



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

ACQ-2012-0401-RFP

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS DOCUMENT

JULY 25, 2012

The Administrative Office of the Courts published the Request of Proposals, ACQ-2012-0401-RFP, on June 22, 2012 for the Superior Court Case Management System.

As required under RFP Section 1.8 – Acquisition Schedule, answers to Vendor submitted questions are provided below.

Q1: RFP Section 2.4.1 and 2.4.2, page 22 – These clauses indicate three references are needed of the Vendor and three different references are needed for each major subcontractor. At the Pre-bidders Conference on May 31, we understood a single set of three references for each bidding team would be sufficient. Can the State verify three total references for a submitting team, in a combination of Vendor and major subcontractors, will meet the requirements of 2.4.1 and 2.4.2?

A1: Please see Amendment 2 for further clarification regarding this requirement.

Q2: RFP Section 4.2.2 and 4.2.3, page 30 – These clauses indicate three qualifications are needed of the Vendor and three different qualifications are needed for each major subcontractor. At the Pre-bidders Conference on May 31, we understood a single set of three qualifications for the team would be sufficient. Can the State verify three total qualifications for a submitting team, in a combination of vendor and major subcontractors, will meet the requirements of 4.2.2 and 4.2.3?

A2: Please see Amendment 2 for further clarification regarding this requirement.

Q3: RFP Section 4.2.2 and 4.2.3, page 30 – These clauses require submitting qualifications for systems implemented “on a statewide basis”. Will the State consider systems implemented for similar large jurisdictions, such as territories of the United States?

A3: See A2 for a response.

Q4: RFP Section 4.2.2 and 4.2.3, page 30 – These clauses first require qualifications for general jurisdiction case management system. Later they further refine the requirement to “providing these solutions to state court administrations and the courts they serve”. May vendors submit large case management systems as qualifications, provided those systems are statewide and relate to justice and/or public safety?

A 4: No.

Q5: RFP Section 2.5, Page 23 - This section requires clients within the continental United States. Will the State allow client sites in the U.S. states and U.S. territories that are not within the contiguous 48 states to satisfy this requirement?

A5: Yes. Please see Amendment 2 for further clarification regarding this requirement.

Q6: RFP Section 2.5, Page 23 – This section requires clients within the continental United States. Will the State reduce this requirement to one State client within the contiguous 48 states?

A6: No. See A5 for a response.

Q7: RFP Section 2.3.11 – Please clarify what taxes the Vendor should collect. Are sales taxes required on hardware, software and services to be provided pursuant to this contract?

A7: For information regarding WA State tax laws, rules and policies, please refer to <http://dor.wa.gov/Docs/Pubs/ExciseTax/FilTaxReturn/BusTaxGuide.pdf>.

Q8: RFP Section 2.4 - Please clarify your definition of Vendor Account Manager. Would the proposed Project Manager be appropriate or would this be the Vendor's contract lead who manages the contract but not project delivery?

A8: There is no such reference in RFP Section 2.4.

Q9: RFP Section 3.3.2 – Would you consider the proposed Project Manager to have "primary responsibility" for the project or are you seeking a higher level of responsibility such as the name of the Delivery Executive to whom the PM would report??

A9: The organization of the project team remains the sole discretion of each Vendor submitting a proposal in response to this RFP.

Q10: RFP Section 2.1.4 states the requirements for Volume 4 of Vendor's Response is to include: Software License Agreement; Source Code Agreement; and Maintenance Service Agreement. What agreements is the State referring to in this section?

A10: AOC expects any Vendor submitting a proposal for a Commercial Off-the-Shelf (COTS) case management solution to require these three derivative agreements.

These agreements support the requirements for compliance as related to software license ownership, source code escrow, and software and system maintenance.

Q11: Exhibit B – Draft Contract, Appendix A, Section 1.2 Holdback - Can the AOC please further explain the requirements for releasing the holdback amounts per invoice and the timing of such release??

A11: Please refer to Section 3.6 of Exhibit B – Draft Contract. Additional information can be provided under “Instructions” within Exhibit R – Deliverable Cost Sheet.

Q12: Does the AOC have a hardware vendor preference (example Dell, HP, IBM, etc)?

A12: Refer to Section 5.4.1 and Exhibit T for details regarding hardware requirements.

Q13: Will the servers be located in the centralized AOC datacenter or in the individual courts?

A13: Servers will be required at the data center located at AOC Headquarters. Refer to Section 5.4.1 for additional information.

Q14: What is current network connectivity between the AOC datacenter and the courts?

A14: Court workstations are currently connected through VPN using internet providers (e.g., CenturyLink, Comcast, etc.). Court workstations have assigned static IP addresses. Speeds vary by court location. The communications protocol is TCP/IP. Court servers (i.e., using FTP, web services, etc.) connect via the State Governmental Network (SGN) and/or Intergovernmental Network (IGN).

Q15: Can you provide more information about the current disaster recovery plan (Exhibit K ID#151)?

A15: AOC requires that Case Management and Accounting Services, with all related databases, applications, and system software, be operational at a remote site within 48 hours in the event of a disaster. The current methodology is to conduct full backups of databases, applications, and system software on a weekly basis and incremental backups on a daily basis. The backups are stored at a remote location and are used to reestablish services.

Q16: The RFP states if connecting to the current SAN (Page 37), Can you provide the details of the current SAN?

A16: Please refer to Amendment 2 regarding modification to RFP Section 5.4.1.

Q17: Are the courts on a single Active Directory Domain/Forest? If no, are there Active Directory trusts between the domains??

A17: Current SCOMIS users are defined to RACF, a mainframe-based security package. For access to Windows based resources at AOC, a limited number of court users

are defined to AOC's Active Directory. No trusts exist between court domains and the AOC domain.

Q18: Should workstations be included in the hardware pricing?

A18: Workstations should only be included in the hardware pricing if the proposed solution requires workstation configuration.

Q19: The AOC states that the courts are non-unified and manage their own operations. Have all 39 counties and associated courts been involved in outlining the system's functional, technical and architectural requirements?

A19: Yes.

Q20: Once a solution is selected, is it mandatory for all 39 counties and associated courts to use this new solution? Can the counties opt out from using the solution?

A20: AOC anticipates a majority of the counties will be using the selected SC-CMS solution. Yes.

Q21: The RFP states that the first implementation has to be completed within 18 months for King County and the King County Superior Court. Are there other constraints that should be considered while planning the implementation for the remaining counties/courts?

A21: No.

Q22: Is the AOC interested in procuring hardware outside of this RFP provided the vendor supplied the specifications and quantities??

A22: No. However, AOC may determine to do so if it is in the best interest for the state.

Q23: Must the proposed SC-CMS have been previously selected for deployment to all general jurisdiction courts under a single contact awarded by a state or commonwealth located within the continental U.S.?

A23: Please see Amendment 2 for further clarification regarding this requirement.

Q24: If the answer to the preceding question is yes, must the proposed SC-CMS be currently implemented in all general jurisdiction courts within the referenced state or commonwealth?

A24: See A23 for a response.

Q25: Is there a requirement that the proposed SC-CMS be currently deployed in a minimum number of general jurisdiction courts?

A25: There is no such requirement regarding minimum deployment in general jurisdiction courts. Please see Amendment 2 for further clarification.

Q26: If the answer to the preceding question is yes, please state the minimum number of general jurisdiction courts that the SC-CMS must be currently implemented in.

A26: See A25 for a response.

Q27: Is there a requirement that the proposed SC-CMS be deployed for a minimum period of time?

A27: Please see Amendment 2 for further clarification regarding this requirement.

Q28: If the answer to the preceding question is yes, please state the minimum length of time the proposed SC-CMS must have been deployed.

A28: See A27 for a response.

Q29: In accordance with Section 1.17, Sections 2.4 and 2.5 have been classified as “Mandatory (M)” and will be scored on a pass/fail basis. Section 1.17 also states that “failure to meet an individual requirement will not be the basis for disqualification”.

Sections 2.4 and 2.5 include multiple requirements regarding proposed business references and visitation sites. For example: the referenced work must have been completed within the last five (5) years; the client must be located within the continental United States, and that the site visit include a central administrative organization, a large court operation and a small court operation.

Section 9.2 provides that the “RFP Coordinator will review Vendor responses to determine compliance with the Mandatory (M) requirements specified in Sections 2, 3, 4, and 8. Only responses passing all Mandatory requirements will be further evaluated”.

Will the failure to meet one or more, but less than all of the individual requirements contained in Section 2.4 and 2.5 eliminate a response from further evaluation under the provisions of Section 9.2???

A29: Yes. Please see Amendment 2 for further clarification regarding this requirement.

Q30: What is the definition of “large court operation” and “small court operation” within the context of the fourth paragraph of Section 2.5?

A30: The differentiation between these two terms is identified by several factors including the number of judges. See Section X, page 80 of the [SC-CMS Feasibility Study](#) regarding more specific details.

Q31: Will separate references from three (3) independent legal entities that use the proposed SC-CMS in the same general jurisdiction court under a single software license satisfy the requirement to provide three (3) “client” references?

A31: No.

Q32: Will experience in the statewide implementation of COTS CMS applications other than the proposed SC-CMS meet the requirements of RFP Section 4.2.1?

A32: Please see Amendment 2 for further clarification regarding this requirement.

Q33: What are INH timelines? How far along is INH in SDLC?

A33: INH is scheduled to be completed on or before April 2014 and is currently engaged in the requirements analysis and design phases of the SDLC.

Q34: SC CMS Integration with INH would require transformation to/from NIEM, routing etc. – is a separate middleware/ESB component being considered for the same?

A34: AOC's current ESB is BizTalk Server 2010. The SC-CMS solution will be required to interact with services running on AOC's ESB using an AOC-provided NIEM Schema.

Q35: Since CMS itself and integration with INH are two distinct components of the solution, can vendors explicitly respond only to the integration component queries in RFP (provided the integration solution can interface with any CMS solution selected)?

A35: No. Vendors must provide a complete solution for the proposed SC-CMS.

Q36: Will all 32 counties have their own local CMS systems?

A36: AOC will provide a state core CMS system for implementation at the local court level.

Q37: Will each local CMS connect to state partners via INH or directly?

A37: Local CMS connection to state partners shall be made via INH.

Q38: RFP Section 4.2.1.1 – Will AOC consider vendor that do not meet the exact requirement or will the entire proposal be tossed out on account of not meeting this requirement? Are installations at the County Court level sufficient to meet this requirement?

A38: Please see Amendment 2 for further clarification regarding RFP Section 4.2.1.

Q39: Under section 4.2.1 Minimum Requirements. Can the requirement for a prior statewide general jurisdiction implementation requirement be met by a major sub-contractor or does it need to be a client of the Vendor (Prime Contractor)?

A39: Please see Amendment 2 for further clarification.

Q40: Section 5.3 has link to caseload information which cannot be opened without a Microsoft Outlook domain-user pw. Please provide this document or the password.

A40: Please refer to Amendment 2 for modifications to RFP Section 5.3, which corrects this hyperlink.

Q41: Exhibit P - Deliverable Compliance Matrix has a numbering scheme that omits Deliverables numbered 3.1, etc. Can you confirm this is correct and that no deliverables have been inadvertently omitted?

A41: The numbering scheme in Exhibit P is correct and provided as intended.

Q42: Exhibit P - Some mandatory timelines are defined in days and some in months, e.g. 3 months vs. 60 days. For consistency, should Vendors assume 20 working days per month?

A42: No. Please refer to RFP Exhibit A – Definitions for specific definitions regarding “Business Days” and “Days”.

Any modifications to the RFP required as a result to answers provided by AOC will be provided as an amendment to the RFP. Any such amendment will be published as a separate RFP document and will be available at www.courts.wa.gov/procure/.

STATE OF WASHINGTON
1206 QUINCE ST SE • P.O. Box 41170 • Olympia, WA 98504-1170
360-753-3365 • 360-586-8869 Fax • www.courts.wa.gov