

RFP # ISD-06192012-SLO, SAN LUIS OBISPO CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REPLACEMENT

Clarifying Questions and Answers

1. Is there a possibility of extending the RFP response timeline to allow vendors more time to incorporate answers received back from the court and AOC? **Per Addendum #1, procurement due dates have been changed. The RFP response due date has been extended 6 days. All other milestone dates after have also been adjusted as seen in the table below.**

No.	Key Events	Old Key Dates	New Key Dates
1	AOC issues RFP on behalf of San Luis Obispo Superior Court	6/19/2012	6/19/2012
2	Deadline for proposers to register for Pre-Proposal {Q&A} Conference	6/27/2012	6/27/2012
3	Pre-Proposal Conference (2:00 PM – 5:00 PM PDT via Conference Call)	7/9/2012	7/9/2012
4	<u>Deadline for proposers to submit questions, requests for clarifications or modifications to Solicitations@jud.ca.gov</u>	7/10/2012	7/10/2012
5	Post Vendor Questions and Court/AOC Answers	7/12/2012	7/12/2012
6	Vendor Solicitation Specifications Protest Deadline	7/13/2012	7/13/2012
7	Proposal due date and time (4:30 PM, PDT)	7/18/2012	7/24/2012
8	Invitations for Demonstrations	7/26– 8/1/12	8/1– 8/7/12
9	Presentations (solution demonstrations and interviews)	8/2-8/8/12	8/8-8/14/12
10	Pre-Pricing evaluation	8/9- 8/13/12	8/15- 8/20/12
11	Cost Portion of Proposals Public opening	8/14/2012	8/21/2012
12	Notice of intent to award	8/21/2012	8/29/2012
13	Execution of contract between vendor and San Luis Obispo Superior Court	9/14/2012	9/24/2012

2. Attachment #17 - The RFP Response template (Attachment 17), section 1.0 is titled “Overview of Proposed Statewide CCMS Deployment Solution”. We assume this is an oversight. If so, please adjust accordingly. **“1.0 Overview of Proposed Statewide CCMS Deployment Solution” should state “1.0 Overview of Proposed CMS Deployment Solution” and has been changed in Attachment 17, Response Template, Revision 1, which was issued per Addendum #1.**
3. Attachment #17 - The RFP Response template (Attachment 17), section 1.1 is titled “Approach to Meet CCMS Deployment Objectives”. We assume this is an oversight. If so, please adjust accordingly. **“1.1 Approach to Meet CCMS Deployment Objectives” should state “1.1 Approach to Meet CMS Deployment Objectives” and has been changed in Attachment 17, Response Template, Revision 1, issued per Addendum #1.**
4. Attachment #17 - The RFP Response template (Attachment 17), section 1.4 is titled “Pricing Summary”. Given that the RFP section 7.2.B requests that the cost portion of the proposal is submitted in a sealed envelope, what does the AOC/Court wish to be included in this section? **The cost proposal must be in submitted in a separate sealed envelope, so “Pricing Summary” has been removed in Attachment 17, Response Template, Revision 1, issued per Addendum #1.**
5. Attachment #17 - The RFP Response template (Attachment 17), section 1.5 is titled “Benefits to the AOC”. Should the title be “Benefits to the San Luis Obispo Superior Court?”, or does the AOC/Court wish for proposers to describe the benefits to the AOC? **In Attachment 17, Revision 1, section 1.4 is now entitled “Benefits to the San Luis Obispo Superior Court”; there is no longer a section 1.5.**
6. Attachment #17 - The RFP Response template (Attachment 17), section 2.1, “Minimum Requirements to Qualify”, Table 1, item 2.1.4, states that “The contract value of each was at least \$2,000,000 for application deployment services excluding application development services”. Can the AOC/Court confirm that the San Luis Obispo Superior Court is only seeking proposers that have actually successfully implemented their **proposed solution** with existing clients, and that the services value of those projects are a minimum of \$2,000,000? Doing this will ensure that the company selected has actually successfully implemented the proposed solution within an operational trial court the size of San Luis Obispo. **That is the intent of the question.**
7. Attachment #17 – Section 2.2.1 of Attachment #17 requests financial and employee information about the proposing company. Can the AOC please confirm that for those larger companies with multiple divisions/lines of business the numbers included here should be for the division of the company responsible for delivery of the proposed solution? Focusing these questions around the actual division will give the AOC/Court a more accurate view of the financial health and size of the partner organization. **That will suffice.**

8. Attachment #17 – Can the AOC please confirm that it wishes for all public corporations to include a copy of their annual report with their submission? **Correct.**
9. Attachment #17 – Section 2.2.2 asks for customer references. Can the AOC/Court please confirm that these references should be trial courts actually operating the proposed solution? Doing this will ensure that the references contacted have actually successfully implemented the proposed solution in an operational trial court environment. **Correct, that is the intent.**
10. Attachment #17 – Section 2.2.2 asks for five customer reference but only includes the tables for three references. Can the AOC/Court please confirm how many customer references should be included? **Provide 5 references. Attachment 17, Response Template, Revision 1 includes 5 tables, but proposers should insert lines as necessary.**
11. Attachment #17 – Section 3.1 asks for pricing acceptance and references. The stated text says “Please reference Attachment 17: San Luis Obispo CMS RFP Costing Matrix”. Should this state Attachment #16 and not #17? If so, it is instructed that Attachment 16 be completed and included separately from the larger proposal. Can the AOC/Court please clarify what it would like addressed in this section? **Costing must be provided in attachment 16, submitted in a separate sealed package; therefore, “Pricing Acceptance and Exceptions” has been removed from Attachment 17, Revision 1.**
12. Attachment #17 – Section 3.3.1 Deployment Approach seems to be defining the major activities within the project. Can the AOC please confirm that it is these sections of the response template that we are suppose to include essentially our project work plan? Is it okay that our work plan doesn’t match 1 for 1 with the activities outlined? If not, please confirm what exactly the AOC/Court wish to be included in this section? **This is correct and the work plan supplied is an experienced high level example, vendors should submit their high level plan to meet the anticipated business objectives.**
13. Attachment #17 – It is assumed that the AOC/Court wish to understand the qualifications the proposed vendor has actually implementing their proposed solution. If that assumption is correct, where within the response template should the company’s qualifications be included? **This should be addressed in a number of sections in Attachment #17, such as: section 1.2, Overview of Vendor Qualifications; section 2.1, Minimum Requirements to Qualify; section 2.2.2, References; section 2.4.1, Vendor Current Market Postion and Strategy; section: 2.4.3.1 Vendor Certifications or Affiliations; 3.2.4, Biographies; section 3.4, CMS/DMS Deployment Management Tools; and section 5.1, Benefit to Court.**
14. Attachment #17 – Attachment #17 “Response Template” seems to be in conflict with Section 8.0 of the main RFP document. Can the AOC/Court please clarify which section or attachment we should follow in crafting our response? **Section 8 of the main RFP document is the guide as to how to use and submit the individual response attachments.**

15. Section 6.4 – The exhibit number appears to be missing. Please clarify which exhibit this is referencing? **In Addendum #1, Section 6.4 of the main RFP document has been modified to reference Exhibit H of Attachment 2.**
16. Section 10.0 RFP Document – How will customer references be scored within the current evaluation criteria? How will oral presentations be scored within the current evaluation criteria? How will company qualifications be scored within the current evaluation criteria? How will financial stability be scored within the current evaluation criteria? **See Section 10.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS in the main RFP. All under the “meeting business requirements and deployment services deliverables grading” criterion.**
17. Section 10.0 RFP Document – Can the AOC/Court please explain how it intends to measure the “degree” to which proposal accepts contracting terms? **See section 10.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS in the main RFP. Vendors will be graded on their ability to meet the contract objectives under the contract terms.**
18. Section 10.0 RFP Document – There appears to be a cut and paste error in evaluation criteria. The sentence “Ability to manage and execute a successful implementation and smooth migration from any existing platform” is repeated twice. **Category meeting business requirements should not have “Ability to manage and execute a successful implementation and smooth migration from any existing platforms” and has been corrected per Addendum #1.**
19. Section 10.0 RFP Document – The stated evaluation criteria puts a total of 60% of the evaluation criteria on the non-functional aspects of the proposers solution. Under this model, it is highly likely that the AOC/Court would be forced to award to the lowest cost proposal, regardless of what they are actually proposing, their ability to meet the courts requirements, or their history is actually delivering what they have proposed. This seems inconsistent with the very detailed 1000+ requirements provided for in the RFP. Can the court verify that this weighting is correct and that that the cheapest solution will likely be the determining factor, regardless of the fit of the solution to the RFP requirements? **The cost weighting percentage is mandated by law. See answer to question 35.**
20. Given that the RFP is written by the AOC on behalf of the San Luis Obispo Superior Court, can the AOC/Court please clarify the roles of the AOC and the Court in the procurement?
Specifically:
- a. Who will be answering vendor questions? **Court and AOC**
 - b. What will be the composition of the evaluation team? (What is the percentage of Court-based evaluation team members vs. AOC evaluation team members?) **Primarily Court personnel.**

21. Can the AOC/Court please confirm whether the following functional areas are within scope of the project:
- a. E-Filing? **The requirement is that the application be e-filing capable and the court would like to pursue e-filing post go-live.**
 - b. Redaction of documents? **Yes, redaction is a requirement and business requirements will need to be gathered, understood and implemented.**
22. The RFP mentions a required 13 month implementation timeframe. Is there a target project completion date that must be met, and if so, what is business driver behind the deadline (funding availability, urgency of need, etc.?) **Cost of old systems, EOL of old systems, loss of services by county provider.**
23. Will the AOC/Court accept multiple cost proposals (for example, an annual use fee instead of an outright license purchase, as long as each cost proposal is self-sufficient and comprehensive? Doing this would provide the court more flexibility to implement the proposed solution within the financial constraints. **Multiple Software licensing options and would be part of the costing component. Responses to the core RFP and all attachments and exhibits with the exception of any pricing licensing options proposed in Attachment 16, SLO CMS RFP Costing Matrix, Revision 1 are to be one per vendor.**
24. It is stated that an automated data conversion is not part of this project. Is the court planning a manual data conversion? **No data conversion for case information will be done. The exception to that is that the court requires old calculation tables for manually entered old cases that will need to calculate against the correct bail schedules.**
25. Functional Requirements – Should all functional requirements identified as “mandatory” be viewed as required for acceptance of proposal? **Grading for that category will be based on best fit with the most required matches. Therefore, the column name “Mandatory” has been changed to “High Priority” in Attachment 7, Business and Functional Requirements, Revision 1, issued per Addendum #1.**
26. Functional Requirements – Can the AOC/Court please clarify, or define the terms, the terms used in the “optional” column of the functional requirements spreadsheet? **Nice to have but not mandatory.**
27. On Attachment 16 (RFP Costing Matrix) tab 2 “1-License”, rows 46-50, the cost for 5 years is requested. However, on tab 4 “Maintenance and Support”, rows 5-7, the cost for 3 years is

requested. Can the AOC/Court please confirm the total number of years costs to be included – is it 3 years or 5 years? Can the AOC/Court also please confirm that the same costs are to be entered in both these tabs (for years 1-3)? **Revised to 5 years in Attachment 16, SLO CMS RFP Costing Matrix, Revision 1, issued per Addendum #1.**

- 28. On Attachment 17 (RFP Template) section 3.2 “Requirements Response”, the bullet list of attachments includes an Attachment 12 “Local Infrastructure Requirements”. However, the RFP published on the procurement website has Attachment 12 titled as “Network-Desktop Requirements” and does not appear to include an attachment for “Local Infrastructure Requirements”. Is this an oversight in the bullet list, or will the AOC/Court publish a new “Local Infrastructure Requirements” for vendors to include in their responses? **Please use Attachment 13 as it is inclusive of “Local Infrastructure Requirements”. The “Requirements Response” section has been revised accordingly in Attachment 17, Revision 1.****
- 29. Need some assistance, please! We can't find the 'legend' for responses on Attachments... what are the 'response codes', for instance, what do we put in the response column when our functionality meets the requirement or requires modification or we will not provide, etc.? If you can help us with that we will look forward to responding to the attachments in the format you require. **The answers should be “yes,” “no,” or “future.” Any additional information you feel is important should be included.****
- 30. In Section 2.2 of the Attachment #17 - Response Template it asks for the proposing company to include its client references. Can the AOC/Court please clarify how it wishes for client's to answer the "Average Annual Contract Value" portion of the reference tables? Total contract value divided by number of years? Does this just pertain to the implementation only, not the ongoing support and maintenance? **Total contract value divided by number years will suffice.****
- 31. Within the professional services spreadsheet of Attachment #16 the AOC/Court has identified three phases of effort with twelve major activity areas. Further, the AOC/Court has identified another set of required "Deployment Services" in Section 2.4 of the main RFP document that also outlines project phases and activities. These two sections of services don't appear to be consistent with each other from a scope perspective. Can the AOC/Court please identify which prescribed set of activities it wishes for proposing vendors to follow? Are vendor's allowed to deviate from the prescribed activities to ensure the court's success? **The main RFP is a guide and the attachments are the response templates. Vendors should adjust the response templates if necessary, in order to propose the main business and strategic objectives.****

**Question and Answers from Vendor Q&A Teleconference held on
July 9th, 2012 from 2PM-5PM PDT**

32. How do you want us submit professional services information since the spreadsheet is locked down? **Use the response template in Attachment 17, or attach an additional spreadsheet. Attachment 16, SLO CMS RFP Costing Matrix, Revision 1, issued per Addendum #1 should be unlocked.**
33. Would San Luis Obispo Superior Court consider or prefer a platform approach. We have seen that some of our larger, enterprise customers prefer to minimize their project costs by maximizing the use of their own IT resources. With this approach, you would create all or the vast majority of the configurations and deliverables for your new system with train the trainer and configuration training from us. You would further minimize your costs by creating your own data exchanges (using the JustWare API) and data conversion. **The court is prepared to supply subject matter experts and IT to the extent possible but would rely heavily on vendor supplied resources until adequate knowledge transfer is achieved as per the RFP. The court expects a train the trainer approach to bring those SMEs / Technical staff up to speed and allow them to in turn train staff.**
34. If a company doesn't meet the gateway requirements will their proposals still be considered? **Even though hard requirements were given, overall fit, deployment strategy and approach along with cost will factor in on the court's final decision.**
35. What law are you referencing re: 50% cost component in the table? **The RFP evaluation scoring allocation for cost is based on the requirement set forth in the Judicial Branch Contracting Manual (JBCM), Chapter 4C, Step 6.B. The subsection relating to cost points allocation appears on page 12:**
- “Cost Points: The evaluation criteria must be based on value-effective factors that include cost. These factors are weighted; generally, the administrative and technical requirements should equal 50 percent and cost should equal 50 percent.”**
- The JBCM can be accessed at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbcl-manual.pdf>
36. Does the state have a preference around the tech for the solution: (i.e.: browser based or tech server)? **Please refer to attachment 13 for Infrastructure requirements.**

37. Has the AOC demo'd any other products or solutions in the market place to date? **The AOC has seen demos from vendors and currently run Vendor provided CMS software from Sustain. The AOC also supports various custom built applications.**
38. Can the AOC confirm they are looking for an off the shelf solution not a custom solution? **The solution that provides the best overall fit, deployment strategy, and approach along with cost all will factor in on the courts final decision.**
39. What time will the answers that will be posted on the 12th be available? **By end of day July 12th, 2012 PDT**
40. From the RFP it appears that the AOC is asking for an off the shelf solution. It may be impossible to meet your requirements with an off the shelf solution. Would the AOC/Court entertain a custom solution? If the answer is yes, then some of the requirements may not be valid for such a solution. **The solution that provides the best overall fit, deployment strategy, and approach along with cost all will factor in on the courts final decision.**
41. Regarding the timeline, is it absolutely set in stone? If a company suggests another timeline will that be considered? **The Court has a desire be fully deployed in as close to a thirteen month window as possible.**
42. Regarding third party software, does that include (i.e.: Windows software, data base software) or just third party as it pertains to the software stack? **The hardware, 3rd party software, and application software will be purchased by the court however as per the RFP, the Deployment vendor is to supply a complete inventory and server/application build instructions that the deployment vendor will use to build the environments while doing knowledge transfer to the Court Technical staff.**
43. Is there a budget allocated for this project? **Yes, there is an allocated budget for the project.**
44. Is there a proposed budgetary limit to this project? **Yes, there is a budgetary limit to the project.**
45. Regarding the number of users on the system, can you provide a case-wide break down by users? **Please refer to Attachment 15 for court users. There will be approximately 160 trusted Web users (DA, Sheriff, PDs, Public Defender, Attorneys, etc.) and possibly 1,000 public access users at any given time.**

46. Can we assume that the hardware will be provided by the court? **The hardware, 3rd party software, and application software will be purchased by the court however as per the RFP, the Deployment vendor is to supply a complete inventory and server/application build instructions that the deployment vendor will use to build the environments while doing knowledge transfer to the Court Technical staff.**

END OF DOCUMENT