specified document type?

No. A judge must have the ability to annotate a document and retain access to that annotated version until the judge finalizes it. Draft court-generated documents would not be docketed and placed on the system until filed. Attorneys may submit proposed orders to the

court, and the court would have the ability to file a signed version, with or without modifications. There must be public versions of certain documents with confidential information redacted. Amendments by interlineation in the courtroom, particularly in criminal and juvenile cases, might be considered separate versions, but more likely would be treated as a new document.

36. Atch 1, Page 6, Requirement 41, "Create electronic case file from documents received electronically and from scanned paper documents." Describe how you envision this happening. Would a filed document initiate a new case in the CMS somehow?

A new case could and should be initiated by electronically filed documents, just as if a person presented a paper document at the counter.

37. Atch 1, Page 7, Requirement 69, "Transmit opinions, upon release, to legal publishers". How would these opinions be transmitted? What is the desired method of delivery?

Electronic mail is the anticipated method of delivery, although the Judiciary is open to other solutions.

38. Atch 1, Page 17, Requirement 61, "Process a partial or complete refund and provide a receipt reflecting the refund." Please provide an example of the types of refunds required.

A bond may be returned at the end of a case, whether it is a civil or criminal case. Money held in trust also could be refunded. Overpayments are another example in which a refund is required.

39. Atch 1, Page 18, Requirement 76, "Allow interfacing with Financial Management Division's accounting software, automatically updating it with transaction data." Is this software different than the proposed ERP software stated in the RFP? If so, please provide a list of the fields in the accounting software that need to be populated so we can determine the cost and SOW of the required interface.

The accounting software is the proposed ERP software.

40. Atch 1, Page 19, Requirement 79, "Provide an interface between the court case management system and an interactive voice response system (IVR) to provide case information to individuals over the telephone." Does the Judiciary currently have an IVR solution in place? If so who is the vendor? If not, are you wanting proposals for IVR systems as part of this RFP? Do you have a preference for an IVR vendor, or do you want recommendations for IVR vendors?

The Judiciary does not have an IVR solution in place currently. It does not have a preference for an IVR vendor and will work with the selected Offeror to identify IVR requirements before competitively selecting a vendor.

- 41. Atch 1, Page 31, Requirement 28, “Allow access to all case and person data in all parts of the CMS. A probation officer should be able to see (as a person-level alert) that a suspended imposition exists that has been sealed.” Is this requirement referring to just Probation, CSFC and Public Defender data, or does this apply to Court data as well?**

It applies to all data, subject to security controls.

- 42. Atch 1, Page 32, Requirement 42, “Assign and reassign cases to responsible person using one or more of the following methods: randomly; according to predefined business rules (e.g., by case category, by case status, by responsible person according to caseload balancing policies); according to existence of specific conditions (e.g., conflict of interest, disqualification). Supervisor override allowed.” Does the Judiciary want an automatic process that is configurable according to the defined criteria, or would having the necessary reports and case load/case weight data displayed in a supervisor dashboard so that they can manually assign cases be sufficient?**

Manual assignment is not the requirement. The Court would like the assignment to be automatic, with the ability to control the factors used in making the determination.

- 43. Atch 1, Page 33, Requirement 48. Please describe what an "interstate compact case" is.**

An interstate compact case, as it is used in the referenced requirement, involves the relocation of a probationer across state or territory lines. See <http://www.interstatecompact.org/> for more information on the interstate compact and the Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision. There are other interstate compacts dealing with other case types (e.g., child support, establishment of paternity, child custody).

- 44. Atch 1, Page 33, Requirement 51, “Enter information gathered during assessment and provide for interactive administration, calculation, and retention of assessment instrument. (Probation, CSFC).” Please describe what is required for the assessments. Would a tool that allows administrators to define a list of questions that can be assigned values based on answers that can be used in calculating a score/level, printed out and saved to the case file be sufficient?**

The solution described would be acceptable to meet the requirement. The results of the assessment could potentially trigger specific business functions.

45. Atch 1, Page 34, Requirement 55, “Allow mass case operations by selection of cases to which an action applies with a single transaction: a. Reassign a group of pending events from one responsible person, courtroom, or date to another; b. Reassign a group of cases from one person to another, and maintain a history of assignments; c. Display cases subject to a flagged condition of a certain kind which occurred or failed to occur on a specific date or date range, for mass case processing, including log entries; d. Generate individual documents or groups of documents through mass case processing; e. Identify inactive cases to process for disposition and prompt user regarding appropriate action (e.g., schedule hearing, prepare notice of motion to dismiss/withdraw, extend dates, failure to appear).” Please clarify what type of "case processing" will be applied to the records described in Item c.

The principle of mass case operations is to select a group of cases according to some criteria and apply the same operation to all cases in the group. This saves the user from performing exactly the same operation over and over again to individual cases. The question is directed toward the Probation / CSFC / Public Defender requirements, but the same principle applies in the Superior Court section. The case processing operation is identified by the verb for each numbered item. In (d), for example, for probationers who missed their appointments, the user would select them and print the same warning letter to them, or a recommendation to the prosecutor for a revocation of probation, as appropriate.

46. Atch 1, Page 34, Requirement 57, “Provide review process of manually or electronically transferred interstate compact case information.” Please clarify what an "interstate compact case" is. How will interstate compact cases be electronically transferred? What system(s) are these cases coming from?

See Question #43 regarding interstate compact for adult offender supervision. Interstate compact information is exchanged between Guam and sending/receiving states and territories. The CMS/ERP will need to include data fields and capabilities to: (1) generate and transmit (e.g., via e-mail) transfer requests to other states/territories and process responses; and (2) receive and process interstate compact requests received from other states/territories. In the future, interfaces may be developed to support the electronic exchange of interstate compact data, but this is beyond the scope of the current procurement.

47. Atch 1, Page 36, Requirement 81, “Toll supervision term and calculate new end date. (probation)”. Please clarify what is meant by "Toll Supervision term." Does this mean amending or changing the length of the term?

“Toll Supervision term” simply means track time the time served, including any suspensions or other penalties affecting the end date.

48. Atch 2, Page 1, Requirement 9, “Disable Hyperlinks to external papers or websites”. Does this refer to hyperlinks contained within documents being e-filed?

Yes. See Question #20.

49. Atch 2, Page 3, Requirement 27, "Allow a judge or justice to securely apply an electronic signature to an e-filed proposed order." What type of document will the proposed order be? (PDF, Word, etc.)

It is anticipated that the proposed order would be filed in Microsoft Word format.

50. Atch 4, Jury Management. For licensing purposes how many jury staff (end users) are there?

For proposal purposes, Offerors are to assume there are 10 end users of the jury management system.

51. Atch 4, Jury Management. How many Court locations are there or do the jurors report to one location only?

There are currently two court locations, although jurors only report to one location. This is not expected to change in the foreseeable future.

52. Atch 4, Jury Management. Are they a one-step or two-step court? (Do they only send out one mailing to the jurors or two for qualifying first then only summoning qualified jurors?)

Currently, the Judiciary follows a two-step process.

53. Atch 4, Jury Management. We understand that Guam's MIS is currently performing the Merge/Purge of their Drivers and Voters list. We would like to provide a quote on our Merge/Purge and Suppression Service. How many records are in Driver list and Voters list?

This is not part of the current procurement and should not be included in a CMS/ERP proposal. However, the Judiciary would be interested in receiving such a quote separately. There are 10,000 people on the combined list.

54. Atch 4, Jury Management. Does the Judiciary currently process the Merged List through the US Postal Services National Change of Address (NCOA) to meet the new Bulk Rate requirements set by the USPS?

No.

55. Atch 4, Jury Management. How does the Judiciary categorize their jurors' term of service (for instance one day, one trial; 1 week etc.)?

Petit jurors serve three months active and 15 months on call. The jury commissioner brings in 150-300 for a felony case, 60-80 for misdemeanor. Grand jurors serve six months active and 18 months on call, three panels at the same time. The court runs the grand jury operations through the jury commissioner, not the prosecutor.

56. Atch 4, Jury Management. How are the jurors instructed to report for jury service? Do they report to a date specific for Orientation and then call in nightly?

Jurors not selected have to call after 5:00 P.M. every day for three months.

57. Atch 4, Jury Management. Is the Signature Pad technology already in place? If yes, what is the product name? Is the intent to capture the juror's signature to image it on a Fee Waiver Document?

No, the technology is not in place. The stated purpose of this is to capture the juror's signature to image it on a Fee Waiver Document, to facilitate the jury fee being paid to the juror's employer when the employer pays full salary during jury duty.

58. Atch 4, Jury Management. Please clarify what you mean by, "Verify that an address is valid and that a person has a particular address."

When a juror's address is entered into the system, it is to query existing court records to determine whether the person's address is current or needs to be updated in the system. Further, the system would query a GIS database to validate that the address exists. However, Guam's Geographical Information System (GIS) database is out of date and has no mechanism by which it can be updated. The Bureau of Statistics and Plans is seeking funding to migrate the database to a new platform and update it. Once that database is migrated and updated, the CMS will interface with it through the CJIS Exchange Broker. For purposes of the CMS/ERP proposal, Offerors are to provide functionality to query existing court records to determine whether the person's address is current. Functionality and the GIS interface to validate addresses may be requested of the winning Offeror at a later date, but is not to be addressed in the CMS/ERP proposal.

59. Atch 4, Supreme Court. Please provide more detail and examples on what "disqualifies" a judge from being assigned to a case. Are the disqualifications detected automatically, or is a disqualified flag set on the case? What is meant by "Handle exchange of cases between judges based on previous cases with a party...?"

Judicial disqualifications should be handled manually (flag the case), as when a judge recuses him/herself —related to or knows a party, once worked with an attorney, etc. All judges handle family law cases, so if judge X is assigned to a new case involving family A, judge Y who previously handled family A can take the case, and judge X can take one of judge Y's cases to keep the load even.

60. Atch 8. Please confirm that the CJIS Exchange Broker is out of scope. If out of scope, will vendors have full and open access to specs?

Yes, the CJIS Exchange Broker is out of scope. Once the contract is awarded, Datamaxx will work with the winning Offeror and provide interface specifications.

61. Atch 8. Does the Judiciary have a preference for an IVR vendor? Does the Judiciary want recommendations on IVR vendors?

See Question #40.

62. Atch 8. Is there a list of fields and/or a NIEM IEPD defined for each of the documents listed in the Interfaces attachment of the RFP?

No field listing is currently available. The winning Offeror will be expected to develop an IEPD for each exchange, using the NIEM IEPD (if available) as a basis.

63. Can a list of fields from each table listed in the Legacy Data Structures attachment be provided?

Yes. See Question #25.

64. Describe the Judiciary's process for applying electronic signatures to documents. In what format (.doc, .rtf, other) will the documents be created, sent, and saved?

The Judiciary has no current process for applying electronic signatures to documents. This is anticipated for court-generated orders, whether based on a proposed order submitted by an attorney or not. Vendors may propose a process. One scenario is that the judge would enter a password to apply a facsimile signature on a document (in .doc or .rtf format), and the system would convert the document to PDF/A for electronic transmittal and storage in the DMS (optionally with a digital signature so that the document cannot be tampered with). Routine orders may need less security than judgments and sentences.

65. On Page 33 of the RFP, it is stated that the winning Offeror must commit to a financing plan for any amount not available. Could this be addressed using deliverable-based invoicing?

No, the request is that payment be spread over time, not that deliverables be held up until money is available.

66. In regards to the qualifications of the Offeror – can the combined quals of the offering team be used to meet them?

Yes. Additionally, see Question #33.

67. In the RFP, it states that the Judiciary will acquire the hardware, 3rd party software and network components. Would the Judiciary be open to allowing the Offeror to procure these items?

The Judiciary would be open to this possibility, if it is the most cost-effective approach. This will be discussed during contract negotiations. Cost proposals should be based on the assumption that the Judiciary will acquire hardware, 3rd party software, and network components.

68. Is there a preferred implementation order for the various components of this RFP?

No. The Judiciary will expect the winning Offeror to recommend a logical implementation approach.

69. Is it acceptable to propose completing an analysis of the data conversion effort as part of the project and once that is completed to provide an estimate to execute the full conversion?

No. Offeror is expected to provide a cost proposal based on available information and experience with similar projects.

70. Has the Judiciary done an assessment on the quality of the data that exists in the various databases? If so, what were the results of the assessment?

No such assessment has been performed.

71. Is there a data dictionary for the various databases that will need to be converted?

No data dictionary is available for any of the current databases. However, record layouts are available – See Question #25.

72. How many years of data will require conversion?

The Judiciary has not determined this yet, but Offerors are to assume 10 years of data for proposal purposes. Remaining data will be stored in a to-be-determined format so it can be referenced when researching persons and case histories.

73. Is it acceptable to propose completing an analysis of the interface effort as part of the project and once that is completed to provide an estimate to execute the full conversion?

No. Offeror is expected to provide a cost proposal based on available information and experience with similar projects.

74. Is there an established budget for this project and what is the budget?

See Question #1.

75. Does the court have staff to help with the extract of data from the existing legacy system?

Yes, the Judiciary has staff available to assist in this effort. If the Offeror's proposal is based on use of such staff, the specific assumptions regarding number of staff and hours involved must be clearly presented.

76. Can the Court guarantee the outside agency cooperation for the development of an interface? Any delay with outside agencies vendors can impact schedules and budgets.

The court will work with the agencies and vendors to ensure that interface development goes smoothly, adjusting time frames if required by external agencies.

77. Does the Court have the staff identified to train as super users to assist in the establishment of business process and code table configuration?

The Judiciary has staff available to assist in this effort. If the Offeror's proposal is based on use of such staff, the specific assumptions regarding number of staff and hours involved must be clearly presented.

78. Does the Court expect to serve as the Tier 1 help desk support after the system goes live?

Yes.

79. Would the Court consider operating the CMS and Jury system as part of a cloud environment?

Yes.

80. Does the Court have staff to assist in training during the implementation of the systems?

Yes, court staff are available and may be utilized in the Offeror's proposed training approach. If the Offeror's proposal is based on use of such staff, the specific assumptions regarding number of staff and hours involved must be clearly presented.

81. Under Section 2.2.1 Business Goals, the Judiciary refers to providing public access to case information on the Internet. In Attachment 6, the RFP specifies that the Judiciary requires functionality relative to Public Access to Electronic Court Records, Data, and Meta Data (p. 6 Attachment 6). Does the Judiciary's requirement to provide public access to electronic court records include all documents associated with the case, including judges' decisions and other case records?

Yes, subject to security requirements.

82. Does the Judiciary expect the CMS project to archive and index existing paper documents, or does integration of scanned and electronic documents refer to those documents generated at the time of system deployment and thereafter? If existing court records will be archived:

- a. What is the volume of documents to be scanned?
- b. In what formats are the documents to be scanned?
- c. What is the age of the oldest document sets?

Documents received or generated after the system is deployed will be scanned. Existing records will be scanned on an as-needed basis to support current and new court cases.

83. On page 6 of the RFP, the Judiciary indicates one of its operational goals is for the infrastructure to "provide adequate response time and minimize down time so as never to disrupt Judiciary operations through such means as failover/load sharing capabilities, multiple network paths, etc." Does the Judiciary currently have a redundant network or failover infrastructure in place? If no, then is the design of a redundant/failover network to be included in the Scope of Work for this project?

The Judiciary does not currently have a redundant network or failover infrastructure in place. Offerors should include the design of a redundant/failover network in the scope of their proposals.

84. Relative to Section 2.5.3, section on "Integration", on p. 19 of the RFP: Are the solutions that are already in the works with Datamaxx the specific software solutions that comprise the generically termed "CJIS Exchange Broker"? Is the vendor solution required to

interface/integrate with Datamaxx's systems? If so, please define the lines of responsibility of remote systems and entity integration requirements that are indicated in this RFP.

Yes, the Datamaxx solution is generically termed the CJIS Exchange Broker and the vendor solution is required to interface with that broker (see Question #60). Agencies (or their vendors) operating remote systems will develop connections with the broker for their respective systems. The CMS/ERP vendor will be responsible for developing NIEM-based IEPDs for the exchanges listed in the RFP and for ensuring the CMS/ERP can deliver/receive the data defined in the IEPDs. Agencies/vendors of remote systems involved in the exchanges will be responsible for ensuring their respective systems can deliver/receive the data defined in the IEPDs.

85. Relative to Attachment 8: Interfaces: Are all of the XML data formats for the interfaces listed already defined? If not, then is the vendor responsible for defining the formats?

See Question #62.