

AMENDMENT 1 TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

ACQ-2016-0301-RFP

INH EDR DATA INTEGRATION

The Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) has released Amendment 1 for the Request for Proposal (RFP) for INH EDR Data Integration.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this amendment is to correct administrative errors in the text of the RFP document.

The sections below of the original RFP document are amended as follows, (lined through text is removed, added text is underlined) :

1.11 - NUMBER OF COPIES

Send two (2) originals and ~~seven~~ nine (9) identical copies and, on an unrestricted, non-password-protected CD-ROM or USB flash drive, one (1) complete copy of the proposal in portable document format (PDF), and one (1) complete copy in native file format readable by MS Office 2003 or newer to the RFP Coordinator. The PDF submission must provide a separate file for each volume of Vendor's proposal as specified in Section 2.1.

5.7 - CONFIGURATION REQUIREMENTS (MS)

Vendor must fully describe the tasks, schedule, AOC organization, and other resources required to configure, maintain, and administer the hardware, software, and infrastructure to support the proposed solution. Resources considered in this description must include, but are not limited to, specialized information technology and communications personnel, specialized tools, and ancillary goods. The description must explain what tasks, schedule, and resources are required to configure the solution at the data center and at each of the court/county locations (if applicable). This must address both initial installation and administration of upgrades. Vendor must identify which tasks it expects AOC ~~the court, and the county clerk~~ to perform and what resources it expects AOC ~~these organizations~~ to provide.

5.8 - SOFTWARE DEPLOYMENT (MS)

Vendor must fully describe the tasks, schedule, and resources required to initially deploy software to support the proposed solution. In addition, Vendor must provide a parallel description of the requirements for testing and deploying software updates and upgrades. Resources considered in this description must include, but are not limited to, specialized information technology and communications personnel, specialized tools, and ancillary goods. The description must explain what tasks, schedule, and resources are required to deploy all required software at the data center and at each of the court/county locations (if

applicable). Vendor must identify which tasks it expects AOC the court, and the county clerk to perform and what resources it expects AOC these organizations to provide.

6.2 - RESPONSE TO BUSINESS REQUIREMENTS COMPLIANCE MATRIX (MS)

The Business Requirements are included in **EXHIBIT M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix**.

EXHIBIT M provides the Business Requirements for the INH EDE Data Integration solution. This exhibit provides the business requirements for which the selected Vendor must meet compliance. Vendor must describe how its solution complies with the requirements by completing the **EXHIBIT M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix**. Detailed instructions for completing the exhibit can be found on the first worksheet in the exhibit.

In support of the business requirements provided in **EXHIBIT M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix**, AOC has provided some business use cases for further details. The business use case can be found in **EXHIBIT N - Business Use Cases Requirements Compliance Matrix..**

Additional supporting information for completing this compliance matrix can be found in the following RFP Exhibits.

- EXHIBIT H - INH EDE Overview
- EXHIBIT I - EDR technical environment
- EXHIBIT J - KCDC Data Replication High Level Design
- EXHIBIT K - EDR Data Integration High Level Design
- EXHIBIT L - JIS Data Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Record Systems

9.1 - EVALUATION PROCESS

Vendor responses will be evaluated by subject matter experts (SMEs) selected by the RFP Coordinator. These evaluators will be representatives from AOC. The RFP Coordinator will not serve as an evaluator but will facilitate the evaluation process and may develop information for presentation to the team.

The process for awarding a contract as a result of this RFP may be done in phased efforts. Vendor's proposal will be evaluated based on the process outlined below. The top scoring Vendor(s) will proceed to the next step in the evaluation process. Proposals with tied scores will be treated equally, and the tied Vendors' proposals will be moved forward to the next phase if they are among the top scoring Vendors and AOC chooses to further the evaluation process.

The steps in the evaluation process include:

- Receipt of Proposals.
- Administrative Review (Pass/Fail).
- Risk Assessment.

- Evaluator Review of Proposals (Scored).
- Vendor [Presentations](#) Demonstrations (Scored).
- Cost Evaluation (Scored).
- Reference Checks (Scored).
- Summary and Recommendation.
- Optional Best and Final Offer.

9.6 - EVALUATION CRITERIA

Specific Criteria for RFP Evaluation:

| Review Component | Results/ Points | Component Weight | Phase Total | Evaluation Phase Weight |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Administrative | Pass/Fail | | | |
| Business References | Pass/Fail | | | |
| Management Proposal | 100 | 15% | 100% | Phase I 40% |
| Business Requirements | 100 | 20% | | |
| Technical Requirements | 100 | 50% | | |
| Service & Deliverable Requirements | 100 | 15% | | |
| Presentations | 100 | 100% | 100% | Phase II 30% |
| Costs | 100 | 100% | 100% | Phase III 30% |
| Total | | | | 100% |

All other sections of the original RFP remain as written.