

1 (Vendor meeting held April 30, 2007 commencing at
2 2:04 p.m.):)

3 MR. BOYD: I guess we'll get started now. My name
4 is David Boyd. I'm the State Court Administrator. I would
5 like to welcome you here today to our vendor conference on
6 our EDMS RFP. This is, in spite of the way some of my days
7 went last week during the last week of the legislative
8 session here in Iowa, today is a real exciting day for me,
9 anyway. Another exciting day as we move along in this
10 project. As I told my wife when we released this RFP
11 recently, whatever hair on my head is not gray yet will soon
12 become that color, I'm sure.

13 But we started down this -- one reason why this
14 day is rather exciting, we started down this path once
15 before. Some of you may be aware of that. But back in the
16 late '90s and into the early years of this century we had
17 started a process of moving towards EDMS. We had done a lot
18 of research and background. We had done a feasibility
19 study. We had actually put an RFP out on the streets. We
20 were looking for pilot counties, and we had some problems
21 with our proposed funding stream because of difficult times
22 in the state fiscally. The Governor and the legislature
23 decided to remove some funding from our technology fund and
24 use that on other state projects. That caused us to put
25 this project once before on hold, and it's been on hold

1 until now.

2 Back in 2005 it became apparent to me that we were
3 moving closer to the day when we might be able to put this
4 RFP back out on the street and to look at piloting an EDMS
5 project for eventual state-wide use. At that time I
6 contracted with the National Center for State Courts to come
7 in and do a review and a follow-up to our prior feasibility
8 study to see what condition we were in, what had improved
9 since 2000 and what we still needed to do that would allow
10 us at some point in time to release the RFP. Based on that
11 study, I put several plans in place to help us get to the
12 point where we could release the RFP.

13 As I tried to explain or tell people when I speak
14 about the EDMS project, I often talk about the fact that
15 while we currently have a fine automated system out there
16 called ICIS, the Iowa Court Information System, ICIS is a
17 system that helps us manage our business in the Iowa
18 judicial court system. Where we're headed today is to a
19 system that will actually change how we do our business.
20 And part of that led to the creation of an ad hoc group to
21 look at the Rules of Civil and Criminal Procedure in Iowa,
22 as well as our statutory provisions and other court rules
23 that would need to be modified in some way, shape or form to
24 help us get to where we want to go.

25 Obviously, the system we hope has a number of

1 benefits to us and to the Iowa Judicial Branch, including
2 easy electronic access to our records, a way to route
3 information to people who need the information who may not
4 be physically present in the courthouse at that time. It
5 will allow us to reduce the ongoing problems that we face,
6 as well as the counties face, in terms of the storage that
7 we have, storage problems we have for all of the paper files
8 that currently exist. And also it allows -- will allow
9 judges to access the system and do their work on cases
10 regardless of what county they might happen to be sitting in
11 at the present time.

12 To help with that, the ad hoc group that was
13 appointed was chaired by Judge Robert Hutchison from here in
14 Des Moines. Judge Hutchison years ago had been on our court
15 technology committee back in the infancy of talking about
16 this project, and he was kind enough to co-chair a group
17 that took a number of months to go through all of the Rules
18 and also look at statutory provisions and to put a series of
19 Rules that are currently out on our website and out for
20 public comment, which I guess ends tomorrow. Public comment
21 ends May 1 and then the court will take those comments up
22 and decide what, if any, changes will be made in what we
23 have out there. So we're kind of excited to get to this
24 point again where we have this proposal out on the street
25 for you to look at and potentially to bid.

1 With that, I'm going to introduce and turn the
2 podium over to Judge Hutchison, who is going to help lead us
3 through the balance of the conference with the help of --
4 with help of some others. Judge Hutchison has recently
5 agreed to take on an additional task as we go through this
6 project. I will soon be appointing a Business Advisory
7 Committee made up of court personnel and a couple members of
8 the bar who will provide the core group representing the
9 Judicial Branch as the project moves forward in terms of
10 day-to-day contact with the vendors.

11 So Judge Hutchison, I'm going to turn it over to
12 you and let you take it from there.

13 JUDGE HUTCHISON: One of the things that I really
14 would like to have as far as technology for my court
15 chambers is caller ID, but David has successfully blocked
16 that; because he knows if I had it, I would not answer his
17 calls. Every time I get a call from him it's bad news for
18 me.

19 I have been involved in this technology process
20 for, I think, about 12 years now and have had a biding
21 interest in electronic filing since the concept was first
22 discussed with our committee back then.

23 For those of you who are here on behalf of the
24 vendors, I would strongly encourage you to take a look at
25 the proposed electronic Rules if you have not done so

1 already. That was a culmination of about eight months of
2 work of our committee, and the court had it for another four
3 months before they were put out for public comment in
4 January. I think that you will have a far better
5 understanding of what we're trying to do if you look at
6 those Rules. But that's really not the end of the story.

7 I think for what you're going to do, it is really
8 important for you all to understand that this project is not
9 a technology project. It is a business project. We tried
10 as our electronic Rules committee to set up some structure
11 for how things are going to work, but there is lot that is
12 not covered in the electronic Rules, especially in terms of
13 how things are going to be handled, and you folks are going
14 to have to help us think how to do that.

15 This process that David just talked about is going
16 to have a big part in deciding that, and I suspect we'll be
17 talking to a lot of different groups, including the bar, on
18 how to do this. Presumably, you folks have a lot of
19 expertise in this; and I hope you'll share it with us as we
20 go through this.

21 What we're looking for here is a business solution
22 for a myriad of problems we have in a paper court. If you
23 look at the project, you can see we're going entirely
24 paperless. As I understand it, we will be the first state
25 to go completely paperless for every type of case. I'm from

1 here in Polk County. We're currently involved in trying to
2 get a new courthouse for Polk County, and the architect that
3 came to talk to us was amazed when I told him that that's
4 what he needed to be planning for. He's done a lot of court
5 projects and didn't know of any state that had done that.
6 Make sure you know what we're going to.

7 I want to thank Karen Teig for reporting this for
8 us. It is important for us to have a record here, and this
9 also is the way of future for reporting. I want to mention
10 to you all as we go forward, we welcome your questions and
11 comments today, but please do, when you have a question or
12 comment, identify yourself for Karen's sake and for our sake
13 and only talk one at a time. She, like all reporters, is
14 only able to take one person at a time.

15 With that, I'm going to introduce Larry Murphy,
16 who is the head of our IT Department. For those of you
17 going forward, you're going to be working a lot with Larry,
18 with Ken Bosier, who is the project manager, and with me and
19 my committee. I look forward to that. I appreciate you
20 coming today. We appreciate your interest.

21 MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Judge. I appreciate that.

22 I'm going to make some introductions so that you
23 know some of the people that are around the room here. We
24 have a Judicial Technology Committee that is kind of the
25 governance structure for any technology related business

1 solutions. And we have with us today Judge Hoffmeyer from
2 Sioux City. You want to raise your hand or stand up? He's
3 chair of the Judicial Technology Committee. Next to him is
4 Clay Gavin, and Clay is Clerk of Court up in Dubuque. He's
5 been a member of the committee for some time. And Diane
6 Tott, she is the Clerk from Story County. And Judge
7 Hutchison introduced Karen. Karen is also on our Judicial
8 Technology Committee. These folks -- well, excuse me.
9 Kent, I missed you. Sorry. Kent Wirth, he's District Court
10 Administrator from Council Bluffs area in southwestern Iowa.
11 These folks are the ones, with others -- there's an 11
12 person committee -- that are going to evaluate the
13 proposals. They are going to be important in the overall
14 product in making recommendations to David, the State Court
15 Administrator, for final decision.

16 Also here we have Leesa McNeil, and Leesa is a
17 District Court Administrator from the Sioux City area.
18 Donna Humpal is in the back of the room there. Donna. She
19 was very instrumental in working with the Rules committee
20 and putting together the document that you see on line and
21 the proposed Rules that the Supreme Court has.

22 Keerthi is here. She's a recent addition to our
23 organization to help us with work flow and our business
24 processes and definitions.

25 Grant Dugdale is our attorney with the Attorney

1 General's Office. He'll probably be answering questions if
2 you have them related to the sample contract attached.

3 And Diane Thompson, you're here, and Diane's with
4 Iowa Work Force Development, and they may partner up with
5 us, as they're looking for an electronic filing business
6 solution as well, so they are keenly interested in the
7 outcome of this bidding process.

8 And then last, but not least, is Linda
9 De Francisco, and Linda is our administrative person in the
10 IT area, and you probably contacted her or she's contacted
11 you about the myriad of things in regard to the RFP.

12 Ken Bosier, as the judge talked about, is the
13 State's project manager for this EDMS effort. So he'll be
14 involved. He'll be working with the Business Advisory
15 Committee and the Judicial Technology Committee.

16 We have a similar process going on with regards to
17 our pilot counties. And so as you saw in our deployment,
18 we're going to have two pilot counties start up, and we
19 asked the counties in the districts to do a similar bidding
20 process to give us the best chance for success at EDMS. We
21 want to have cooperation of the attorneys, the judges, the
22 Clerks' office, court administration demonstrate how they
23 will handle the workload during the pilot project, and they
24 are submitting proposals. And, David, if you would flip the
25 chart, please. These are in alphabetic order. No order of

1 preference except the alphabet. Our counties that have
2 submitted letters of intent to be on the bidding are Carroll
3 County, Clinton County, Dubuque County, Plymouth County and
4 Story County. Let's see. Story County -- I'll start at the
5 bottom -- is the Ames area. It's the county to the north of
6 metro area here. Plymouth County is LeMars, home of Wells
7 Blue Bunny. If you eat ice cream, that's where it comes
8 from. The rest of those have cities of the same name in
9 them. You should know where those are in Iowa geography.
10 So two of those five counties will be selected as the pilot
11 counties for the launch of pilot testing of EDMS.

12 The next thing I want to talk about is the
13 development of this, our philosophy. We have spent some
14 time, as David alluded to, developing feasibility studies,
15 working with the National Center For State Courts, having
16 the Rules committee developing strategies with the Judicial
17 Technology Committee, and we've formed the Request for
18 Proposal. But we really need solutions from the vendor
19 community in order to make this thing work, and so we're
20 really looking at creative ideas and suggestions that can
21 bring to bear a solution for the citizens of Iowa.

22 As far as funding goes, we have put in there a
23 proposed funding stream and potential cost. We have funding
24 to probably start the first 20 or so counties. That fund is
25 replenished each year, so there's going to be some

1 additional funds that will have to be sought from the
2 legislature in order to complete this; but if it's like our
3 rollout of ICIS, the Iowa Court Information System, that
4 after we build some success, the legislature was more than
5 happy to fund us to a level that we needed to complete it.
6 In fact, they asked us in the last year could you do the
7 last 45 counties in a year. And we brought forward a method
8 to do that, and they funded us to the level that would meet
9 that plan. So I think we have a reputation of delivering
10 and being successful at that.

11 I already explained the evaluation committee is
12 going to be the Judicial Technology Committee. In addition,
13 Judge Hutchison is going to sit on that committee and two
14 attorneys representing the members of the bar. These two
15 attorneys have a vast quantity of experience in technology,
16 as well as business solutions for going paperless.

17 The protocol for today -- I'll get to the question
18 and answer period. As Judge Hutchison said, all good court
19 reporters, I would like to have you please to stand and
20 announce your company and your name and then make a comment
21 or question.

22 We're going to respond to the questions today as
23 best we can, but we will put it all up on the web, and the
24 answers on the web will be the prevailing answers that
25 govern you or steer you as you bring forth your proposal.

1 So with that, I think we'll turn it over to you to
2 ask questions, so who wants to be the brave soul that wants
3 to go first?

4 VENDOR: My name is Mohammed Shaikh. I'm with
5 Image-X. My question is are you going to be both the EFM
6 and EFSP or are you going to allow other people to file into
7 the system? Electronic filing?

8 MR. MURPHY: Repeat the question.

9 VENDOR: (Mohammed Shaikh with Image-X) Are you
10 going to be both EFM and EFSP or are you going to allow
11 third parties to a file into the system electronically?

12 MR. MURPHY: By third parties, you would mean
13 what?

14 VENDOR: (Mohammed Shaikh with Image-X) Generally
15 in other courthouses process servers, third party companies,
16 how active as electronic filing server provider. And they
17 acted as EFM, electronic file manager. Some of the places
18 both the EFSP and EFM.

19 MR. MURPHY: Do you have any answer to that?

20 JUDGE HUTCHISON: Well, I'm not quite sure I
21 understand the question, but the Rules contemplate that
22 everyone will file electronically whether we're talking
23 about private citizens who do not have lawyers, process
24 servers, abstracter, they have access to the system, and
25 attorneys. Everyone will file through the internet. I

1 don't think we have a final decision on who's going to
2 maintain the server, although I suspect we will, but I think
3 that's the question.

4 VENDOR: (Mohammed Shaikh with Image-X) In
5 addition to that server that you have, the filer needs help,
6 will the court provide that help or will they go to a third
7 party to get the help?

8 JUDGE HUTCHISON: I think we're anticipating that
9 we will provide the help.

10 VENDOR: Jason Jones, Cisco, INC. Since this RFP
11 only encompasses the two pilot counties and mentions the
12 appeals court, would you suspect that the hardware and
13 software would be sized only for those three courts, or
14 would it need to be sized for state-wide rollout?

15 MR. MURPHY: It will need to be sized for
16 state-wide rollout.

17 VENDOR: (Jason Jones with Cisco, INC.) Do you
18 have any sort of volume estimates or ball park estimates for
19 document filing, those sorts of things, to effect sizing of
20 server?

21 MR. BOSIER: We can provide that and post it on
22 line at the website.

23 MR. MURPHY: I want to go back to your first
24 question, and we're anticipating and expecting that we're
25 going to be successful in the two county pilot projects.

1 We're going to try to do everything we can to be successful,
2 and then we're going to go to the appellate courts. I guess
3 we would look to the vendors to have an incremental
4 expansion of capacity base so we're not buying the full
5 elephant at the front end. If we would buy one leg, another
6 leg and take this in parts as we go about expanding this.
7 There's a little bit of unknown because our approach to this
8 is that, let's say, that just for instance, that Carroll
9 County is one of the pilot projects. Our intent is and our
10 approach is that we come back and in that judicial
11 subdistrict there are 12 other counties, if I'm not mistaken
12 in that area, so we would then have 12 additional counties;
13 and it could be the same thing with Plymouth County. I
14 don't know how many there are -- six more counties that
15 would be done. So within a year, year-and-a-half, we would
16 expect that we would have 20 some counties come on pretty
17 rapidly after our successful pilot testing. I think that --
18 hopefully that clarifies that question a little more.

19 Yes, sir.

20 VENDOR: Reginald Harvey with Preyna, P-r-e-y-n-a,
21 Enterprises. There was some mention about potential impact
22 if you should have homeland security considerations for this
23 project. Not suggesting that that has an impact on this
24 particular RFP, but to what extent does business presumption
25 and disaster recovery need to be addressed here with respect

1 to supporting the ongoing business of the 99 counties and
2 the consolidated databases?

3 MR. MURPHY: I can maybe answer that question by
4 our current strategy with regard to our database management
5 of the Iowa Court Information System. We have two data
6 centers, and they are not yet there, but they will be
7 shortly, be able to be replicated within 15 to 20 minutes of
8 each other so that in the event that this building was not
9 available, was taken out for some reason, natural or
10 otherwise, that the courts would run at another alternate
11 data center within a day. And so we're envisioning that
12 strategy to be held true with electronic document management
13 as well; because it will be dependent upon it, because there
14 won't be the paper. So we're expecting it to be redundant
15 in two data centers rather quickly. Does that answer your
16 question?

17 VENDOR: (Reginald Harvey with Preyna Enterprises)
18 Just to clarify, so the assumption we can make is that
19 concern will be subsumed with your ICIS system.

20 MR. MURPHY: That's right.

21 VENDOR: (Mohammed Shaikh with Image-X) What
22 about the backfile of that already existing paper? Are you
23 going to convert that also into images?

24 MR. MURPHY: Our plan is to not do backfiling.
25 Day one forward.

1 VENDOR: (Mohammed Shaikh with Image-X) When you
2 say paperless, those will still be there, paper for the
3 backfiles.

4 MR. MURPHY: There will still be paper for the
5 backfiles. I would say that -- there are cases that go on
6 for some period of time. If you're involved in those cases,
7 it's a lengthy period of time. But, quite honestly, most of
8 our cases are in and done within a year. So we're not
9 looking at a long period of time until we're all addressing
10 electronic file.

11 VENDOR: Joni Brostrom, Lexis Nexis File & Serve.
12 Page 27 talks about "EDMS must provide for
13 electronic notification to the filer of receipt of the
14 filing. EDMS must provide for electronic notification of
15 events scheduled for documents filed by the court." I am
16 assume you're talking about notice of court hearing and that
17 kind of thing?

18 MR. MURPHY: Uh-huh.

19 VENDOR: (Joni Brostrom with Lexis Nexis File &
20 Serve) Will the court staff be doing that? How does the
21 e-mail notification have and who is responsible for
22 maintaining the list of who is involved in the case and
23 their e-mail addresses?

24 MR. MURPHY: Judge Hutchison, can you address that
25 as far as the Rules are concerned?

1 JUDGE HUTCHISON: I don't remember for sure, but
2 my guess is -- it's a hard question to answer because we
3 don't have a uniform system as it is. In some counties the
4 clerk is responsible for the mailings and other counties
5 like mine it's actually the court attendants who are doing
6 the mailing. So what we're going to need is a repository in
7 each case of who all the participants are that need to be
8 notified. Whichever way that's going to happen, whether
9 it's going to be my court attendant or clerk in another
10 county, they can go to that list and get that for everybody
11 to receive notice of either hearing or of filing.

12 VENDOR: (Joni Brostrom from Lexis Nexis File &
13 Serve) Is it your envision that that list of people would
14 reside within EDMS?

15 JUDGE HUTCHISON: Yes.

16 MR. MURPHY: And, Kent, haven't we provided for in
17 our case management system we provided already an e-mail
18 address for the attorney of record, so it will be within the
19 confines of the case management system that the e-mail
20 process is updated. That's the responsibility, according to
21 the way I read the rules, for the attorney to keep the court
22 or the Clerk updated on change of e-mail address and the
23 burden is upon the attorney. Donna is shaking her head back
24 there. Thank you. I appreciate that.

25 JUDGE HUTCHISON: I want to put one little wrinkle

1 in this for you. One of the things that came up when we
2 were talking in the Rules adoption was the possibility that
3 a lawyer might want to add a separate e-mail address for a
4 particular case, and we made provisions for that in the
5 Rules. That's why I say you have to kind of be case
6 specific as you're developing this so that we know that
7 Johnny Smith in this case wants this e-mail address. I
8 think it does have to be case specific, not just lawyer
9 specific.

10 MR. MURPHY: And I'll just add this -- I don't
11 want to answer too many questions here. But the group that
12 worked on the Rules really wanted it to be e-mail rather
13 than going to a system and having to log onto our electronic
14 filing system to get what's the next notice or the next
15 action. So they wanted it to go to the attorney's desktop
16 and that's how it came out. Now, whether the court adopts
17 that or not, I don't know. But that's what was envisioned.

18 Okay. Another question up front.

19 VENDOR: Jason Jones, Cisco. The RFP refers to
20 scanning. Is scanning hardware and software in the scope of
21 RFP or procured outside?

22 MR. MURPHY: It's in the scope in the proposal.

23 VENDOR: (Jason Jones with Cisco, INC.) Thank
24 you.

25 MR. MURPHY: Along that line, several of the

1 documents talk about pro se litigation and the Rules
2 committee proposed that there be a public kiosk in every
3 county courthouse where pro se's, if they don't have
4 something at home or want to go to a public library, they
5 can go to the kiosk with their document and then file, want
6 to do the cover sheet and then scan in their document or
7 attachments and file right there in the public area. So
8 scanners are included.

9 VENDOR: Jim May with Bearing Point. With respect
10 to the kiosk, the pro se filer would be treated like any
11 other filer would need to get some kind of confirmation of
12 filing. You're presently asking for e-mail confirmation of
13 filing. If that person doesn't have e-mail, which is why
14 they're using the kiosk, how are you going to do that?

15 MR. MURPHY: Do you know the answer to that,
16 Donna?

17 MS. HUMPAL: They might use the kiosk because they
18 don't have a scanner or something is wrong, for whatever
19 reason, so that may not be it. They can go ahead and -- you
20 know, I think they also need to have an e-mail address.
21 Otherwise, they would have to ask the court for permission
22 to be a nonelectronic filer and they can take their
23 documents to the clerk to get it into the system
24 electronically.

25 MR. MURPHY: In the committee meetings we talked

1 about they get a G-mail or a hot mail account and use that
2 as their -- and they could use the public kiosk to inquire
3 if they wanted to.

4 VENDOR: (Jim May with Bearing Point) On a
5 separate question with respect to use of Adobe format, when
6 you scan a document using Adobe, you have the capacity to
7 OCR the document and then index the words within the
8 document for searching. I assume that's a function you want
9 to take advantage of. It takes time to do that. Working in
10 a public kiosk, it can take several minutes, in fact, ten
11 minutes in a complicated document. Number one, is that your
12 aim to do the OCR? Number two, is there a way to work
13 around that and have you considered that?

14 MR. MURPHY: I think it was our intention to have
15 an OCR in order for the court and others to take full
16 advantage of the process. So we will have to look at the
17 efficiency factor there as we consider implementation.

18 Okay? Other questions?

19 VENDOR: Jason Jones, Cisco. I have two questions
20 about the judge's access. Is it expected that the judge
21 will be able to access the electronic case file while
22 disconnected to the network? Will they have local cache
23 copies?

24 MR. MURPHY: If you read the National Center for
25 State Courts' recommendation, it is that the judges would

1 have tablets and every day that new case is assigned to the
2 judge would be in locally cached on the tablet or laptop and
3 then when they're reconnected to the network, it would
4 update recent addendums to the file or recent filings.

5 VENDOR: (Jason Jones with Cisco) Okay. That's
6 the intention?

7 MR. MURPHY: That's the intention.

8 VENDOR: (Jason Jones from Cisco) And my second
9 question, is the annotation by a judge or note taking by a
10 judge also in the scope for this RFP?

11 MR. MURPHY: Judges?

12 JUDGE HUTCHISON: I'm not sure I understand your
13 question. Note taking in terms of taking down testimony at
14 trial for my purposes you mean?

15 VENDOR: (Jason Jones from Cisco, INC.) For
16 example, if they were to view a filing with a paper
17 document, they would write notes. Is the electronic
18 equivalent of that intended to be part of this RFP?

19 MR. MURPHY: Judge Hoffmeyer?

20 JUDGE HOFFMEYER: The National Center said yes.
21 Now, I think we're not certain, while maybe we want that
22 capability, I'm not certain how many judges will actually be
23 using the note taking on the tablet PC. I think that's
24 uncertain how that will be used or utilized.

25 MR. MURPHY: Or maybe perhaps by another

1 generation.

2 JUDGE HOFFMEYER: Yes.

3 VENDOR: Joni Brostrom, File & Serve. You talked
4 about being able to support credit cards on electronic text.
5 I'm assuming that's just for collecting filing fees?

6 MR. MURPHY: That's correct. Well, yeah,
7 primarily filing fees.

8 VENDOR: (Joni Brostrom with Lexis Nexis File &
9 Serve) This won't have anything to do with fine payments
10 or --

11 MR. MURPHY: We already have a process for that.

12 JUDGE HUTCHISON: Filing fee and the registration.

13 MR. MURPHY: And registration. I forgot about
14 that. Yes.

15 VENDOR: (Joni Brostrom with Lexis Nexis File &
16 Serve) I guess I've got all the questions.

17 MR. MURPHY: That's fine.

18 VENDOR: (Joni Brostrom with Lexis Nexis File &
19 Serve) You talked about business rules and business
20 process. And that the business -- one or the other is going
21 to change from court to court; that we need to be prepared
22 for that. Will the two or is your intention with the two
23 pilot courts to come up with a standard set of rules and
24 then the processes will vary, or are we talking about I
25 think it's 77 counties, right, different processes in every

1 county you go to?

2 MR. MURPHY: Well, there are 99 counties, and
3 there's probably 99 different processes that go on right
4 now. We're going to try to come up with -- to work on a
5 role base workflow with our business rules so that the
6 committee, the Judicial Technology Committee, formed an
7 abstract idea that, you know, in Polk County -- I'm just
8 going to give you two examples -- in Polk County to handle
9 traffic tickets, use that as an example, there may be five
10 people that do that, and they play different roles in the
11 process of that ticket. Whereby in Adams County down in
12 southern Iowa, there's only one-and-a-half people that work
13 in that office. Suzie in Adams County may wear all five
14 roles that five people handle in Polk County. So that's
15 what we're thinking will work, and we're going to try to
16 strive towards some general business rules that can be
17 broadly approached across the state with some flexibility
18 within the county.

19 So it's sort of a little bit of a balance, but
20 more towards uniform because not one size always fits all.
21 And we have to have the ability that if Sally is sick today
22 or on vacation, that the local manager can make adjustments
23 in the daily work schedule. That's kind of a long winded
24 answer to your question, but hopefully it illustrates our
25 thought.

1 VENDOR: (Joni Brostrom with Lexis Nexis File &
2 Serve) I had another one, another question just since I'm
3 standing.

4 MR. MURPHY: Sure.

5 VENDOR: (Joni Brostrom with Lexis Nexis File &
6 Serve) You talk about being able to take care of court
7 steno notes. Are court steno notes different from court
8 transcripts?

9 MR. MURPHY: Yes.

10 THE COURT: What format do they come in?

11 MR. MURPHY: Karen.

12 (Discussion was held off the record while Karen
13 answered a question.)

14 JUDGE HUTCHISON: They are required to be kept and
15 they take an incredible volume of space. That is one of the
16 business problems that is driving this project is court
17 reporter notes. In Polk County they are stored in a place
18 that none of you would ever want to go.

19 MR. MURPHY: The difference is steno notes are
20 kept on every case and stored in the Clerk's office and it's
21 only upon appeal to an appellate court that they are
22 transcribed into a transcript, and the current approach is
23 that they would be filed -- the transcript would be filed,
24 although there's some other thoughts that the court -- the
25 Supreme Court may consider for that. There's a difference

1 between steno notes and transcripts. And the transcripts
2 are owned and property by the court reporter in Iowa, the
3 way I understand it, anyway.

4 MR. BOSIER: And the Rules do call for ASCII.

5 VENDOR: Reginald Harvey with Preyna Enterprises.
6 Tagging onto the last question with a slightly different
7 slant, in reviewing the business plan that was published on
8 your site and the feasibility study and the RFP there were
9 several casual mentions of proprietary systems. Yet during
10 the introduction you were encouraging the use of best
11 solutions from the vending community. So my question is
12 asking for clarity with respect to the extent of commercial
13 off-the-shelf solutions for various things as to computer
14 enhancement, case management, feasibility, that sort of
15 thing. Am I perceiving a conflict there or which are you
16 leaning toward?

17 MR. MURPHY: Well, I think we're looking at
18 off-the-shelf type of software if we can, with integration.
19 I mean there's a lot of things that we're looking for in our
20 RFP, because it needs to integrate with the case management
21 system, they need to be a document management, work flow.
22 All those things are key to a successful EDMS project as we
23 see it. And we have a blend of -- we've built our own case
24 management system in Iowa, but for jury we went with an
25 off-the-shelf jury solution, so we have some of both in the

1 Judicial Branch. But as far as proprietary, which areas are
2 you looking at as proprietary?

3 VENDOR: (Reginald Harvey with Preyna Enterprises)
4 I wasn't making a decision. I was just confused by seeing
5 the sporadic references proprietary software, and it didn't
6 seem to make sense that you would acquire and attempt to
7 maintain something that was completely unique and
8 nonstandard.

9 MR. MURPHY: Well, we're looking for as many open
10 solutions as possible. Yes.

11 VENDOR: Again, Reginald Harvey, Preyna
12 Enterprises. That being the case, there may be some
13 necessity as the phases of the piloting or implementation or
14 design review occur, and you outlined some of those in the
15 documents I referenced earlier. To retire or have a plan to
16 phase out technologies that you acquired prior to 1999, how
17 do you anticipate handling that if to move forward, what you
18 were doing in the past becomes obsolete? Or in other words,
19 to what extent might be hemmed in to use things that you
20 became dependent upon if that has conflict with some of the
21 performance that you outlined?

22 MR. MURPHY: I think the evaluation committee will
23 take a look at that. If it's identified in the proposal
24 that there are possible conflicts, I think they would be
25 open to looking at that discussion. That's the best way I

1 can answer the question. I understand what you're saying.
2 It's just that I can't -- unless you're more specific, I
3 can't answer it.

4 VENDOR: (Reginald Harvey with Preyna Enterprises)
5 No, that's fine. Thank you.

6 MR. MURPHY: Yes, back here.

7 VENDOR: Jeff Miller with Tallgrass Technology.
8 Are you willing to accept multiple submissions from
9 proposals from us if we have a couple different alternative
10 ways to approach a solution?

11 MR. MURPHY: I believe the answer is yes.

12 VENDOR: Jim May from Bearing Point again. With
13 respect to page 28(B)(5), references are made to the GJXDM
14 for data interchange with respect to citations. Are you
15 envisioning that this would be an end point on the existing
16 CJIS hub capable of receiving in those formats, or are you
17 asking that the vendor provide an end-to-end solution which
18 would include the adapter on the other end to transmit into
19 this system with...

20 MR. MURPHY: I understand the question and I'll
21 try to answer it. We would see this as -- I'll just say
22 this: We have currently a method by which to receive
23 traffic tickets in electronic format, and we envision that's
24 going to be incorporated with the CJIS initiative, so it
25 would be an end point of the ESB. But I want to say this.

1 There are others, because when we look at our court filers,
2 the largest volume of court filers in case types is traffic
3 tickets. There's about a half a million to 600,000 of those
4 a year of traffic tickets. That's our biggest volume of
5 things coming in. After that, then it's the Department of
6 Human Services child support recovery. And for them to go
7 to a cover sheet and when they have a system already.
8 They're interested in the name standards and having an
9 exchange using an XML, so that they can be as efficient with
10 federal dollars as possible. So that's why that strategy is
11 sitting in there, so we wouldn't really receive a cover sheet
12 from their administrators or attorneys. We would receive a
13 stream of data that we would turn into a document for
14 presentation to a judge. Does that answer the question?

15 VENDOR: (Jim May with Bearing Point) Yes.

16 THE COURT: Sort of?

17 VENDOR: (Jim May with Bearing Point) It did. On
18 page 31(C)(4), EDMS national standards you're starting out
19 at 1.2 and 1.1 specifications. Have you had any discussion
20 or interest in starting at 3.0? Minnesota is.

21 MR. MURPHY: Yeah, we would be open to 3.0, as
22 long as it's above that standard and 3.0 is.

23 VENDOR: Joni Brostrom, File & Serve. In the
24 pilot counties are you intending to include all case types
25 in those counties before you move on to anything else and,

1 if so, which case types are you intending to start with or
2 have you got that far yet?

3 MR. MURPHY: I think our strategy is that we're
4 going to take whatever is to be filed after a certain date,
5 so that would be all case types.

6 VENDOR: (Joni Brostrom with Lexis Nexis File &
7 Serve) So you'll be starting with everything all at once?

8 MR. MURPHY: Uh-huh. Gulp.

9 David brought up a good point. The pilot
10 counties, we went through and we looked at a target range of
11 counties, based upon population and filings over a year
12 period of time, and so we excluded a number of the larger
13 ones, Polk County, Scott County, Linn County. And then
14 there's a number of counties, about 50 of them or 60 of
15 them, that are smaller population and smaller case filings.
16 And we wanted to do that in order to give this a good test
17 without hopefully straining the system, the court system,
18 too bad, the legal system, but yet give it a good test, a
19 variety of case types, and then we can extend it into larger
20 counties, and as well as smaller counties. That was sort of
21 the approach that we took, to hit a sweet spot or a targeted
22 number of counties. I think there were 24 that were
23 eligible for this, and they had we have five that intend to
24 submit proposals for consideration for the pilot testing.
25 So hopefully that gives you a little warmer fuzzy feeling

1 about this.

2 Other questions?

3 VENDOR: Jim May from Bearing Point. The State
4 Attorney General's office has some very specific ideas about
5 entering into contracts where the State's liability is
6 limited, and there is guidance that allows for limitation of
7 liability, but has to be backed up by business reasons; and
8 I am asking whether or not those business reasons seem to be
9 apparent in this situation and whether or not proposals
10 which request a limitation on liability would be deemed
11 responsive.

12 MR. MURPHY: Grant?

13 MR. DUGDALE: Certainly, right now I would say
14 that we are leaning towards no limitation of liability
15 provisions. That's not something I specifically addressed
16 with my client; and whether factors exist in this case that
17 would warrant some limited, very limited, limitation of
18 liability provisions, that issue has not yet been decided.
19 What I think I would like to do before we go too much
20 further in this process is try to get a more formal answer
21 after I've met with my clients to discuss the risks that
22 would be involved with any kind of limitation of liability
23 provision. But as a general matter I don't like them. So
24 that's where my baseline analysis is going. I have problems
25 with them, and I don't like them, and I don't think

1 necessarily right now I'm committed to resolving that
2 question or answer that question right now.

3 MR. MURPHY: We will get you an answer for that
4 question.

5 VENDOR: (Joni Brostrom with Lexis Nexis File &
6 Serve) With regard to the contract, who is the signing
7 authority? It says it's with the Judicial Branch. Who is
8 that?

9 MR. MURPHY: The man right over there. That would
10 be David K. Boyd.

11 Other questions? Mr. May brought up the one
12 question probably a lot of people in this room are wanting
13 to know the answer to, I would guess.

14 Yes.

15 VENDOR: Joe Mudroch from Oracle. I'll ask a
16 question. You mentioned a funding source. What is the
17 dollar that you have planned for the initial pilot and then
18 for the overall going out the next year, two years for the
19 entire state?

20 MR. MURPHY: We're estimating, if you looked at
21 our business plan, that this would be in the neighborhood of
22 about \$19 million, and I think we have funding sitting in
23 our accounts right now for about \$5 million to launch this
24 initiative. And we get an annual insurgence or infusion of
25 money to the neighborhood of \$4 to \$5 million annually for

1 court technology and business solution initiatives.

2 VENDOR: (Joe Mudroch with Oracle) Thank you.

3 MR. MURPHY: We believe we have the money, the
4 desire, the interest and the business need to move forward.
5 What we're looking for is your solutions so that we can
6 continue on and form a partnership with the business
7 community.

8 Any other questions? Going once, twice. Okay.

9 Thank you very much for your time today. We really
10 appreciate it. Look forward to your responses.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25