

Judicial Council of California
Enterprise Document Management Services
RFP IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS
RFP Questions and Answers

1. May companies locate outside of the USA submit a proposal? **ANSWER:** Yes, a company whose headquarters are outside of the USA may submit a Proposal. However, your data centers or data storage must be located in the USA. The Proposer must also be licensed to do business within the State of CA, implement the DMS and have a proper presence in the State of CA to maintain and update the DMS.
2. Do Proposers need to attend meetings in person during the Solicitation process? **ANSWER:** No, this is not required.
3. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? **ANSWER:** No, this is State of California DMS implementation and solution.
4. Can we submit the proposals via email? **ANSWER:** No, please follow the instructions in Section VII., 1.2. to complete the Proposal submission process accurately.
5. Is the CA JCC expecting separate proposals for: 1) the CA Appellate Courts, and 2) another for the Judicial Council of California? Or, can we submit one proposal that covers both entities? Please explain. **ANSWER:** Please note this solicitation is for the JCC. A Proposer may submit a proposal that covers both entities. You may also submit a proposal for either the Appellate Court DMS or the JC DMS.
6. How many users will be expected so that we can establish the appropriate licensing. **ANSWER:** Please find the details on user counts in the DMS RFP Section IV, 5.2 and in the table below.
 - a. How many users will be required to access to the new EDMS system (detail by Appellate Courts and Judicial Council):
 - i. All day, every day? Yes.
 - ii. Daily, but occasionally during the day?

Appellate Courts	1,300
JCC Departments	
Real Estate & Facilities Management	980
Capital Program	50
Branch Accounting & Procurement	70
Total	2,400*

Note: This is the total user count for the three departments identified only. It does not include other departments with DMS needs yet to be identified.

7. Can the EDMS system cover both the Appellate Courts and the Judicial Council or must they be separate systems? Please explain. **ANSWER:** They can be the same system but the requirements for the Appellate Courts are different than the Judicial Council departments so, this must be considered and outlined in any Proposal submitted.
8. What mobile platforms do you want mobile web access for (iPhone, iPad, Android, Windows. Etc.). Please detail. **ANSWER:** Ideally we expect the vendors to indicate what they are able to support. The Technical Requirements, tab "Services and Operations," requirement #17 is where this would be indicated. Requirements states, "Vendor shall support multiple device user interfaces (desktops/laptops, tablets, and smart phones) over HTTP. E.g. HTML5. Vendor shall have native apps available for tablets and smart phones with offline document viewing."
9. What version of Microsoft Outlook and MS Office is the Appellate Courts using? **ANSWER:** The versions vary by court, however, most courts are either on 365 or Windows 10. Vendors should indicate any compatibility issues.
10. What version of Microsoft Outlook and MS Office is the Judicial Council using? **ANSWER:** Most JC users are on Windows 2013 and some are on Windows 2016 or 365. Vendors should indicate any compatibility issues.
11. Do you require any scanning devices? If so, please specify the number by desktop scanners, medium duty scanners, and high volume scanners. **ANSWER:** No. Scanning devices are not required in this RFP.
12. **The web site containing** the RFP documents states that "This RFP will result in not more than two Notices of Intent to Award a contract". Will you be awarding the RFP to two different solution providers and leaving it up to the individual courts to select the desired solution? **ANSWER:** No. We may only grant one Notice of Intent to Award for both the Appellate/Supreme Court DMS and the JC DMS solution. However, we may grant two Notices of Intent to Award one for the Appellate Court DMS and a separate Notice of Intent to Award for the JC.
13. If not awarding the RFP to two different vendors, can you clarify what you mean by the statement "This RFP will result in not more than two Notices of Intent to Award a contract"? **ANSWER:** This statement means there will not be more than a total of two Notices of Intent to Award granted under this DMS RFP.
14. The RFP Mentions that the system would allow the collection of fees for downloading documents. Is there one fee structure, or different fees for different types or sizes of documents? **ANSWER:** Currently, there is no fee structure that has been agreed upon amongst the Clerk/Administrators. When they have the ability to post docs to the website, they will need to determine what fees will be charged. That said, there will either be a flat fee regardless of doc size/type or they may follow the Federal Court and other court's models by charging by the page.
15. The RFP states "The system shall provide for a tool to efficiently extract metadata from workflow process (with no custom programming)". Can you provide an example of the type of metadata you would like to extract? **ANSWER:** The metadata examples would be Case Number, Party Name, Short Caption (case title) and possibly document description (name, e.g., research memo, draft opinion). As each court will want to

access public and non-public facing documents from a DMS repository, they want the ability to create their own metadata indexing so that it can serve whatever their individual business needs are without having to ask the vendor to make an enhancement/change request. It is possible the DCs may agree to develop a single master list of metadata types and then the courts want the ability to pick and choose from that list which ones are needed in each court per their business needs. It's also expected that every document extraction will have at a minimum the Case Number.

16. The RFP states "The products and/or services will closely align with the current Judicial Council and Appellate Court networking and computing environments.". Can you share what your existing networking and computing environments are? **ANSWER:** The Judicial Council and Appellate Courts utilize layered security architecture with segregated network for information security. For security and reliability, connectivity between systems often operates over dedicated circuits. Every system component should be designed with high availability. The overall system should support business continuity in an event of a datacenter failure or similar disaster. We use a hub and spoke model, Internet access is facilitated centrally, and Internet traffic is proxied. On the server side, we utilize both Red Hat Enterprise Linux and Windows Server 2008 or above, are standardized on the Oracle database platform, and utilize a centralized storage mode (vs. local or direct-attached storage). End users are standardized on Windows 7 and Office 2013, however a migration to Windows 10 and Office 2016/Office 365 is underway.
17. Can you share what development languages your current staff is familiar with? Not clear as to why this is relevant as we do not plan to code the DMS on possible support after deployment for configuration request. **ANSWER:** Java, ColdFusion, SQL, C, C++
18. Do you have a preference in regards to development languages used? No.
19. Do you have a preference as to what database is leveraged by the new solution? **ANSWER:** No preference.
20. Do you have a target go-live date for the project to be completed by? **ANSWER:** No. This will be determined by the implementation schedule proposed by the awarded vendor.
21. **BEGIN PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE QUESTIONS:**
22. A scope clarification question, is your goal to simply acquire a DMS and keep your existing ACCMS? **ANSWER:** Yes, we want to support the Appellate Court system that is existing today and the DMS will integrate with the ACCMS. Additionally, we have identified our need for a DMS for the Judicial Council departments as Future Projects. The Judicial Council internal departments that are interested in the DMS are: Capital Projects; Branch Accounting and Procurement; and REFM. We are interested in having a Master Agreement to cover the DMS for these Judicial Branch Entity clients.
23. Is there any component to this RFP that will include Case Management functionality in addition to DMS? **ANSWER:** No, we are only interested in a SaaS Document Management System only.
24. Is the JCC planning to maintain ACCMS and integrate the new DMS? **ANSWER:** Yes, we do not have plans to decommission ACCMS and we have identified our need to integrate a new DMS with our ACCMS.
25. For the JCC side of the RFP there are three (3) areas that are earmarked for implementation and there is a section called Optional Future Implementations. Is the JCC looking for

additional quotes for the three (3) JCC departments in addition to the Appellate Court implementations? **ANSWER:** Essentially for the Judicial Council future projects we are looking for cost estimate pricing as follows: There is standard project and deliverable costing that will be priced with the Proposal you submit. Please refer to Appendix B4a, Work Order Form and Appendix B4b, Cost Estimate for future pricing on the scope of any Judicial Council departmental DMS additions.

26. For the DMS RFP what are the data conversion volumes? **ANSWER:** Please refer to Appendix B-03, Sections 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 which details volumes.
27. In reference to DMS RFP Section 1.2.1 Background (3); also MDS Sec IV, Proposed Future Environment 6.1.3 Integration with ACCMS: What document management software is being used for the eFiling system? **ANSWER:** None, we are currently utilizing our own ACCMS system in conjunction with the eFiling system.
28. In reference to DMS RFP Section IV, Proposed Future Environment Public Portal: Is the responding vendor required to build and host the public portal referenced? **ANSWER:** No. There is an existing portal and has no DMS connected.
29. In reference to the DMS RFP Section VII.2.1 / VII-2 Proposal Format: The sections of (assuming) Volume I that appear under VII.2.1 and VII.2.2 do not correspond. For example, in VII.2.1, Section 5 makes reference to the Pricing Proposal that contains the Cost Workbook; this is supposed to be in Volume III, not in Section V of Volume I, yes? And VII.2.2 lists two Section 4s. This is very confusing. Can you specify exactly what is to be contained in Volume I so we can more easily assist the evaluators? **ANSWER:** For purposes of clarity and brevity we have updated the entire Section VII and the Appendix C, Bidders Response Template. Please refer to the new format and RFP found here <http://www.courts.ca.gov/35069.htm>.
30. In reference to the DMS RFP Section VII.2.2 / VII-3 Proposal Format: Does Volume II require MASTER, CD/DVD, and 9 COPIES as stated? This contradicts the earlier 5 copies -- one Master and 4 copies -- stated in VII.1.2 for the Technical/Non-Cost Proposal. Please clarify. **ANSWER:** 5 hardcopies each for the Technical Proposal and the separately sealed Cost Proposal. Both the Technical Proposal and the separately sealed Cost Proposal should be submitted in USB flash drive format also.
31. In reference to DMS RFP Section VII.2.2 / VII-4 Proposal Format: The heading Bidder Experience and Staff response refers to Appendix C although it appears under Section 4 (which should be Section 5, yes?). Should this text be relocated in the RFP under Section 3 Appendix C? Please clarify. **ANSWER:** Bidder Experience should be included in the vendor's response template in Appendix C. We have updated and reissued Appendix C to address clarifications after reviewing some of the vendor questions.
32. In reference to DMS RFP Section VII.2.5 / VII.6-8: Volume IV Attachment I and SOW provides headings for mandatory content. Do you regard these as sections within the volume and if so can you clarify what text belongs under what section so that we can better order our response for your Tier 1 evaluation? **ANSWER:** We have reissued the Volume VII and the Appendix C, Bidders Response Template for your clarity. The Attachment I is part of the Tier 1 evaluation for Proposal material responsiveness review. If a Proposer notates in Attachment 1 that the Proposer will require changes to the RFP's Appendix H and does not include the redline Form of Agreement changes with an explanation then your Proposal will be deemed non-responsive and the Proposal will not be reviewed in Tier 2. The Tier 1 review is for material responsiveness to the administrative requirements of the RFP. The SOW is part of the Tier 2 evaluation, which is the Technical/Non-Cost Evaluation.

33. Please describe the current document management solution in use for ACCMS. **ANSWER:** The documents are attached to our internal ACCMS application and housed there. There is no DMS solution per se.
34. Please describe how SAP is being used in the Judicial Branch, specifically: What transactions need to be linked in the new DMS system? **ANSWER:** This will be determined during the JC BAP (Budget Accounting and Procurement) SAP requirements gathering phase. Candidates are documents such as purchase orders and contracts. The SAP system is not a part of the Appellate Court DMS Solution.
35. In reference to DMS RFP, Appendix C – 9.0 RFP Checklist / p. 15: Numbering is off on your Attachment references. For example, Reference is made to Attachment 10: Completed Attachment 10, RFP Response Template. There is no Attachment 10. Attachment 2 is listed as Small Business Declaration, which actually is Attachment 3. This is confusing. Please clarify what you mean. **ANSWER:** On October 7, 2016 we have completed replaced Section VII: Proposal Format and Appendix C, Bidder’s Response Template for accuracy and clarity. All Attachments and document references should be accurately posted at this time.
36. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Service Operations: Requirements 1, 2, 3, 4, 5: Are all of the following regulatory and certifications mandatory: FedRamp; ISO 270001; AICPA/SOC; PCI/DSS; HIPPA? **ANSWER:** If a requirement has “NA” it is not applicable to the requirements. This addresses numbers 2-4. For the requirements 1 and 5, the recent update to the Service Operations tab indicates, these requirements are “2-Prefer”. “2-Prefer” indicates this is a preferred requirement. The vendor should respond if/how they shall meet the requirement.
37. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Appellate Courts: Requirement #6. What is the Doghouse File? **ANSWER:** This is the term for the confidential high security legal working file for an appellate court case. The Justices and court staff use this confidential working file to reach appellate or supreme court level decisions. This is a hard copy or an electronic copy of a case file that may be viewed by multiple parties inside the Court.
38. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Appellate Courts: Requirement #17 states: *The system shall provide for a CP workflow process that allows for AU selectable work queue assignments.* Please explain the intent behind this requirement. **ANSWER:** CP stands for Collaborative Process and AU stands for Authorized User. So, this requirement means the system should be able to allow for a collaborative process (meaning a common activity done by the Court where several entries participate in the creation of a document) that an authorized staff person can get into. An example of that would be within the DMS, the custom workflows that are vendor developed, would allow for a repository or way to access a draft document that multiple people will exchange or share between themselves. For instance, if a collection of cases were pending in a chamber or department, a staff person/justice should be able choose which draft document to create or work on and then put it back into the holding tank for the next person to access/use/modify it.
39. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Appellate Courts: Requirement #25: Kindly provide the document referenced - *Information Technology Policy and Procedures Manual Section 3.0 Audit and Accountability Policy.* **ANSWER:** Please note that the referred to document classified as internal use only. Vendors can utilize the Audit and Accountability (AU) section of NIST Special Publication 800-34 to respond. This document is available at <http://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-53r4.pdf>.

40. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Appellate Courts: Requirement #47: What is the volume of legacy content (# of documents and total size of all the documents)? **ANSWER:** Will publish data. Currently under research.
41. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Appellate Courts: Requirement #63: Please describe the login validation process currently in use for ACCMS, specifically: What identity management system is being used? **ANSWER:** Active Directory. User ID and password.
42. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Appellate Courts: What is the anticipated storage growth for each project? **ANSWER:** For the District Courts of Appeal portion of the RFP the anticipated storage growth will be 30% per year.
43. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Appellate Courts: Requirement #67 states: *Replace all document links in ACCMS to point to the new document in the DMS.* If these embedded links are inside the documents, do you require the vendor to modify these document to point to new links in the DMS? **ANSWER:** Yes, this is the requirement. The vendor should respond how they plan to address.
44. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Integration Technology: Requirement #14: Please describe what Computer Aided Facilities Management (CAFM) system is being used by the Judicial Branch, specifically: What document types need to be linked in the DMS? **ANSWER:** IBMs TriRiga. Item types are blueprints, contracts, lease agreements.
45. In reference to: IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Integration Technology: Requirement #19: Please describe what mail system is being leveraged at JCC/CCTC? **ANSWER:** MS Outlook.
46. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Document Store: Requirement states: *Solution shall support federated repositories.* Can you provide more information on which repositories you expect to be included? **ANSWER:** *"Federated repositories enable you to use multiple repositories. These repositories, which can be file-based repositories, LDAP repositories, or a sub-tree of an LDAP repository, are defined and theoretically combined under a single realm."* - IBM.
47. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Document Capture: If existing scanners will be used for the document capture, can you please describe the make(s) and model(s)? **ANSWER:** Makes and models vary. Vendors should indicate if there are compatibility issues.
48. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Document Management: Requirement #6 states: *The workflow process should support the logic of a state diagram (table) functionality.* Please explain the intent behind this requirement. **ANSWER:** The state is where an item is in the work flow. The workflow should follow the logic outline from one state to another. Workflow diagram help illustrate these "states".
49. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Document Management: Requirement #17 states: *The solution shall allow electronic seals, emblems, insignia and logos to be added to documents.* Normally these additions are made available within an authoring application, such as Word or PowerPoint. If this is not acceptable, please clarify the intent behind this requirement. **ANSWER:** The requirement is as it stands. The vendor should respond in accordance to their ability.
50. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Document Management: Requirement #57 states: *The solution shall allow text in specific locations in a imported or captured document to be added to the metadata of the stored document.*

Please explain the intent behind this requirement. **ANSWER:** The intent is as written. There should be an ability to add text and meta data to imported document.

51. In reference to IT-DMS-2016-01-MDS-Appendix-B1-technical-reqs / Tab: Document Management: Requirement #58 states: *The solution shall allow keywords to be defined that when found in an imported or captured document, indicate a metadata value that is automatically included in the stored document metadata.* Please explain the intent behind this requirement. **ANSWER:** Keywords should be defined, and these identified in documents, and meta data built in accordance with the identified key words.
52. Does the FedRamp certification requirement apply only to the “infrastructure” we are running on; or does the “end to end” service need to be FedRamp certified. **ANSWER:** Vendors should indicate the details of their FedRAMP certification. The RFP does not specify infrastructure vs. “end to end” so indicating your certification and the components thereof are sufficient to meet the FedRAMP requirement. Additionally, there is an update to this requirement which will make this requirement “Preferred” rather than “Critical”.
53. Reviewing the various required response documents, there are requirements for both the Appellate Courts and the Judicial Council. If we plan on submitting a response for both the Appellate Courts and the Judicial Council (3 entities), can we do this by submitting one set of Proposal Documents (Volumes)? Please advise. **ANSWER:** Yes but, if the response to any of the matrices are different for the Appellate Court vs. the Judicial Council, it should be noted.
54. In paragraph 9.0 RFP Checklist in Appendix C, halfway down, you have a check box for Attachment 10, however there is no Attachment 10. Should this instead be Appendix C? **ANSWER:** Yes, please review the updated checklist. This was corrected for accuracy purposes.
55. Why do the same matrices appear in both Appendix A - SOW and Appendix B-2; and they are both required in our response (as listed in the checklist)? In fact, the header in Appendix A shifts from [Enterprise Document Management System Appendix A – Statement of Work (SOW)] to [Enterprise Document Management System Appendix B-02 – Implementation and Support Requirements] on the third page of Appendix A. Please advise if it is intended that we fill out and submit these same matrices twice. **ANSWER:** In Appendix A, SOW, the response is acknowledging that a deliverable will be included in the SOW. Appendix B-2 is an acknowledgement of the role for that deliverable so, for example, in deliverable #1 (Provide a Project Manager (PM) to represent the Bidder in the management of the project, interfacing with the JCC PM in any decisions relating to the project), the Bidder will lead (L) and the JC support (S). A “Yes” response signifies agreement.