



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 30, 2002

PROSPECTIVE PROPOSER:
RE: RFP No. AOC10.02

Addendum No. 5

This Addendum No. 5 is issued for the Civil Case Management System Software project RFP No. AOC10.02 which was issued on October 24, 2002.

Please note that Addendum 5 responds to two additional questions submitted by vendor (s). The questions along with the answers are posted for your review.

If you have any questions, please contact Adrian Prost at (818) 558-3075.

Sincerely,

Adrian Prost
AOC Program Manager

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>1. Does the RFP require the vendor to give up rights to its pre-existing intellectual property (or that of a third party)?</p>	<p>No, the vendor is not required to forego its ownership of pre-existing intellectual property. Refer to Section 4.16. The vendor is required to provide a non-exclusive license to the AOC as described in Section 4.16.2 (c) and 4.16.3(c). That license does not restrict the vendor (or third party) from continuing to own and use the intellectual property in question. The AOC must approve the introduction of vendor or third party pre-existing intellectual property, in part to ensure that it has the necessary licenses to protect its interests and to be able to use the intellectual property going forward as will be necessary or desirable for the project.</p> <p>The AOC may be willing to consider variations to the scope of the license granted to it regarding pre-existing intellectual property. Vendors wishing to explore that should submit a proposal detailing the exact language of the legal provision proposed for granting the license with respect to each item of pre-existing intellectual property that the vendor proposes to use. Among other things, such proposals must detail the temporal and geographic scope of such licenses (including how those might affect the AOC's ability to conduct the business at which this project is aimed) and any impact on pricing.</p>
<p>2. Why did the State recall the Los Angeles and Ventura Request for Proposal for a case management system (CMS) and re-issue a new AOC RFP, AOC10.02?</p>	<p>The Los Angeles and Ventura RFP was recalled due to significant changes to the scope, scale and requirements of the CMS Project. These changes to scope, scale and requirements are outlined in Sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 of the RFP. These changes substantially alter the direction of the project towards a more custom solution that can incorporate off the shelf components. The contract will be awarded, if at all, by the Administrative Office of the Courts directly, rather than by individual courts.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
	<p>In addition to the changes listed above, the AOC restructured the RFP to include a Two Phased Approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase I – Assessment & Discovery (Fixed Price) • Phase II – Design/Build/Deploy (Hourly Rates and Total Sum Not to Exceed Price) <p>This incremental approach increases vendor understanding, reducing project risks and increases the accuracy of pricing and timeline to the project.</p> <p>These four changes (scope, scale, requirements, and approach) were a significant departure from the original LA-Ventura RFP and necessitated the cancellation of the LA-Ventura RFP and subsequently issuance of the current AOC RFP.</p>