



## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

### ACQ-2016-0701-RFP

## QUESTIONS & ANSWERS DOCUMENT

### ROUND 2

October 27, 2016

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) published the Request for Proposals, ACQ-2016-0701-RFP, on August 26, 2016, and Q&A Document – Round 1 on October 12, 2016 for the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ) Case Management System (CMS) project.

As required under RFP Section 1.18, answers to Vendor submitted questions are provided below.

**Q1: RFP Section 5.9 - Data Conversion:** The last paragraph, states the following: *“The plan must identify the preferred process for acquiring data extracts from the AOC, 3rd party DMS providers, and the probation departments”*. Can the AOC please provide further information pertaining to: (a) The list of 3<sup>rd</sup> party DMSs solution names and/or providers involved within scope of the project that require data conversion (including the DMS providers serving the probation departments)? (b) The types of 3<sup>rd</sup> party documents that require data conversion, for example, are the documents mostly .TIFF files, or PDF files? (c) The estimated number of electronic documents that would be required for data conversion?

**A1:** (a) Based on current information, the following is a list of known 3<sup>rd</sup> party DMS solutions: Laserfiche, Liberty, OnBase, LeadTools, Xerox Documate, and HP Trim. (b) AOC is unable to determine percentages of different file types. (c) The AOC is unable to provide an estimate regarding the number of electronic documents required for data conversion.

**Q2: Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix, Civil Tab:** There are only a few requirements in the RFP that reference electronic filing with limited mention of e-Filing in the main document. Can the AOC please confirm that the

State expects for an e-Filing solution to be included and proposed in scope for the project?

- A2: Yes. See RFP Exhibit N – CLJ-CMS Scope Diagram for more information regarding electronic filing. See Instructions tab in Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix for definitions related to “Mandatory” and “Desirable.”
- Q3: **Q&A Document – Round 1 Question Q15 and Answer A15:** We understand that the AOC has limited information pertaining to the probation department data sources, but is there any information that the AOC can provide pertaining to the how many different incumbent CMS solutions are in the state? And would the AOC be able to list the current probation CMS solution names and/or providers (for e.g., are they home grown applications or COTS based solutions)?
- A3: Yes. At this time, AOC has identified a minimum of six (6) systems, both Commercial-off-the-Shelf systems (COTS) and custom developed applications, currently in use by probation departments. Participation of specific courts and probation departments will be determined at a later date. Of these six (6) systems, three (3) were custom developed in-house by local courts. The other three (3) are COTS applications (CaseLoad Pro, LORYX, and Law Base).
- Q4: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix, Court Administration Tab:** There are a number of jury management related requirements included in this tab. Some are listed as “mandatory” and some are listed as “desirable” (for example, requirement AD1 for “Jury Management” is listed as “desirable”. From an overall solution perspective, can the AOC please confirm that the State wishes for inclusion of a Jury Management System to be included in scope of this project?
- A4: See RFP Exhibit N – CLJ-CMS Scope Diagram for more information regarding jury management. See Instructions tab in Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix for definitions related to “Mandatory” and “Desirable.”
- Q5: **RFP Section 2.4 – Business References and Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Section 2.4 states that proposers cannot use the Washington AOC as a reference. Exhibit M requires that respondents include the name of the reference where the functionality is deployed for each requirement marked “Supports the Requirement”. How should respondents respond to those unique requirements in Exhibit M where the only place that functionality is deployment is in Washington? Should the functionality exist within the software, it doesn’t seem appropriate to identify that as anything less, simply because it only exists within the State of Washington.
- A5: RFP Section 2.4 is limited to business references which may be further offered for On-site Visits as proposed in Exhibit H. These references must also be used for citing clients where any given requirement in Exhibit M has been deployed without customization. To meet compliance for any required response, “Supports Requirements” shall mean it is available to all vendor clients as part of a general release for the proposed CMS software. See Amendment No. 3 for a modification in

Exhibit M – Instructions Tab for the “Supports the Requirements” under the Response Code section.

**Q6:** **RFP Section 2.4 – Business References:** RFP Section 2.4 limits respondents’ ability to include business references within the Washington AOC. In an effort to provide a more equitable reference process, will the AOC expand this requirement to include all court/judicial organizations within the State of Washington?

**A6:** No. While Vendors are restricted from using system implementations under any current contract with AOC as a reference, Vendors may use client references where the proposed solution has been implemented under a separate contract with other court/judicial organizations.

Any modifications to the RFP required as a result to answers provided by AOC will be provided in an amendment to the RFP. Any such amendment will be published as a separate RFP document and will be available in WEBS and at <http://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](http://www.courts.wa.gov)