

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 #2

September 3, 2010

- 1. Are there any constraints regarding the location of where work can be performed for this RFP – remotely and/or offshore?**

No.

- 2. What is the total number of names on the source lists for the jury candidate pool?**

117,470 is the total number of names from the source lists. The source list that the Judiciary uses is Guam Voter's Registration List and Guam Registered Driver's List.

- 3. How many concurrent users do you anticipate for the ERP system?**

For proposal purposes, Offerors are to assume that up to 30 users will use the ERP system concurrently.

- 4. Is the Judiciary expecting the vendor to do a data conversion of existing imaged documents in AS-400 Vanguard Document Management System to the new DMS in CMS/ERP system? If so, can the Judiciary provide an estimate of the number of documents to be converted into the new document management system?**

Yes, the Judiciary is expecting the vendor to convert imaged documents to the new DMS. The imaging system currently contains 480,000 TIFF images. The images are 1-bit, 240dpi utilizing CCITT T.6 compression.

- 5. How many document scanners are available currently with the Judiciary? Is the Judiciary expecting to buy new document scanners for the new CMS/ERP system? Also, is the vendor expected to recommend the hardware for the document scanners?**

Nine document scanners are currently available: Fujitsu Image Scanners Model fi-5750C (6); Fujitsu Image Scanner Model fi-5900C (1); and Fujitsu Image Scanners Model fi-5650C HVRS (2). All of the scanners employ Kofax Adrenaline hardware. The Judiciary will solicit input from the winning vendor regarding the replacement/purchase of scanners based on the vendor's solution.

- 6. Does the Judiciary have an Active Directory based system for authenticating users into the network?**

The Supreme Court and some of the smaller units are running Active Directory (currently running Windows Server 2003 R2 Active Directory, but upgrading to Windows Server 2008). The Trial environment runs Server NT 4, but will be migrated to Active Directory.

- 7. Can the Judiciary provide the name of the E-mail system that is currently used (e.g. MS Exchange) ? Also, can the Judiciary expound on the "cloud" email system it is planning on implementing?**

The Judiciary currently uses SLMail Pro version 6.3 (Seattle Lab), but has started implementing Google Apps Standard for certain users.

- 8. Is the intent of the Judiciary to replace the existing electronic filing solution provided by Counterclaim, Inc for the Supreme Court?**

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

9. Does the Judiciary have any preference on the technology environment for the proposed CMS/ERP solution – for example, Microsoft platform Vs Linux or J2EE/Java platform? Can the Judiciary provide/state their current technical environment – hardware and software (OS, SQL Server 2008 etc.)?

As stated in RFP Section 4.5: “The Guam Judiciary is allowing Offerors great latitude in their selection of technologies; however, the Judiciary prefers Microsoft’s Windows operating system and SQL Server database management system.” The Judiciary does not have a preference between J2EE and Java. The Judiciary has currently standardized on Windows Server 2003 R2 on Dell servers, but is upgrading to Windows Server 2008 and slowly migrating physical servers over to virtual servers utilizing Microsoft’s Hyper-V. File services are provided via Windows Server 2003 cluster on Dell servers, with backend storage on a Dell/EMC CX300 fiber channel SAN. Several other servers are also connected to the SAN, such as the courtroom audio archive server. The Judiciary currently utilizes Microsoft SQL Server 2000, but is looking to migrate to SQL server 2008.

10. In responding to the capabilities table in the different attachments provided, does “Included” mean the vendor will provide that functionality as part of the implementation/bid but may or may not have that functionality ready for demo (e.g., it is currently under development)?

The Offeror is to mark a capability as being “Included” if the proposed solution will provide the functionality – regardless of whether the proposed application(s) currently include the capability. However, the Notes column should be used to indicate any functionality that is to be developed.

11. Does the Judiciary have a target timeframe for completion of this project?

No. The Judiciary expects the winning Offeror to establish, maintain, and manage to a realistic project schedule.

12. How many electronic signature pads is the Judiciary expecting to purchase for capturing electronic signatures in the new CMS/ERP system?

The number of signature pads to be purchased by the Judiciary has not been determined. The winning Offeror will be expected to make a recommendation based on its proposed solution.