

**\*\*Beginning May 9 the Judicial Branch will post responses to as many of the submitted questions as possible by 4:30 p.m. each day. Although the question numbers may not be in sequence, all questions will be answered. A document with all questions and responses in sequence will be posted once all questions are responded to\*\***

*May 11, 2007*

1. Is it correct that this RFP only encompasses two pilot counties and one pilot appellate court? If so, does server hardware need to be sized only for these three pilot courts or does it need to be sized for statewide rollout?

*Response: No. This RFP covers the pilots as well as implementation following successful pilots.*

2. Is the Judicial Branch looking for an active-active configuration between the two data centers or an active-standby configuration?

*Response: Please refer to the Vendor Conference Minutes.*

3. Section 3.2.A.7 refers to scanning. Is scanning hardware and software to be included in the cost proposal?

*Response: Yes. Please refer to the Proposed Court Rules 16.102.*

6. Are we to include costs to modify the existing case management system (mentioned in 3.2.A.12) or to simply provide an interface or API for Courts staff to use when modifying the existing system?

*Response: Costs to modify the CMS for integration purposes should be included in the proposal.*

8. Section 3.2.A.15 states that the EDMS must work with Windows and Mac operating systems. Is this requirement intended for internal users as well?

*Response: This is not an internal user requirement.*

10. Is it the intention of the Judicial Branch to provide judges disconnected access to electronic case files in the process described in section 3.2.A.20 by using some sort of local cache?

*Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 136.*

19. Do the requirements in sections 3.3.C.2 and section 3.3.C.3 apply to internal communication between EDMS software components or to integration between the EDMS and other systems?

*Response: Internal communications.*

24. The sentence in section 3.4.D.1 is unclear, can more detail be provided?

*Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 131.*

46. Who is the incumbent contractor for these services? Or is this a new requirement?

*Response: There is no current incumbent contractor for EDMS services.*

47. What is the estimated value of this contract? Or how much was budgeted for this project?

*Response: Please refer to the Vendor Conference minutes.*

48. What will be the duration of the contract?

*Response: The initial term of the contract is for 3 years with up to 3 one year add-ons at the option of the Judicial Branch. Please reference the Sample Service Contract, Section 1.2 concerning the add-ons.*

55. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – A - Will there be a single or multiple scanning infrastructure setup at a court?

*Response: That will depend on the size and layout of the court facility with a minimum of 2 in each court.*

56. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – A – Do you intend to scan documents from the past? If yes please share the document volume.

*Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 202.*

62. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – B – Will there be any ceiling limit regarding the size of document to be uploaded?

*Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 186.*

63. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – B – Do you have infrastructure setup for payment gateway? If not then will you tie-up with a bank for providing the payment gateway services?

*Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 95.*

82. Which emailing solution is available within SOIJB IT setup?

*Response: The Judicial Branch uses Lotus Notes email.*

83. Is there any requirement around migration of content from an existing system to EDMS?

*Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 202.*

86. (3.2.A.10) – Please clarify “records management rules”.

*Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 157.*

87. (3.2.A.10) – Does the state have a defined business continuity plan that a vendor solution is expected to support? If yes, please provide details.

*Response: The Judicial Branch does have a defined business continuity plan, but the vendor is not expected to support.*

88. (3.2.A.10) – Referring to “vendor **must** provide a SAN solution in our redundant data centers”, is it the intent of the stat for the vendor to provide SAN hardware or to provide a solution that will run on existing SAN hardware in the data center?

*Response: The vendor is to provide a SAN hardware solution.*

90. (3.2.A.13) – Regarding integration of documents with existing Electronic Public Access, is it desired that Electronic Public Access will be able to display documents from the EDMS, or that documents from the EDMS can be published to the Electronic Public Access repository for later retrieval?

*Response: EPA should display the documents from the EDMS.*

91. (3.2.A.14) – What is that general architecture of the current web portal used by citizens for court dockets and financial records? What is the security scheme for this function and how are roles setup?

*Response: Citizens access public records via the web through a WebSphere based application which sends queries for Judicial data from the Host site to Judicial's RAC database structures. Citizens can self register for additional for access through the EPA application which runs on the Executive Branch ITE's Enterprise A&A (authentication program), which is backed by ldap servers. (Roles are handled by custom ldap attributes which get passed to the custom java code on the app servers.)*

92. (3.2.A.15/16) – Does “Electronic Filing Solution” in these requirements mean general document storage and retrieval, or do system management and administration functions need to run on the specified platforms/browsers?

*Response: These functions would need to be included.*

93. (3.2.A.20) – Does “push” mean physical location of documents on the judge’s PC, or can links that connect to physical documents on the server be used?

*Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 136.*

95. (3.2.B.7) – Is a payment processing function currently deployed?

*Response: Payment on certain case types is accepted via the Public Access portal using a payment engine provided by the Executive Branch Information Technology Enterprise (ITE) our EPA hosting provider.*

97. (3.3.D.3) – Are other EDMS systems implemented at the State?

*Response: No.*

98. (3.3.C.2) – Should the proposed technology utilize or support GJXDM or NIEM for electronic data exchange?

*Response: Yes. Please refer to the RFP section 3.2.B.5.*

127. Will the State agree to include a Limitation of Liability provision in any contract awarded as a result of this RFP that (i) reasonably limits the Vendor's liability for actual direct damages to an amount relative to payments under the contract, and (ii) disclaims liability for indirect and consequential damages, with limits subject to appropriate exclusions, such as certain indemnification obligations or breach of confidentiality?

*Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 190.*

128. Page 4, 1.1 – Please provide information regarding how much workflow will occur in the EDMS solution versus workflow processing already present in ICIS?

*Response: Current "application flow" in the ICIS system is configurable by individual user and allows users to set flow from one view to the next based on their business process. EDMS workflow will be substantial as this project is more than just e-filing. It is the workflow of the documents through the system*

129. Page 30, 3.3, B – please confirm that the scope of the initial project is the three court pilot project?

*Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 39.*

131. Page 37, D.1 – please clarify regarding what word is missing in “separate cost of implementing each <blank> of the EDMS.”?

*Response: The missing word is "phase".*

149. For the States EDM Business Plan, the State hired a consultant to review and redesign the technology plan for this RFP? What is the name of the company that was hired and are they allowed to bid on this RFP?

*Response: Please reference the answer to Question # 145.*

150. In the States EDM business plan they have projected estimates for budget purposes for a project of this size? Are those funds approved and readily available?

*Response: Please reference the Vendor Conference minutes.*

151. What ECM software solution(s) has the State already seen or viewed and what do they like about each?

*Response: Some conference demonstrations, demonstrations to committees in the past couple years, but no specific likes/dislikes about them.*

152. How much of the RFP was constructed by the States Information Services versus the departments' actual needs?

*Response: The RFP was drafted in house.*

153. Who is the State's final decision maker for the vendor of choice?

*Response: State Court Administrator David K. Boyd after receiving the Judicial Technology Committee's recommendation.*

157.3.2A # 10 It was stated records management rules, are you referring to a records retention schedule that is connected to a file plan? If so, does the state have an existing schedule and plan already in place?

*Response: Yes there must be a method for archiving as well as the ability to purge. There must be a "notification" feature with configurable options based on Case Type, Disposition Date, Disposition Type, and Document Type. Records management is defined by the Clerks Manual and Iowa Code.*

159. 3.2A #15 – What solutions has the state seen that works in both on a Windows and Mac operating system?

*Response: No specific solutions have been observed.*

160. 3.2B #8 - The RFP states electronic signatures for filing, Will electronic signature pads be acceptable as well?

*Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 138.*

161. 3.2B #19 – What types of electronic files are the States steno notes produced in?

*Response: The steno notes are produced in multiple electronic formats depending on the software used by the Court Reporter.*

173.3.2.B.5 - GJXDM and NIEM are relatively new standards. Do you have a specific list of data exchanges into EDMS that you would like to implement? If not, are you looking for the respondent to suggest several, discuss the potential issues involved with implementing these specific exchanges, and price the proposal based upon these documented assumptions? Is there a requirement or desire to implement these exchanges through the new CJIS hub?

*Response: There is a set of exchanges that will be implemented via the CJIS bus over the life of the CJIS project. Nine initial exchanges will be implemented over*

*the next 4-5 months. Those nine initial exchanges are; Victim/Offender Information, ECCO, (PSI) Pre Sentence Investigation, Sentence Order, Complaint, Arrest Warrant, OWI (Operating While Intoxicated), Protective Order & Trial Information.*

179.3.2.B.23 - Does the phrase “The Plan” refer to “Electronic Document Management System – Judicial Branch, October 2005?”

*Response: Yes.*

180.3.3.A.2 - Can you clarify “The State of Iowa must own the code for the routing of this deliverable.”? Would this exclude solutions using commercial off the shelf product?

*Response: Refer to the response to Question # 141.*

184. 3.3.F.1(a) - What parts of the existing ICIS system topology would be deemed to conform to this statement?

*Response: Those parts of the ICIS topology that cross over public network segments outside the control of law enforcement of the state meeting this requirement.*

185. 3.4.B - This appears to imply the State is open to proposals for only a portion of the overall solution. How will the evaluation process reconcile this? Is the State contemplating multiple awards?

*Response: Refer to the RFP section 1.2.B. The Judicial Branch is looking for a "vendor or vendors" . . .*

186.3.3.G.3 - What are the criteria for “large data sets?”

*Response: Proposed rules do not contain any limitation on document size and the Judicial Branch should be able to accept any size document. However, the capability to stop an offending filer at any time should be included and this should*

*also address an offending filer in an automated fashion - for example someone attempting to post hundreds of documents when Judicial offices are not staffed.*

187.3.4.C.4-6 - Should the work plan be separated to conform with the categories mentioned on page 34, in section 3.4 item B?

*Response: Yes.*

188.3.4.D.1 - What does the word “each” refer to? Is it a project phase, element, county, instance or service category as described on page 34, section 3.4 item B?

*Response: Each phase.*

197. Does the Judicial Branch require a redundant, fail-over system for high availability?

*Response: Please refer to the response to Question # 135.*

201. Does the Judicial Branch require that Court fees be transferred to a Judicial Branch account upon acceptance of the filing?

*Response: Yes. Please refer to RFP section 3.2.B.7.*

202. Does the Judicial Branch require configurable fees and sub fees, including future effective dates?

*Response: Yes, configurable & future effective dates/times. This will be an integration point with the CMS.*

