



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
COURTS (AOC)**

REGARDING:
JUDICIAL BRANCH ENTERPRISE
DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
RFP# FIN122210CK

RESPONSES DUE:
FEBRUARY 8, 2011, 1:00 P.M. PST



TO: POTENTIAL PROPOSERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts
Information Services Division

DATE: January 13, 2011

**SUBJECT/PURPOSE
OF MEMO:** Request for proposals
The Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) seeks an enterprise document management solution capable of solving challenges respecting electronic document management in the California courts, and the AOC.

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposal (“RFP”) as posted at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/>
Project Title: Judicial Branch Enterprise Document Management System
RFP Number: FIN122210CK

**SOLICITATIONS
MAILBOX:** solicitations@jud.ca.gov

**DUE DATE & TIME
FOR SUBMITTAL OF
QUESTIONS:** The deadline for submittal of questions pertaining to solicitation document is:

5:00 p.m. (PST) on Friday January 28, 2011

**PROPOSAL DUE
DATE AND TIME:** Proposals must be received by:

1:00 p.m. (PST) on Tuesday February 8, 2011

**SUBMISSION OF
PROPOSAL:** Proposals should be sent to:

**Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No: FIN122210CK
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION**
- 2.0 PURPOSE OF THIS RFP**
- 3.0 RFP ATTACHMENTS**
- 4.0 RFP APPENDICES**
- 5.0 PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE**
- 6.0 ASSUMPTIONS PERTAINING TO PROJECT SCOPE**
- 7.0 SUBMISSION GUIDELINES**
- 8.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL**
- 9.0 EVALUATION PROCESS**
- 10.0 SELECTION CRITERIA AND WEIGHTING**
- 11.0 RIGHTS**
- 12.0 RELATIONSHIP OF PARTIES**
- 13.0 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS**
- 14.0 CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION**
- 15.0 DISABLED VETERAN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION GOALS**

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 The California Constitution directs the Judicial Council of California to adopt rules for court administration, practice and process. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency for the Judicial Council which has policy-making authority over the state court system.

The vast majority of cases in the California courts begin in one of the 58 superior courts — which reside in each of the state's 58 counties. The next level of judicial authority resides with the Courts of Appeal. Most of the cases that come before the Courts of Appeal involve the review of a superior court decision that is being contested by a party to the case. The Supreme Court sits at the apex of authority in the state's judicial system, and as such it may review decisions of the Courts of Appeal in order to settle important questions of law and ensure that the law is applied uniformly.

The Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and Superior Courts may be referenced in this document as the Courts or as the California Courts. The Courts and the AOC together make up the Judicial Branch.

- 1.1.2 The California Court Case Management System (CCMS) is a statewide initiative to develop and deploy a unified case management system for all 58 superior courts. CCMS will reduce operating costs, increase efficiency, and give Californians an unprecedented level of access to their courts.

Development of CCMS began with the criminal and traffic case categories, followed by civil, probate, small claims, and mental health. Final development will combine the functionality already developed with new functionality for family law, juvenile delinquency, and juvenile dependency case categories. The final release, on schedule for completion in July 2011, will also include statewide reporting, court interpreter and reporter scheduling, and integration with justice partner applications.

- 1.1.3 Recent AOC assessments have revealed the need for a Judicial Branch Enterprise Document Management System (DMS). Key facts identified include:
- The operational environment at the courts is highly dependent on inefficient, labor intensive paper based processing;

- About half of California's 67 courts, which include the California Supreme Court, the Courts of Appeal and the Superior Courts, have no electronic document management system;
- Fourteen courts stated in the 2010 California Court DMS survey that they plan to procure and deploy a DMS within the next 12 to 36 months;
- Technology standards have not been established to guide courts in the selection of DMS solutions that are compatible with and leverage the Judicial Branch's shared services model (see Appendix C);
- The AOC business divisions need DMS technology tools to allow them to capture, store, preserve, process, track, and share information.

A DMS is defined as that subset of enterprise content management features required to fulfill the requirements of the Judicial Branch to capture, store, manage, preserve and deliver content in an electronic format. The term "content" includes, but is not limited to: paper of any size, microfilm, electronic documents (PDF, XML, and MS Office), and rich media (picture, video, audio and computer aided design drawings).

2.0 PURPOSE OF THIS RFP

2.1 The AOC invites all interested software and software implementation service providers (hereinafter "vendor," "proposer" or "service provider") with proven experience, to submit proposals to license and implement an enterprise document management solution for use by the Judicial Branch.

2.2 Project Objectives

- 2.2.1 Make a system available branch-wide for electronic storage, distribution, and management of documents;
- 2.2.2 Identify and publish DMS technology and product standards that address the DMS business requirements of the Judicial Branch;
- 2.2.3 Reduce the staff time required for tracking, retrieving, and managing paper documents;
- 2.2.4 Minimize the cost of physical paper document storage in terms of total lineal feet of internal facilities and dollars of leased space used to store and archive court and administrative documents;
- 2.2.5 Leverage the size of the Judicial Branch for the procurement of DMS enterprise license agreements and/or master services agreements using economies of scale to achieve cost savings;
- 2.2.6 Identify DMS products that are compliant with the Judicial Branch's computing and networking infrastructure environments;

- 2.2.7 Identify DMS products that best support the technical integration with CCMS and integrate with key Judicial Branch e-Business initiatives such as the Phoenix SAP financial system, California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR), e-filing, and e-Citation;
 - 2.2.8 Facilitate the procurement and licensing of a DMS by the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara as a pilot test case for the superior courts;
 - 2.2.9 Improve Judicial Branch operations, increase the level of efficiency and control costs;
 - 2.2.10 Provide a secure, stable repository for AOC and court content, integrating with and/or complimenting existing repositories and systems of record as necessary;
 - 2.2.11 Provide intuitive search and retrieval of content across the Judicial Branch;
 - 2.2.12 Provide scalable and expandable DMS solutions to meet the growing needs of the Judicial Branch, including expansion of user base and processing volumes;
 - 2.2.13 Provide a reliable, cost effective and straight forward migration process from existing repositories to the selected standard as needed by each individual court;
 - 2.2.14 Support the Judicial Branch requirements primarily with out-of-the-box functionality.
- 2.3 Vendor Partnership
- 2.3.1 The AOC seeks to engage a vendor to design, configure, deploy, train and subsequently maintain and support a scalable DMS solution.
 - 2.3.2 Proposers may leverage partnerships and or consortiums with third party tools to meet the broad scope of requirements represented by this RFP.
 - 2.3.3 The AOC has designed the proposal evaluation and vendor selection process to ensure that all qualified proposers are evaluated fairly.
 - 2.3.4 The AOC prefers to award a multi-year, enterprise software license agreement and master services agreement in whole or in part to a single or consortium of software vendor(s) system integrators for the full range of feature sets, system hosting models and service deliverables required by the Judicial Branch. However, after scoring and evaluation of all proposals, if it is determined that no single vendor or vendor consortium proves adequate to address the full range of requirement categories; the AOC may choose to

award portions of this RFP to multiple vendors or vendor consortiums.

2.4 Scope of Project Deliverables.

- 2.4.1 Application Software Enterprise Licensing
- 2.4.2 Specifications for Production, Deployment, and Staging Hardware
- 2.4.3 Implementation Services
- 2.4.4 Technical Support, System Administration, Implementation and End-User Training and Documentation
- 2.4.5 Knowledge Transfer to AOC, Court, and Data Center Hosting Personnel
- 2.4.6 Solution Testing
- 2.4.7 Capacity and Scalability Documentation
- 2.4.8 Post Implementation Maintenance and Support Services
- 2.4.9 Integration and Migration Services

3.0 RFP ATTACHMENTS

- 3.1 Attachment 1, Administrative Rules Governing Request for Proposals. Proposers shall follow the rules, set forth in Attachment 1, in preparation of their proposals. This attachment is for the proposer's **reference only** and does not need to be submitted with the RFP response.
- 3.2 Attachment 2, Minimum Contract Terms. Contracts with successful firms will be signed by the parties on a State of California Standard Agreement form and will include terms appropriate for this project. Terms and conditions typical for the requested services are attached as Attachment 2. This attachment is for the proposer's **reference only** and does not need to be submitted with the RFP response.
- 3.3 Attachment 3, Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Minimum Contract Terms. Proposers must either indicate acceptance of the Minimum Contract Terms, as set forth in Attachment 2, or clearly identify exceptions to the Minimum Contract Terms, as set forth in Attachment 2. If exceptions are identified, then proposers must also submit (i) a red-lined version of Attachment 2, that clearly tracks proposed changes to this attachment, and (ii) written documentation to substantiate each such proposed change. This attachment **must be submitted** with the RFP response.
- 3.4 Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form. The AOC is required to obtain and keep on file, a completed Payee Data Record for each vendor prior to entering into a contract with that vendor. Therefore, the proposer's proposal must include a completed and signed Payee Data Record Form,

set forth in Attachment 4. This document **must be submitted** with the RFP response.

- 3.5 Attachment 5, Cost Submission Matrix. Proposers must propose all pricing necessary to accomplish the work requirements of the eventual contract. It is expected that all proposers responding to this RFP will offer the proposer's government or comparable favorable rates and will be inclusive of all pricing necessary to provide the contracted work. This attachment **must be submitted** with the RFP response.
- 3.6 Attachment 6, Customer Reference Form. References supplied must be provided using the form attached as Attachment 6. This document **must be submitted** with the RFP response.
- 3.7 Attachment 7, Vendor Certification Regarding Debarment and Suspension, certifying neither proposer nor any proposed subcontractors are currently under suspension or debarment by any state or federal government agency, and that neither proposer nor any proposed subcontractors are tax delinquent with the State of California. This attachment **must be submitted** with the RFP response.
- 3.8 Attachment 8, RFP Submission Checklist. This document is for **reference only** and intended to provide proposers with a summary of mandatory and optional submission components for this RFP.
- 3.9 Attachment 9, AOC Travel Rate Guidelines-Consultants. After this RFP is awarded, the selected proposer must adhere to the AOC Travel Rate Guidelines for Consultants for any travel that is to be billed to the Judicial Branch as part of any engagement related to the execution or delivery of contracted solutions and services. This attachment is for the proposer's **reference only** and does not need to be submitted with the RFP response.

4.0 RFP APPENDICES

- 4.1 Appendix A: DMS Features List. Detailed requirements for each functional category can be found in Appendix A. These requirements have been distilled by the statewide court DMS strategy team from a comprehensive list of Enterprise Content Management (ECM) features based on review and analysis of current needs and future anticipated growth of the Judicial Branch. In the interest of eliminating repetition, requirements applicable to multiple modules requirements are grouped by functional category as opposed to organization units, as follows;
 - 4.1.1 Integration Technology
 - 4.1.2 Security and Encryption
 - 4.1.3 Store

- 4.1.4 Document Capture
 - 4.1.4.1 Metadata Technologies
 - 4.1.4.2 Forms Processing
 - 4.1.4.3 Electronic Forms
- 4.1.5 Document Management
 - 4.1.5.1 Records Management Technologies
 - 4.1.5.2 Workflow/Business Process Management
 - 4.1.5.3 Electronic Reports Management

Each feature is assigned a priority for desirability: High, Medium, Low. Additionally, each feature is placed in one of the following categories:

- Core – we consider this feature basic core functionality.
- Desired – this feature would be beneficial in our environment.
- Optional – this feature may be beneficial in some situations.

There is an area for the proposer to indicate whether each feature is supported, configurable, provided by a third party, requires customized coding, is included in a future release, or is unsupported.

This appendix **must be updated and submitted** with the RFP response.

- 4.2 Appendix B: Judicial Branch Business Process Use Case Scenarios. Groups of high-level operational business process use case scenarios and flow diagrams are presented in Appendix B. Proposers must provide a short narrative response describing how their product features and or services will excel or be challenged in addressing effective automated solutions. The narrative addressing Appendix B **must be submitted** with the RFP response.
- 4.3 Appendix C: DMS Technical Requirements. Several technical architecture and infrastructure requirements are presented in Appendix C. The proposer must provide a short narrative response describing how their products are able to perform in the Judicial Branch's technical environment given a range of volume thresholds. The narrative addressing Appendix C **must be submitted** with the RFP response.
- 4.4 Appendix D: Technical Features List. Several technical architecture and infrastructure features are listed in Appendix D.

Each feature is assigned a priority for desirability: High, Medium, Low. Additionally, each feature is placed in one of the following categories:

- Core – we consider this feature basic core functionality.
- Desired – this feature would be beneficial in our environment.
- Optional – this feature may be beneficial in some situations.

There is an area for the proposer to indicate whether each feature is supported, configurable, provided by a third party, requires customized coding, is included in a future release, or is unsupported.

This appendix **must be updated and submitted** with the RFP response.

5.0 PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE

- 5.1 The AOC has developed the following list of key events and dates, subject to change at the discretion of the AOC.

No.	Key Events	Key Dates
1	AOC issues RFP	January 13, 2011
2	Deadline for proposers to register for Pre-Proposal Conference.	January 21, 2011
3	Mandatory Pre-Proposal Conference	January 25, 2011
4	Deadline for proposers to submit questions, requests for clarifications or modifications to solicitations@jud.ca.gov	January 28, 2011, 5:00 P.M. PST
5	Proposal due date and time	February 8, 2011, 1:00 PM PST
6	Invitations for Finalists' Presentations	March 9, 2011(estimated)
7	Finalists' Presentations (solution demonstrations and interviews)	March 2011 (estimated)
8	Final evaluation	March 2011 (estimated)
9	Notice of intent to award	April 2011(estimated)
10	Execution of contract	April 2011 (estimated)
11	Santa Clara Pilot Begins	September 2011 (Estimated)

5.2 MANDATORY Pre-Proposal Conference Details

- 5.2.1 Proposers are invited to attend a **mandatory** pre-proposal teleconference and web meeting. There will be no in-person meeting.
- 5.2.2 The pre-proposal conference will serve to clarify the requirements of this RFP. It is the proposer's responsibility to become familiar with all information necessary to prepare a proposal. Participation is required by any proposer wishing to submit a response to this RFP.

- 5.2.3 Proposers are strongly encouraged to register for and attend the conference as early as possible.
- 5.2.4 Proposers planning to attend the conference must contact solicitations@jud.ca.gov by the date specified in the Key Events Table (Section 5.1) to register.
- 5.2.5 Proposers should prepare for the conference by reading the RFP and creating a list of questions to be asked during the conference.

6.0 ASSUMPTIONS PERTAINING TO PROJECT SCOPE

- 6.1 This RFP reflects requirements of the Judicial Branch.
- 6.2 The California Supreme Court, some Courts of Appeal, many Superior Courts and the AOC do not have a DMS in place. The DMS solutions outlined in this RFP will be published as Judicial Branch standards.
- 6.3 Courts that have an existing DMS will determine if and when a migration to the standard solution would be feasible. Ease of migration, total cost, production implications, end users training and adoption, downtime and overall staff time and effort will be key factors in evaluating a migration decision.
- 6.4 DMS deployments may be local, at a single court or centrally hosted on behalf of several courts. A centrally hosted solution may be at the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) or locally, at a court with the capacity to host DMS for a smaller court. The final DMS implementation approach will be determined by the deployment team, based on a court by court assessment.
- 6.5 For purposes of this proposal, please refer to the following table for sample environment sizes and volumes.

Superior Courts			
Court Size	No. of Courts	Total Users	Total Pages Processed Monthly
Small	37	2,801	2,235,291
Medium	12	4,434	4,462,109
Large	9	15,644	16,507,255
District Courts of Appeal			
Small	6	902	3,406,800
Supreme Court			
Small	1	150	1,688,520

7.0 SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

- 7.1 Proposers shall submit the following:
- 7.1.1 One unbound original of the price proposal and one separate unbound original of the technical proposal.
 - 7.1.2 One electronic formatted copy of the pricing proposal, in MS Excel compatible format on a CD-ROM.
 - 7.1.3 One electronic formatted copy of the technical proposal in MS Word compatible format on a CD-ROM.
 - 7.1.4 All proposals (hard and electronic copies) must be submitted with the price proposal in one sealed envelope marked with “Cost Proposal” and the technical proposal placed in a separate sealed envelope marked with the Proposer’s name. These two envelopes should then be placed in a single outside envelope. The outside envelope must be sealed and clearly marked with the RFP Number, Project Title, the Proposal Due Date, and the Proposer’s name.
 - 7.1.5 The hard and electronic copies of the technical proposal must not include any pricing information. Proposals received by the AOC prior to the proposal due date and time that are marked properly will be securely kept, unopened until the proposal due date and time. Late proposals will not be considered.
 - 7.1.6 All proposals must be delivered via U.S. Mail, express mail carrier, or hand delivery only. A receipt should be requested for hand delivered material.
 - 7.1.7 The Proposer is solely responsible for ensuring that the full proposal is received by the AOC in accordance with the RFP requirements, prior to the date and time specified in the RFP, and at the place specified. The AOC shall not be responsible for any delays in mail or by express mail carriers or by transmission errors or delays or missed delivery.
- 7.2 Proposers will submit one original copy of the cost proposal in a separate envelope. Include software licensing and professional services required to design, configure and deploy the DMS solution. The cost proposal must be presented in the format provided in Attachment 5, Cost Submission Matrix of this RFP. Finally, it is important that proposers use the cost format presented in this RFP and not their own format. Please do not use “TBD” (to be determined) or similar annotations in the cells for cost estimates.

- 7.3 Proposals must be delivered to the individual listed under Submission of Proposals, as set forth on the cover memo of this RFP. Only written responses will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered or certified mail or by hand delivery.
- 7.4 Proposers are also required to submit an electronic version of the entire proposal, including requested samples and financial information, on CD-ROM. If financial information cannot be provided in an electronic format, hard copy submittal will be accepted.
- 7.5 Proposals should be prepared as simply as possible and provide a straightforward, concise description of the proposer's capabilities to satisfy the requirements of the RFP. Emphasis should be concentrated on accuracy, completeness, and clarity of content. All parts, pages, figures, and tables must be numbered and clearly labeled.

8.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL

The proposal must be organized into the following major sections. Sections are indicated as mandatory or optional.

- 8.1 Title Page (**Mandatory**)
- 8.2 Letter of Transmittal. (**Mandatory**) The proposer must prepare a cover letter on the prime proposer's business letterhead to accompany the proposal. The purpose of this letter is to transmit the proposal in a brief paragraph. The letter must be signed by an individual who is authorized to bind the firm to all statements, contained in the proposal. The cover letter must state the primary proposers and name the participating proposers.
- 8.3 Table of Contents (**Mandatory**)
- 8.4 Executive Summary. (**Mandatory**) Limit this RFP section to a brief narrative highlighting the proposer's proposal. The summary should contain as little technical jargon as possible and should be oriented toward non-technical personnel. This section should not include cost quotations. Please note that the executive summary must identify the primary contact for the software proposer, including a valid e-mail address and telephone number.
- 8.5 Scope of Services. (**Mandatory**) Include a general discussion of the service provider's understanding of the "overall" project and the scope of work proposed.

- 8.6 Company /Team Background and Resource Capabilities (**Mandatory**)
- 8.6.1 Include a narrative description of the company, its place in the marketplace, and the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed DMS solution.
- 8.6.2 If multiple firms are represented in the proposal, include this information for each firm with the provided Vendor Certification Regarding Debarment and Suspension, Attachment 7.
- 8.6.3 The AOC needs to evaluate the proposer's stability and ability to support the commitments set forth in response to the RFP. The AOC, at its option, may require a proposer to provide additional support and/or clarify requested information. The AOC will conduct typical business reference checks on all of the proposers participating in the proposal process. Proposers must provide the following information about the company or companies included in the proposed solution. The software vendor(s) and the professional services firm must outline the company's background, including:
- 8.6.3.1 The tax ID number of the proposed prime and sub-contractors (provide via Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form).
- 8.6.3.2 How long the company has been in business.
- 8.6.3.3 A brief description of the company size and organizational structure.
- 8.6.3.4 Submit a list of key personnel with their resumes, who, if awarded a contract under this RFP, will be assigned to this project.
- 8.6.3.5 If applicable, how long the company has been selling the proposed solution to public sector clients.
- 8.6.3.6 Provide an audited or reviewed profit and loss statement and balance sheet, in accordance with reporting requirement of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), for the last three years. Additionally, provide a statement of any bankruptcies filed by the proposer and any law suits filed against the proposer for malfeasance and a detailed listing of the adverse action, cause, number, jurisdiction in which filed and current status. The AOC requires a description of

the outcome of any such legal action where there was a finding against the respondent or a settlement. The statement shall address all present and prior business relationships of those concerned. Identify any significant mergers, acquisitions, and initial public offerings. History must cover, at minimum, the last three years.

8.6.3.7 Listing of five to ten software installations by name. Please list government customers first. If possible, also include the number of users, modules implemented, system integrations, and data migrations.

8.6.3.8 Any material (including letters of support or endorsement from clients) indicative of the proposer's capabilities.

8.6.3.9 Disclosure of any judgments, pending litigation, or other real or potential financial reversals that might materially affect the viability of the vendor(s) organization or public safety products, or the warranty that no such condition is known to exist.

8.6.3.10 Disclosure of any known or planned sale, merger or acquisition of proposer's company(ies).

8.6.3.11 In the case of partnered or combined responses, the nature of the relationship among the parties must be described. Include whether the parties collaborated previously and the intended relationship and reporting structure for the proposed project.

8.6.3.12 The State of California Information Practices Act of 1977 requires the AOC to notify all proposers of the following:

8.6.3.12.1 The principal purpose for requesting the above information about your company is to provide financial information to determine financial qualification. State policy and state and federal statutes authorize maintenance of this information.

8.6.3.12.2 Furnishing all information is mandatory. Failure to provide this information will delay or may even prevent completion of the action for which this information is sought.

8.7 Proposed Application Software and Computing Environment
(Mandatory)

8.7.1 The proposer must present, in detail, features and capabilities of the proposed application software. This part of the response is a free narrative section. The discussion should provide comprehensive information about the actual solution and services being proposed to address the RFP. The content may overlap the content provided in other sections of the response, but should attempt to not directly replicate other content. It is acceptable to refer to the detailed information and supporting tables, charts, and graphs provided in other sections of the response.

8.7.2 In addition, the following information must be included in narrative form:

8.7.2.1 Hardware Environment: Describe the hardware environment required to utilize the proposed software. In the event there is more than one suitable hardware platform, list the best options indicating the relative strengths and drawbacks (if any) of each.

8.7.2.2 Network Environment: Describe the network environment required to utilize the proposed software. In the event that there is more than one suitable network configuration, list options indicating any relative strengths and drawbacks of each.

8.7.2.3 Operating System(s): Identify the operating system(s) required by the proposed application software and database management system in the hardware environment recommended above. In the event there is more than one suitable operating system, list all options indicating any relative strengths and drawbacks of each.

8.7.2.4 Database Platform(s): The proposer should identify the ideal database platform for the proposed software. In the event there is more than one suitable database platform, list all options indicating any relative strengths and drawbacks of each.

8.7.2.5 Desktop Requirements: Identify the desktop computer hardware and software specifications that are required by the DMS solution. Include typical requirements for a “power user,” occasional casual user, report viewer, system administrator and work requestor.

8.7.2.6 Integration Capabilities: Provide a list of other Document Management Systems and Court Case Management Systems that can interface with the proposer’s product.

8.8 Responses to Functional/Technical Requirements (**Mandatory**)

8.8.1 Include responses to the Functional and Technical Requirements contained in Appendices A-D of this RFP here. Proposers must use the format provided and add explanatory details as necessary in a separate document using the requirement number as a reference.

8.8.2 If selected as a finalist, proposers will be asked to identify technical team members to attend a Finalist Presentation to answer additional questions about the proposed solution and provide technical demonstrations.

8.8.3 Appendix A- DMS Features List and Appendix D – Technical Features List must be updated and submitted with the RFP response. For each feature on each tab, under the “Response” column, select a choice from the pull-down menu which best represents the software’s ability to provide each feature. Please see the table below for an explanation of possible responses.

8.8.3.1 Response Key

Response	Rating Scale	Definition
SUPPORTED (Out-Of-The-Box)	5	Supported as delivered "out-of-the-box". No configurations or customized code will be required for the system to meet this requirement.
CONFIGURABLE	4	Supported via Configuration (screen configurations, reports, GUI tailoring, etc.)
3RD PARTY	3	The requirement is met by third party integration or partner functionality and can be implemented seamlessly by the proposer responding to the RFP. Please specify the third-party product and partner meeting the requirement and any additional cost.
CUSTOM	1	To meet this requirement, custom code will be required during implementation. Please briefly describe the customization required. Within the Cost Submission Matrix, also provide estimates of work required to complete the customization.
FUTURE	1	Item will be included in future release. No additional purchase or other cost will be incurred, and customized code will not be required. Please specify the planned release version for the functionality and scheduled release date, if possible.
UNSUPPORTED	0	This requirement cannot be met by the proposer or proposer's partners and will not be included in any future release.

8.8.3.2 Proposers must use one code only per requirement. Any requirement answered in any other way will be treated as a negative/non-response.

8.8.3.3 An answer of Unsupported (Item not addressed by solution) for any single requirement will not preclude a proposer from consideration, but will be factored into the evaluation score.

8.8.3.4 Comments may be entered in the "Comments" column.

- 8.8.4 Third-Party Products/Optional Software. The proposer must explicitly state the name of any third-party products that are part of the proposed solution to the AOC. For each third-party product there must be a statement about whether the proposer's contract will encompass the third-party product and/or whether the AOC will have to contract on its own for the product.
 - 8.8.4.1 Include a description of any products, features or other value added components required to address this RFP. The proposer must also provide proof that they have access to the third-party software source code (own or in escrow) and that the proposer has the ability to provide long-term support for the third-party software components of their DMS solution. Consideration of these products and features or other value added components will be given where these may be of value to the AOC.
- 8.8.5 Proposers must respond to Appendix B: Judicial Branch Business Process Use Case Scenarios with a narrative response describing how their product features and or services will excel or be challenged in addressing these use case scenarios.
- 8.8.6 Proposers must respond to Appendix C: DMS Technical Requirements with a narrative response describing how their product features and or services will excel or be challenged in addressing these requirements.
- 8.9 System Security (**Mandatory**)
 - 8.9.1 The proposer must include a detailed description of the proposed solution's security features. A description of how to secure transactions in a distributed network, over LAN, WAN and VPN connections must also be included.
 - 8.9.2 The proposer must also explain in-detail, the security model of the application, and describe generally the tasks required to configure and maintain application security. Please state if and how system security or user validation can be integrated with Oracle Security Suite, and MS Active Directory.

8.10 DMS Solution Implementation Plan (**Mandatory**)

8.10.1 The AOC recognizes that rollout of a full scale DMS solution is a multi-year endeavor and that there are many possible approaches to implementation. The implementation plan and associated cost proposal should reflect a best-practice based scenario per the proposer's past experience and industry knowledge. The proposer's implementation plan should include the following:

8.10.1.1 Recommended approach for Implementation.

8.10.1.2 Solution map.

8.10.1.3 A visual representation of the components and high-level landscape of the proposed DMS solution. Indicate partner product integration points, future modules and anticipated integration with current Judicial Branch systems (MS Exchange, Court Case Management Systems, etc).

8.10.1.4 Recommend implementation approaches for hosted models including centrally hosted and/or distributed local environments.

8.10.1.5 Note differences between a centrally hosted solution and a local implementation.

8.10.1.6 Project management methodology.

8.10.1.7 Change management methodology.

8.10.1.8 Proposed data migration methods and tools.

8.10.1.9 Methods for capture of hard copy content.

8.10.1.10 Sample project plan and time line for centralized and local implementations.

8.10.1.11 Proposed project staffing, including descriptions of roles and expertise. Please detail by project phase and include estimated court staff time.

8.10.1.12 Methodology for creating a common document classification (Taxonomy) across the Judicial Branch for effective document retrieval.

8.11 DMS Migration Plan (**Mandatory**)

8.11.1 Courts with an existing DMS will work with the vendor to determine if and when a migration to the standard solution would be feasible. Ease of migration, total cost, production implications such as end user training and adoption, downtime, and overall effort will be key factors in evaluating a migration decision. The proposer's migration plan should include the following:

8.11.1.1 Recommended approach.

8.11.1.2 Process for data migration.

8.11.1.3 Ability to preserve existing configurations including user and document security.

8.11.1.4 Sample project plan and time line.

8.11.1.5 Proposed project staffing.

8.12 Development and Staging Environment Hardware & Software (**Mandatory**)

8.12.1 The respondent in this section should include detailed specifications and a rationale for the software, services and equipment priced in the Cost Submission Matrix for the Development and Staging Environments.

8.13 Training Plan (**Mandatory**)

8.13.1 This section should outline the proposer's recommendations and plans for assisting the Judicial Branch employees and contractors to become self sufficient in supporting, maintaining, managing, and utilizing the proposed solution over time. Education on the use of application and interface development tools should be included. The proposer must provide a detailed plan for train-the-trainer training, project team training, user training and technology personnel. This information must include:

8.13.1.1 Clear identification of the proposed training methods (classroom, lab, mentoring, etc.), schedule and assumptions regarding prerequisite skills of the employees receiving the training.

8.13.1.2 Use of third-party training resources. Proposers should identify third party partners that provide training on the

use of their application.

8.13.1.3 Change management processes, procedures and tools needed to host, maintain and support the solution.

8.13.1.4 Functional and technical documentation and training materials that will allow Judicial Branch employees to develop product expertise. This material should be made available in an electronic format.

8.14 Testing Plan (**Mandatory**)

8.14.1 The proposer must provide a general testing strategy. Include the intended plan to develop scripts, track results and conduct unit, integration, functional and user-acceptance tests (UAT).

8.15 Maintenance and Support Program (**Mandatory**)

Specify the approach to carry out post-implementation and on-going support including:

8.15.1 Post-Implementation support (e.g., three months of on-site support after go-live).

8.15.2 Telephone support (include toll-free support hotline, hours of operation, availability of 12 x 7 hotline, etc.).

8.15.3 Special plans defining “levels” of customer support (e.g., gold, silver, etc.).

8.15.4 Availability and locality of user groups.

8.15.5 Recommendations on the number of full time employees (FTEs) required in supporting this solution per court size (see section 6.5).

8.16 Hosting Arrangement (**Optional, respond only if applicable**)

8.16.1 The AOC may be using the California Courts Technology Center (CCTC) to host part of the DMS solution. It is anticipated that DMS deployment will be to a combination of hosted models including centrally hosted and or distributed local environments. Please provide information about any existing hosted arrangements you have to deliver similar DMS solutions. Please indicate what hardware, security, operating system, relational database management system and personnel are used by the hosting facility to provide the service. Provide samples of typical system

promotion methodology and upgrade or patch checklists from other implementations.

8.16.2 Provide a proposed methodology for interaction between the hosting facility and the proposed DMS solution vendor team to ensure appropriate system support. For example, indicate what type of access, if any, to the CCTC the vendor requires to initially setup the production environment and what type of access is typically required for routine activities, once the environment is established.

8.17 Customer References (**Mandatory**)

8.17.1 The AOC considers references an important part of the process in awarding a contract and may be contacting references as part of this selection. Proposers must provide at least five client references for software and services that are similar in size and complexity to this procurement and have utilized a solution similar to that proposed in a comparable computing environment. Proposers should submit references for fully completed (live) installations (see Attachment 6). Please inform references that they may be called by the AOC in February or March of 2011.

8.17.2 The AOC will not call proposers to tell them that their references will be contacted. Similarly, AOC will not work through a proposer's Reference Manager to complete a reference. The names and phone numbers of the project manager/customer contact must be listed. Failure to provide this information may result in the proposer not being selected.

8.18 Cost Proposal (**Mandatory**)

8.18.1 Submit cost proposal separately from the rest of the technical proposal and in sealed envelope(s).

8.18.2 Use Attachment 5, Cost Submission Matrix, to propose all costs, fees, expenses, and pricing for this project.

8.18.3 Costs should include firm pricing for all procurement items (see Section 2.4) and a schedule of costs, aligned with the proposed project plan, to deploy all functional areas/modules as set forth in appendices A-D.

8.18.4 Work Effort Estimates. Please use the cost spreadsheets and the proposed project plan to provide work effort estimates for the

Judicial Branch staff by task during the certification process.

8.19 Exceptions to the RFP (**Mandatory**)

8.19.1 Exceptions shall be clearly identified in this section and written explanation shall include the scope of the exceptions, the ramifications of the exceptions for the AOC, and the description of the advantages or disadvantages to the Judicial Branch as a result of exceptions. The AOC, in its sole discretion, may reject any exceptions within the proposal.

8.19.2 Submit Attachment 3, Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Minimum Contract Terms and the proposer's markup of Attachment 2, Minimum Contract Terms, if applicable, as part of this section.

8.20 Sample Documents (**Optional**)

8.20.1 To establish a complete and competitive proposal, proposers are encouraged to include sample copies of the following documents:

8.20.1.1 Case studies focusing on document management and web content management for past implementations of similar scope. If possible, also include case studies for the digital asset management and learning content management components.

8.20.1.2 Sample project plan for past implementation of similar scope.

8.20.1.3 Sample DMS software user documentation. This documentation should be submitted on a separate CD-ROM that is clearly marked and not included in the printed copy of the proposal.

8.20.1.4 Sample business process flows to use the proposed DMS solution.

8.20.2 The AOC prefers non-proprietary samples to fulfill the requirements outlined in Section 8.20.1. Proposers should submit any questions related to this requirement by the deadline for submission of questions, requests for clarifications or modifications in the Key Dates Table (Section 5.1).

9.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

9.1 Evaluation Committee

- 9.1.1 The AOC will conduct a comprehensive, fair, and impartial evaluation of proposals received in response to this RFP. All proposals received from qualified proposers will be reviewed and evaluated by a committee of qualified personnel (“Evaluation Committee”). The name, units, or experience of the individual members will not be made available to any vendor. The Evaluation Committee will first review and screen all proposals submitted to ensure that responses have been provided for all mandatory areas identified in Section 8.0 Specifics of a Responsive Proposal.
- 9.1.2 Proposers that have provided responses for all mandatory areas will then be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth in Section 10 Selection Criteria and Weighting.

9.2 Evaluation of Proposals

- 9.2.1 The AOC Contracting Officer will review the proposals for responsiveness, including reviewing any Confidential, Proprietary or other such markings prior to the proposals being provided to the evaluation committee.
- 9.2.2 The evaluation committee will first evaluate the technical proposals and score them as described below. These scores will be used to create a short list of firms for further consideration, which may include demonstrations of Proposer’s system; Proposers not on the short list will not be eligible for further consideration.
- 9.2.3 The AOC, at its sole discretion, may hold multiple conversations with Proposers prior to evaluating Proposer’s proposals for the purpose of clarifying information in the proposals.
- 9.2.4 Proposers will be responsible for all costs related to any demonstration. Failure to participate in such demonstrations may result in a Proposer’s disqualification from further consideration.
- 9.2.5 The Proposer must be prepared to conduct demonstrations at the discretion of the AOC. The AOC will notify the Proposer in writing when a demonstration is required. The demonstrations may include a demonstration of the system at a customer site (Proposer’s customer).

- 9.2.6 Demonstrations will be evaluated on the same criteria as the technical proposals. After demonstrations are conducted, each evaluation team member will review his/her own points previously assigned to each Proposer on the short list and make adjustments if necessary, and the final technical proposal scores will be re-calculated.
 - 9.2.7 After the final technical proposal scores have been calculated, the price proposals will be evaluated and scored by the AOC Contracting Officer with a grand total score for each Proposer.
 - 9.2.8 If a proposal fails to meet a material solicitation document requirement, the proposal may be rejected. A deviation is material to the extent that a response is not in substantial accord with solicitation document requirements. Material deviations cannot be waived. Immaterial deviations may cause a proposal to be rejected.
 - 9.2.9 Proposals that contain false or misleading statements may be rejected if, in the AOC's opinion, the information was intended to mislead the AOC regarding a requirement of the solicitation document.
 - 9.2.10 During the evaluation process, the AOC may require a Proposer's representative to answer questions with regard to the Proposer's proposal. Failure of a Proposer to demonstrate that the claims made in its proposal are, in fact, true may be sufficient cause for deeming a proposal nonresponsive.
 - 9.2.11 The AOC, at its sole discretion, may reject any or all proposals and may or may not waive an immaterial deviation or defect in a proposal. The AOC's waiver of an immaterial deviation or defect shall in no way modify the solicitation document or excuse a Proposer from full compliance with solicitation document specifications.
 - 9.2.12 The grand total available score will be 100 points. The AOC will evaluate proposals using the criteria listed in this RFP, with the maximum point value for each category.
- 9.3 Negotiation
- 9.3.1 The AOC, in its sole discretion; reserves the right to accept or reject any or all of the items in the proposal, to award the contract in whole or in part to one or more Proposers, to make awards with or without negotiations to multiple Proposers, or negotiate any or

all items with multiple Proposers if it is deemed in the AOC's best interest. Moreover, the AOC reserves the right to make no selection if proposals are deemed to be outside the fiscal constraint or against the best interest of the AOC.

9.4 Award of Contract

- 9.4.1 Award of contract, if made, will be in accordance with the solicitation document to a responsible proposer submitting a proposal compliant with all the requirements of the solicitation document and any addenda thereto, except for such immaterial defects as may be waived by the AOC.
- 9.4.2 The AOC reserves the right to determine the suitability of proposals for contracts on the basis of a proposal's meeting administrative requirements, technical requirements, its assessment of the quality of service and performance of items proposed, and cost.
- 9.4.3 The AOC will make a reasonable effort to execute any contract based on this solicitation document within forty-five (45) days of selecting a proposal that best meets its requirements. However, exceptions taken by a proposer may delay execution of a contract.
- 9.4.4 A proposer submitting a proposal must be prepared to use a standard state contract form rather than its own contract form.
- 9.4.5 Upon award of the agreement, the agreement shall be signed by the proposer(s) in two original contract counterparts and returned, along with the required attachments, to the AOC no later than ten (10) calendar days of receipt of agreement form or prior to the end of June if award is at fiscal year-end. The period for execution may be changed by mutual agreement of the parties. Agreements are not effective until executed by both parties and approved by the appropriate AOC officials. Any work performed prior to receipt of a fully executed agreement shall be at vendor(s)' own risk.

9.5 Failure to Execute the Agreement

- 9.5.1 Failure to execute the agreement within the time frame identified above shall be sufficient cause for voiding the award. Failure to comply with other requirements within the set time shall constitute failure to execute the agreement. If the successful vendor(s) refuse or fail to execute the agreement, the AOC may award the agreement to the next qualified vendor(s).

10.0 SELECTION CRITERIA AND WEIGHTING

- 10.1 Proposals that contain false or misleading statements may be rejected if, in the opinion of the AOC, the information was intended to mislead the state regarding a requirement of the solicitation document.
- 10.2 If a proposal fails to meet a material solicitation document requirement, the proposal may be rejected. A deviation is material to the extent that a response is not in substantial accord with solicitation document requirements. Material deviations cannot be waived. Immaterial deviations may cause a proposal to be rejected.
- 10.3 Cost sheets will be checked only if a proposal is determined to be otherwise qualified. All figures entered on the cost sheets must be clearly legible.
- 10.4 During the evaluation process, the AOC may require a vendor's representative to answer questions with regard to the vendor's proposal. Failure of a vendor to respond and demonstrate in a timely manner that the claims made in its proposal are, in fact, true may be sufficient cause for deeming a proposal nonresponsive.
- 10.5 A vendor is eligible for a total of 100 points for the written proposal.

10.6 Written Proposal Evaluation. Written proposals will be evaluated by the AOC per the following selection criteria and weighting:

Category	Factors		Total Possible Points
Meeting Mandatory Requirements	Proposal meets all mandatory requirements identified in the RFP.	Total Score	Pass/Fail
Technical Solution	Degree to which the vendor's proposed solution meets the functional requirements	Satisfy all use cases (Appendix B)	10
		Meet infrastructure requirements (Appendix C/D)	10
		Meet features requirements (Appendix A)	25
		Total Score	45
Company Experience and Viability	Ability to successfully perform based on its financial strength, company history, and experience and success in providing like equipment and services to groups of similar size and complexity with similar requirements to that of the Judicial Branch.	Total Score	10
Implementation and Migration	Ability to manage and execute a successful implementation and smooth migration from any existing platforms.	Total Score	10
Ongoing Maintenance & support	Cost effective ongoing maintenance and support.	Total Score	10
Cost Factors	Overall Cost, including any support that may be required by the Court or its agents.	Total Score	25
Grand Total Points			
			100

11.0 RIGHTS

- 11.1 The AOC reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, as well as the right to issue similar RFPs in the future. This RFP is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract. The AOC nor the State of California is responsible for the cost of preparing the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and becomes a public record.

12.0 RELATIONSHIP OF PARTIES

- 12.1 The AOC has the authority to enter into master agreements for goods and services for it and on behalf of the other Purchasing Group members who are, and are intended to be, third party beneficiaries of this Master Agreement. Individual members of the Purchasing Group may elect to utilize this Master Agreement by placing orders, as set forth herein, in which case the terms and conditions of this Master Agreement govern such orders.

13.0 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

- 13.1 It may be necessary to interview prospective proposers to clarify aspects of their submittal. If conducted, interviews will likely be conducted by telephone conference call. The AOC will notify prospective service providers regarding the interview arrangements.

14.0 CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

- 14.1 The AOC is bound by California Rules of Court, rule 10.500 (see: <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/rules/amendments/jan2010-2.pdf>) as to disclosure of its administrative records. If the information submitted contains material noted or marked as confidential and/or proprietary that, in the AOC's sole opinion, meets the disclosure exemption requirements of Rule 10.500, then that information will not be disclosed pursuant to a request for access to judicial administrative records.
- 14.2 If the AOC does not consider such material to be exempt from disclosure under Rule 10.500, the material may be made available to the public, regardless of the notation or markings. If a Proposer is unsure if its confidential and/or proprietary material meets the disclosure exemption requirements of Rule 10.500, then it should not include such information in its proposal.
- 14.3 Proposer understands that a breach of its obligation of confidentiality may result in irreparable damage to the AOC for which no adequate remedy is available and that the AOC will be entitled to injunctive or other equitable relief.

- 14.4 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."
- 14.5 In addition to labeling each confidential page, the vendor must include the following statement on a separate page, indicating all page numbers that contain confidential or proprietary information:

14.5.1 The information contained on pages _____ shall not be duplicated or used in whole or in part for any other purpose than to evaluate the proposal; provided that if a contract is awarded as a result of this proposal, the AOC shall have the right to duplicate, use, or disclose this information to the extent provided in the contract. This restriction does not limit the right of the AOC to use the information contained herein if obtained from another source.

- 14.6 PROPOSALS WILL BE MAINTAINED IN CONFIDENCE BY THE AOC UNTIL ISSUANCE OF A NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD. UPON ISSUANCE OF A NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD, ALL PROPOSALS, INCLUDING PROPOSAL INFORMATION LABELED AS CONFIDENTIAL BY A VENDOR, WILL BECOME PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORD AND SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT, EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT INFORMATION IS PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE BY LAW.

15.0 DISABLED VETERAN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION GOALS

- 15.1 The State of California Executive Branch requires contract participation goals of a minimum of three percent (3%) for disabled veteran business enterprises (DVBEs). The AOC, as a policy, follows the intent of the Executive Branch program. For further information regarding DVBE resources, please contact the Office of Small Business and DVBE Certification, at 916-375-4940 or access DVBE information on the Executive Branch's Internet web site at:
<http://www.dgs.ca.gov/default.htm>

END OF FORM