



Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts

Finance Division
455 Golden Gate Avenue ♦ San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
Telephone 415-865-7960 ♦ Fax 415-865-4325 ♦ TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

WILLIAM C. VICKREY
Administrative Director of the Courts

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
Chief Deputy Director

CHRISTINE HANSEN
Director
Finance Division

December 5, 2002

PROSPECTIVE PROPOSER:
RE: RFP No. AOC10.02

Addendum No. 4

This Addendum No. 4 is issued for the Civil Case Management System Software project RFP No. AOC10.02 which was issued on October 24, 2002.

The Proposal Due Date of December 16, 2002 has been changed. All Proposals (Original and Copies) must be received on or before **January 9, 2003, by 4 p.m. Pacific Standard Time**, at the locations specified in the RFP.

The following pages are hereby replaced: I-7, II-1, III-8 and III-9. Full replacement pages are included in this Addendum No. 4. changes or additions to the text are indicated by a vertical line in the right-hand margin next to the change. Changes or additions to the text are in bold type and underlined, for easy identification.

Please note that Addendum 4 also includes the answers to vendors questions submitted over the past several weeks. The questions along with the answers are posted for your review.

The AOC has issued each page in the addendum package to allow for full replacement of existing pages in the RFP Documents. If any pages are missing, please contact Adrian Prost at (818) 558-3075.

Sincerely,

Adrian Prost
AOC Program Manager



Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts

Finance Division
455 Golden Gate Avenue ♦ San Francisco, CA 94102-3660
Telephone 415-865-7960 ♦ Fax 415-865-4325 ♦ TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

WILLIAM C. VICKREY
Administrative Director of the Courts

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
Chief Deputy Director

CHRISTINE HANSEN
Director
Finance Division

TO: POTENTIAL BIDDERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts

DATE: December 5, 2002

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
This RFP seeks proposals from highly qualified technology specialists (“Vendors”) for the specific analysis, design, architecture, development, and deployment of a general civil, small claims and probate case management system. This is the first of multiple initiatives to build and deploy a comprehensive case management system.

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposals (“RFP”):
Project Title: Civil Case Management Systems Software
RFP Number: AOC10.02

DEADLINE: Proposals must be received by 4 p.m. on ~~December 216, 2002~~ January 9, 2003

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals should be sent to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Grant Walker, Business Services Manager
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:

NAME:	TEL:	FAX:	E-MAIL:
Adrian Prost	(818) 558-3075	(818) 558-3112	adrian.prost@jud.ca.gov

1) II. PROCUREMENT AND EVALUATION PROCESS**2.1 Procurement Schedule and General Instructions**

The AOC has developed the following list of key events from RFP issuance through contract negotiations. All deadlines are subject to change at the AOC's discretion.

No.	EVENTS	Key Dates
1	Issue RFP	Week of Oct. 21, 2002
2	Deadline for Vendor Requests for Clarifications or Modifications	Nov. 4 8, 2002
3	Pre-Proposal Conference	November 4 7, 2002
4	Proposal Due Date	December 216, 2002 <u>January 9, 2003,</u> 4:00pm PST
5	Interviews/Negotiations	Nov. — Dec., 2002 <u>January, 2003</u>
6	Notice of Intent to Award Phase One	End of December, 2002 <u>January, 2003</u>
7	Notice to Proceed	Jan. 2003 <u>February,</u> 2003

2.1.2 The RFP and any addenda that may be issued will be available on the following websites:

<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/>

<http://www.osmb.dgs.ca.gov/cscr/>

2.1.2 RFP Not a Contract

The RFP does not constitute a contract or an offer for employment. The award of any contract pursuant to this RFP is contingent upon funds being made available by the State of California in the appropriate fiscal year for the purposes of this project. In addition, any contract awarded as a result of this RFP is subject to any additional restriction, limitation, or condition enacted by the Legislature or established by the Judicial Council of California that may affect the provisions, funding, or terms of the contract in any manner. The AOC reserves the right to make one award, multiple awards, or to reject all proposals, in whole or in part, submitted in response to this RFP. The AOC further reserves the right to make no award, and to modify or cancel, in whole or in part, this RFP.

2.1.3 Confidential Matters

If any information submitted in a Vendor's proposal is confidential or proprietary, the Vendor must provide that information on pages separate from non-confidential information and clearly label the pages containing confidential information "CONFIDENTIAL."

Following the creation of high-level design deliverables in Phase One, the selected Vendor will proceed with a detailed design of the application (functional components) and supporting architecture (non-functional services). The analysis and high-level design deliverables created in Phase One will be enhanced to include the design details required for system development of the overarching architecture and civil, small claims and probate case types. The development process is expected to follow the detailed project plan developed as part of Phase One (1.3.3 (h), above) and shall include deliverable components typical of the object-oriented lifecycle as noted in Section III. The development process will include implementation of business rules for each SCOC court.

The timeline for deployment of the completed civil, small claims and probate case management system for all SCOC court facilities will be determined during Phase One by the project team and refined during Phase Two. The Vendor is expected to assist with the configuration, troubleshooting, and with addressing system defects throughout the rollout process. The Vendor is expected to include all necessary implementation and deployment services for the four SCOC courts in its Phase Two workplan and detailed cost proposal. Specific implementation and deployment services to be performed by the vendor include but are not limited to the following:

- (a) development of data migration strategy and approach;
- (b) execution of detailed tasks required to migrate data for all SCOC courts from their existing applications, where cost-effective, to the new V3 application;
- (c) development of application interface/integration components and application program interfaces (APIs);
- (d) development of interface configurations specific to each SCOC Court;
- (e) development and execution of an end-user training plan;
- (f) transition of operational and support duties to Court personnel, as detailed in Section 1.4.4.

~~Production deployment of the completed civil, small claims and probate system will occur to all SCOC court facilities, as itemized in Section V, on a timeline to be determined by the project team during Phase One and refined during Phase Two. The Vendor will be expected to assist with the configuration and troubleshooting tasks, and with addressing system defects throughout the rollout process.~~

~~The Vendor should assume that data migration in the phase will occur prior to testing and rollout as required, and be included within the scope of this RFP, as noted above. A key initial deliverable should be a data migration strategy and approach, followed by the execution of the detailed tasks required to migrate data for all SCOC courts from their existing applications, where cost effective, to the new V3 application. The Vendor should also assume that development of application interface/integration components and application program interfaces (APIs) will be included within the scope of the RFP. Interface configuration specific to each SCOC court should also be included within the scope of this RFP. The Vendor will also be responsible for transitioning operational and support duties to Court personnel, as detailed below in 1.4.4.~~

Other production deployment deliverables should be developed by the Vendor as appropriate, including: Change Control; Training and End-User Support materials; Disaster Recovery Plan; Transition Plan; and Administration and Operations Manuals.

As noted previously, it is the expectation that the Vendor will assist the AOC and the SCOC in the creation of a CMS software service, including but not limited to the following:

- (a) Organizational strategy and high-level design, including application development and support, Help Desk, technology operations, business support
- (b) Technology-related processes, including change and configuration management, problem management, service level management, backup/recovery management, storage management, security management

(c) Technology, including non-functional components integrated into the CMS system (for instance, for charge backs and service level measurement), and tools to support the organization and process as noted above.

- iii. Project Glossary
- iv. High Level Requirement documents.
- v. Use Case documents
- vi. Supplementary Requirements documents
- vii. Detailed Technical Specification documents.
- viii. Analysis Model
- ix. Design Model
- x. Software Architecture Document
- xi. Logical Data Model
- xii. Physical Data Model
- xiii. Integration Build plan
- xiv. Implementation Model
- xv. Data migration strategy
- xvi. Test strategy, plans and cases
- xvii. Training and end-user support material
- xviii. User Acceptance plans and scripts
- xix. User's guide
- xx. Training Material
- xxi. Technical guide
- xxii. On-line Help guide
- xxiii. Systems and operations guide
- xxiv. Deployment strategy and plan
- xxv. Change Control Strategy and Plan

3.4.2 Vendor Key Personnel

Identify the personnel proposed for Phase One of the project as outlined in Section 3.4.1, providing names, qualifications, experiences, certifications, degrees, references, and proposed roles. Reflect these resource commitments in the work plan outlined in Section 3.4.1. Proposer should disclose any substantial time commitments in connection with other projects for key personnel that have been proposed.

3.4.3 Proposed Court Staff & Coordination Model

Identify Court resources, skill sets, roles and responsibilities required for the project. Reflect these resource commitments in the work plan outlined in Section 3.4.1. Please document your assumptions.

~~3.4.4 Acceptance of Terms [Please refer to Section 3.2.4]~~

~~The Vendor must include in its "Technical Proposal" a statement as to whether the Vendor accepts the General Conditions in Section IV and the form of Professional Services Agreement contained~~

~~in Appendix C, or whether the Vendor takes any exception to those terms. The Vendor will be deemed to have accepted the terms of those documents, except as is expressly called out in the Vendor's proposal. If exceptions are taken, Vendor must submit in its "Technical Proposal" a "redlined" version of the term or condition showing all modifications proposed by the Vendor. The Vendor's willingness to accept the General Conditions and the form of Professional Services Agreement, with minor clarifications, shall be an affirmative factor in the evaluation of the Vendor's proposal. By contrast, significant modifications to the terms or modifications to particular terms such as Intellectual Property Rights, Indemnification, Limitation of Liability, shall be a negative factor in the evaluation. Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, any exceptions to Section 4.10 (and any of its subsections), Section 4.16, and 4.18 (and any of its subsections), and Section 4.20 (and any of its subsection) must be set forth in detail, with exact proposed modifications to contract language provided. As discussed in licenses, and other arrangements regarding ownership of intellectual property rights will be considered but must be set forth in detail, with exact proposed contract language provided.~~

~~Finally, any proposed additional terms affecting liability or allocation of risk must be set forth in detail, with exact proposed contract language provided.~~

3.5 Phase One Cost Proposal Format and Content

3.5.1 Phase One

The AOC intends to award contracts to one or more Vendors for Phase One Assessment work.

Cost Proposals are to be provided in a separately sealed envelope marked with the Proposers name, contact title and Cost Proposal.

Vendor will provide a fixed price for Phase One Assessment outlined in Section 1.3.2 / 1.3.3 (e.g. \$150K). The Vendor will also provide a table with professional services rates by role/level applicable to Phase One and Phase Two, and any annual price escalation.

Vendors are required to complete the Pricing Page Form included in Appendix D. As described in Section 1.3.2, the Vendors will provide a fixed price bid for Phase One along with Professional Services Rates by resource level. All pricing shall include California sales/use tax, all anticipated travel, lodging, transportation and relocation and all other expenses incidental to the performance of the requirements. Hourly rates as quoted shall remain in effect for the duration of Phase One and Phase Two, if awarded.

3.5.2 Proposed Court Infrastructure Requirements

Identify on a separate page in the Cost Proposal any infrastructure (office space, telephones, computer hardware/software) required to be provided by the Court for Phase One. Please document your assumptions.

Administrative Office of the Courts Case Management Request for Proposal

VENDOR QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
1. Will the AOC provide a list of the vendors who attend the Pre-Proposal Conference?	Please refer to Addendum No. 3, posted on the Court Info website.
2. Section 2.3, Submission of Proposals: The RFP indicates that proposals should be delivered to two (2) different locations, while the cover page of the RFP indicates, only the San Francisco location. Can the AOC clarify the location(s) in which to submit our proposals?	Please refer to Section 2.3.1 detailing Submission of Proposals. This section provides instructions for submitting both originals and copies of the proposals.
3. Section 2.3, Submission of Proposals: Proposals must be submitted before 4:00pm on December 2, 2002. Given that December 2 nd is the Monday after the Thanksgiving Holiday, would the AOC consider moving the proposal due date to the week of December 16 th , given the typical travel associated with the holiday, as well as allowing the vendors additional time to fully analyze the Phase 1 and 2 requirements of this RFP?	Please refer to Addendum No. 3 posted on the Court Info website. The new deadline for submission of proposals is December 16, 2002 at 4:00pm.
4. Section 3.4, Technical Approach and Methodology, Item (e): Can examples of the work products and artifacts be delivered in an electronic format to the AOC, and if so, in	The AOC will accept electronic format for work products. The e-format should be in MS Word or PDF format.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>what format?</p> <p>Section 3.4 (e) Technical Approach & Methodology. Requires submittal of representative examples of 5 work “products” from comparable “projects”. This is a significant amount of documentation. Does AOC desire full copies of each “product” or will limited portions of each document, for example, the Table of Contents & 15 – 20 pages be acceptable?</p>	<p>The AOC does not require full copies of each “product”, please refer to Section 3.4.1. We anticipate a maximum of 25 pages per work product.</p>
<p>5. Does AOC have budget approved for this entire project? If it is a multi-year project, does AOC need approvals for every year?</p> <p>What is the dollar amount you expect to spend on this procurement? Is there a predefined budget for the entire project and a predefined budget for the Phase I and Phase II separately?</p>	<p>There is not a predefined budget for the entire project. Funding has been identified for Phase I. The AOC anticipates the Phase I budget to be approximately \$150,000 per vendor. A Phase II budget has not been defined. Once the Phase II budget has been defined and the contract awarded, no additional AOC funding approvals are required.</p>
<p>6. Has AOC looked at off the shelf case management products and would any fit this requirement or is AOC looking at a custom solution to be developed?</p> <p>In the section 4.2 guidelines, the</p>	<p>We are looking for a custom solution to be developed for this RFP. No package CMS software currently meets the full set of functional and technical requirements of the four courts. It is our expectation that the selected vendor will leverage and reuse, where appropriate, existing commercial and state-owned software components.</p> <p>The AOC reserves the right to use third party</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>RFP says that AOC will/may take services of 3rd parties if it suits the interests of AOC. Will it also make use of 3rd party products/software?</p>	<p>software.</p>
<p>7. Is there a target date by when you want this solution to go live?</p> <p>What is the expected start and end dates of Phase I and II?</p>	<p>There is currently no targeted date for the solution to go live. It is our expectation that Development will be completed no later than the end of 2004.</p> <p>Phase I is expected to begin in February and end April 2003. In Phase II, we would expect the vendor approach to maximize incremental earned value through an iterative approach, delivering various application components throughout the project lifecycle.</p>
<p>8. Will the Phase I and II be all done at AOC facility or wherever possible can vendor facilities be used (especially for development)?</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 1.5 for Facility information. We are requesting the vendor to provide the facilities information in their proposal.</p>
<p>9. Is Phase 1 meant to be a competitive process for Phase 2? If so, how would the AOC envision ensuring the needed allocation of time from Court staff?</p> <p>Is it the intention of the AOC to award Phase 1 to multiple vendors? If yes, is the vendor RFP response pricing to include discovery/assessment etc. of all courts or just a fraction of the courts?</p> <p>If more than one vendor is selected for Phase One, will vendor assessments be conducted concurrently (i.e. more than one vendor conducting assessments and</p>	<p>Yes. Please refer to Section 1.3 of the RFP. A framework or an example of court participation and teams is outlined in Section 1.4. We are asking vendors in their response to include how they will work with the Court staff.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 1.3.2 of the RFP. The scope of Phase I includes the four SCOC courts (Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, and Ventura). The fixed price is for Phase I only. The vendor will include rates by roles for Phase II.</p> <p>Yes. Please refer to Section 1.3.2 of the RFP.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
analysis at the same time)?	
10. What does the AOC envision the form to be for the work product(s) involving the review of the functional requirements for Phase 1. And what form for reviewing the non-functional requirements?	We have supplied a form that you may use (Appendices A, B and E) or develop your own format.
11. In Section 1.3.3, what is the purpose of the prototype(s)? What is it intended to demonstrate?	Please refer to Section 1.3.3. The AOC does not expect a fully functional case management system. We expect to take one or two use cases that have been defined as part of the 8 – 12 week assessment project to demonstrate you can turn around prototypes that meet those use case criteria in a timely manner. The expectation is to provide one or two prototypes that demonstrate to us you have the ability to 1) Perform detailed use case analysis 2) Turn use cases into prototypes - users would then be able to quickly review and comment.
12. Is Section 3.4.4 a duplicate of 3.2.4?	Section 3.4.4 is deleted. Replacement pages III-8 and III-9 are attached. Section 3.2.4 is unchanged.
13. At what point in the project (Phase I or Phase II) does the AOC envision the delivery of an initial Technical architecture?	The AOC would expect this to be a Phase II Deliverable
14. Did the AOC intend any meaning to the reference in Section 3.5.1 of \$150K?	Yes, this is a reference point for the cost/fees for Phase I and described as a baseline for an 8-12 week engagement for two to three vendors (\$150K per vendor). In addition, Section 2.6 of RFP requires that pricing fall within the competitive range.
15. Are there relational database maps available for the different databases within each court? Specifically table relationships?	There are varying levels of documentation for each court. This will be investigated in the Phase I discovery process.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
16. What is the relationship of this project to the AOC CMS certification program?	CMS certification is a separate program with requirements for California Case Management Systems. The draft functional requirements in Appendix A are inclusive of the CMS certification requirements.
17. Who is on the Evaluation Committee?	It is anticipated that representatives from the four courts and the AOC will serve on the evaluation committee.
18. Given two equal vendors, would priority be given to a California based company?	No preference will be given to a California based company.
19. Is it your expectation to reuse existing infrastructure (e.g. Oracle), if so, can state components of priority?	Ideally, the new system will leverage/reuse significant portions of existing application components and infrastructure investment. See Appendix B for draft infrastructure component standards and guidance.
20. With respect to Intellectual Property, can the vendor also resell CMS product to other courts or states?	No, not under the terms and conditions given in the RFP, specifically Section 4.16. The AOC might be willing to consider alternative arrangements by which the vendor would be allowed to sell CMS products to courts or agencies outside the State of California. Vendors wishing to explore that option should submit a proposal conforming with the terms of the RFP as written – and an alternate proposal that details the specific terms under which the vendors would have rights to sell CMS products to courts or agencies outside of California (including proposed legal provisions) and any impact on pricing.
21. Please discuss the attributes of your largest courts that you feel cannot be served by any existing COTS package?	Existing COTS packages are not sufficiently extensible, flexible and scalable to meet the needs of the largest courts.
22. The RFP leans toward custom vs. COTS yet the attachment contains a checklist which asks if specifications exist in the current core CMS. Are existing CMS packages acceptable if	Yes, it is our expectation that the selected vendor will leverage and reuse, where appropriate, existing commercial and state-owned software components, subject to AOC approval. Please refer to Section 4.16.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
modified to meet the specifications?	
23. In the RFP there's potential that you will have one vendor actually do the assessment phase all the way down to planning as far as development and have the second vendor do the full development?	Please refer to Sections 1.3.3 and 1.3.4. The AOC fully intends to keep all options open. We anticipate two to three vendors will be selected for Phase I and one Vendor will be selected for Phase II (Design, Develop, and Implement).
24. If you're going to award Phase I to two separate vendors, is each vendor going to be proposing pricing that covers the entire assessment as though they were being awarded exclusively?	Yes, please refer to Section 1.3 and 2.6 of the RFP for the award.
25. Are requirements frozen at this point for the purpose of this RFP?	No. A Phase I deliverable is to complete the identification of Functional Requirements for the SCOC Courts. Please refer to Section 1.3 of the RFP.
26. Intellectual property question – with those components that we essentially transfer in or that we would transfer in how does that relate to the whole issue of intellectual property and who owns that and the resale ability of that?	Refer to Section 4.16. As the terms and conditions provide, the vendor continues to own pre-existing intellectual property that it brings to the CMS project. Keep in mind, however, that the AOC must approve the introduction of any such intellectual property; and that if it does approve, the vendor must grant appropriate licenses for the AOC's use of that intellectual property. Similar requirements govern the use of any third-party intellectual property.
27. Regarding implementation: Will the final vendor be involved with the delivery/implementation of the final product?	Please refer to Section 1.3.4, revised in this Addendum 4. Replacement page 1-7 is attached.
28. Are data conversions in the scope of the RFP?	Please refer to Section 1.3.4, revised in this Addendum 4. Replacement page 1-7 is attached.
29. Are follow-on utilities and interfaces,	The vendor should assume that development of

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
such as agency, public-access issues, etc., within the scope of the RFP?	Application Program Interfaces (APIs), as well as interface configurations specific to each SCOC court, is included within the scope of the RFP. Please refer to Section 1.3.4.
30. The RFP .pdf documents seem to be locked, inhibiting the copy and paste feature. Can you provide the password to unlock the documents, or provide the RFP in an alternate format?	The RFP is locked down and will remain locked for the duration of this RFP process.
31. Section III, Proposal Format and Content, does not specify the inclusion of the Required Functional Features List. Please clarify where you would like this section to appear within the response.	Functional Features List is a Phase I deliverable. We do not expect this to be included in the proposal.
32. Will the SCOC Cross-Court Project Teams be assigned to Phase One Full-Time?	Please refer to Section 1.4 of the RFP, this section provides an example of one "Project Organization". However, the specific Project Organization will be determined after the Award process is completed.
33. Will the SCOC Cross-Court Project Teams be assigned to Phase Two Full-Time?	There will be full time court staff dedicated to the project. The number of teams will be determined after Phase I completion.
34. What are the critical factors driving the decision to convert legacy system data?	Please refer to Section 1.3 of the RFP for the statement of the business problem.
35. How much data is being converted by the system (in years and months)?	During Phase II, the AOC would expect the vendor to determine how much data will be converted.
36. What are the anticipated risks associated with converting legacy system data?	The AOC expects the vendor to identify risks associated with converting legacy data as a Phase II deliverable.
37. What are the primary objectives associated with converting legacy system data?	The AOC expects the vendor to identify objectives for converting legacy data as a Phase II deliverable.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
38. Does the Client have qualified available staff to assist with the data conversion effort?	The AOC expects the vendor to determine what the team should be and the skills needed as a Phase II deliverable.
39. Describe each system from which data must be converted (Include the file names and the type of data such as case, person, etc. - stored in each file/table)?	The AOC expects the vendor to describe each system and the data to be converted as a Phase II deliverable.
40. Will the vendor be allowed to ask additional questions during the Phase I Assessment and Analysis Phase?	The AOC and Courts will be available to answer questions from the selected Phase I vendors.
41. What type of imaging does the Client require? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ad Hoc ▪ Batch 	The AOC expects the vendor to understand and determine each courts needs/requirements as a Phase I deliverable.
42. The RFP calls out several operating systems with the exception of HPUX. Can you clarify whether or not this was an oversight and state that the hardware platform can be provided? If not, please advise the reason why.	The reference cited is in Appendix B, the draft technical requirements. These requirements are meant to be starting points, and do not constitute the final set of requirements of the four courts. Any current version of Unix as a server operating system is acceptable.
43. How does AOC anticipate managing the changes in case management processes and forms that may be required during conduct of the project? Specifically, can we assume that all forms and reports on which the application is based will be frozen at Phase I – system design?	All forms and reports will be part of the requirements process and we expect them to continue to change over time. We would expect the vendor to have a change management methodology to address this process. Please refer to Section 3.4 of the RFP.
44. Can the contractor bid solely on the first phase?	The vendor selected to perform the Phase I work will be expected to commit to

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
	perform the Phase II work, if selected as the final vendor.
45. Will the selection of the Vendor be based on one final cost price for the RFP, or different selectable options (Part A = \$X; Part B = \$X, etc.) not to be exceeded?	Please refer to Section 2.6 for Phase I evaluation process and Section 2.9 for Phase II evaluation process. The AOC anticipates multiple vendors for Phase I and one vendor for Phase II.
46. In the event that requirements change in Phase II of the Project, will the Vendor be allowed to re-bid and change the price?	Please refer to Section 4.20 regarding the process to be followed in the event of changes.
47. RFP Appendix D states that the fixed fee quote includes the hardware, software, network, and telephone costs. What constitutes the software? Does this mean only the OS and the utilities that are included with it for free? Do we need to include the cost for additional software such as the .Net Framework? (Attachment D)	The Fixed Fee should include all software costs except items that the vendor identifies in Appendix D as Court Provided Resources. This would include OS, utilities and all tools needed to complete the project. Please refer to the Pricing Page of Appendix D.
48. For Data transmission security, does the AOC define procurement of SSL certificates as a software item to be included in the costs?	The Fixed Fee should include all software costs except items that the vendor identifies in Appendix D as Court Provided Resources. This would include OS, utilities and all tools needed to complete the project. Please refer to the Pricing Page of Appendix D.
49. As the development is expected to be onsite, what types and versions of the design and analysis tools will be provided by AOC to the vendor? Or may recommend design tools of its own choice?	The Vendor has the choice of all design tools to complete the project.
50. Was any vendor involved in the preparation of this RFP prior to its	No potential proposers were involved in the preparation of the RFP.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
release to the public? If "yes," who?	
51. How many users will be utilizing the system? How many end users will need to be trained? Now and in the future? Concurrently?	See the specifications outlined in the RFP section 2.5. The AOC would expect the vendor to determine the exact number of users during Phase I discovery.
52. Since AOC intends to maintain the proposed application in the future, knowing the skill-sets of AOC employees will help us propose a suitable technology. What software skill-sets do AOC employees presently have?	The AOC would expect the vendor to determine the level of software proficiency of AOC employees as a Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
53. What is the predominant way to accept payments? Is there a particular method or any changes to your methods for accepting payments? Does accepting electronic payments also include payment by ACH Credit/Debit option?	The AOC would expect the vendor to determine on a court-by-court basis methods for accepting payment as a Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
54. What are the models/specifications of the existing scanners?	The AOC would expect the vendor to determine existing scanners for each court as a Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
55. In regards to security, does the AOC plan to register as the certifying authority? If not, how will this be addressed?	The AOC would expect the vendor to determine certification authority as a Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
56. Is documentation on electronic payment services such as credit/debit cards and electronic fund transfer available with the AOC?	The AOC would expect the vendor to determine payment services as a Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
57. Does the AOC have established Web development standards or	The AOC would expect the vendor to identify web standards for each court as a

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
product preferences? What browsers and versions of each will the system be required to support?	Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
58. It seems that the AOC prefers to implement this project using iterative Life Cycle methodology. Is AOC open to the Vendor's suggesting a different approach?	Please refer to Section 1.3 of the RFP. The AOC is open to other Life Cycle methodologies, however the one described in the RFP is the preferred.
59. How does the AOC envision the workflow to be integrated with the application? Automated routing and approval processing? What manual processes need to be automated? Does the AOC currently have an automated workflow processing system? Is there any available documentation?	The AOC would expect the vendor to determine workflow integration, routing and approval processes as a Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
60. Will the archived image of the original form need to be retrieved across the web? If so, what browsers and versions require support?	The AOC would expect the vendor to identify and understand archived image requirements as a Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
61. What FileNET products are currently being utilized?	The AOC would expect the vendor to identify FileNET products as a Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
62. How many different document types are there with different applications that would require scanning?	The AOC would expect the vendor to determine scanning requirements as a Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
63. Does the AOC have any preference for any particular digital signature technology?	The AOC would expect the vendor to determine digital signature technology preferences as a Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
64. Are there any business process models or business process analysis documentation available with AOC	The AOC would expect the vendor to develop and or identify process models and documentation as a Due Diligence activity

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
describing tasks, workflows, resource requirements, and system dependencies in detail?	during Phase I discovery.
65. Please describe the FileNET imaging software licenses that the AOC currently owns. Please include the software product, support level, and number of licenses (concurrent licenses, processors, etc.). Specifically, in order to include license costs in the proposal, we need to know what software and to what level the AOC is licensed.	The AOC would expect the vendor to determine FileNET software licenses as a Due Diligence activity during Phase I discovery.
66. Do you want Vendors to identify details in the Project Plan where AOC Staff will be used to perform some of the work?	Yes, please refer to Sections 1.4 and 3.4.3 of the RFP.
67. Will some of the AOC Staff assigned to this Project devote 100% of their time to the Project?	Yes, Please refer to Sections 1.4 and 3.4.3 of the RFP.
68. Will the AOC developers be available for dedicated blocks of time, (i.e. half-days or full days during each week) for the duration of the project?	Please refer to Sections 1.4 and 3.4.3 of the RFP.
69. Have you worked with any outside vendor to identify and validate the business objectives/strategy for this procurement? If "yes," who?	The AOC and the Courts developed the business objectives along with IT consultants. No potential proposers were involved in the preparation of the RFP.
70. Is every court in California going to use this new CMS system and for all their case types?	There is not a requirement for any/every court in California to use the new CMS System. Deployment decisions will be made on a court-by-court basis.