

****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 14, 2007

4. Is OCR (Optical Character Recognition) processing required for scanned documents?

Response: OCR capability is required.

7. Are we to include costs to modify EPA (mentioned in 3.2.A.13) to show electronic case files, or to simply provide an interface or API for Courts staff to use when modifying EPA?

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

13. If the answer to #8 is yes, does conflict resolution need to be part of the solution? For example if a case file was updated locally and remotely while a judge was disconnected how would that conflict be resolved?

Response: Yes. We are looking to the selected vendor to suggest solutions to questions like conflict resolution.

14. Section 3.2.B.8 refers to electronic signatures. Does this refer to the electronic signature definition in the rules for electronic filing posted on the Judicial Branch website?

Response: Yes.

16. Is the sealing of portions of document referred to in section 3.2.B.15 include providing redacted versions of a document to those users that don't have access to the original document?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 139.

17. Is access to the sealed portion of a document role based? For example can a portion of the document be sealed from some users but not others?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 139.

18. Section 3.3.A.2 states that the State of Iowa must own the code for workflow software deliverables. Would this include the workflow engine itself, or just the workflows built to run in a licensed workflow engine?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 141.

21. Section 3.3.D.4 seems to exclude the EDMS server software from the availability requirements. Is this an accurate reading?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 135 and the EDMS server software should meet the same availability requirements as well.

25. What exchanges are sections 3.4.D.5.c referring to?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 173.

26. Pg. 25, Sect 3.1, A: *“The successful contractor must have successfully implemented a solution similar to that described in The Plan.”* - It was stated at the vendor conference that there was no other State Judiciary with a system like the one you have described in this RFP. Yet, you have stated that the Contractor must have successfully implemented a solution similar to that described in The Plan. Please explain. Is this pre-requisite experience a HARD requirement?

Response: Refer to Section 3.4.C.b.(iii) and 3.4.C.b.(iv). The selected vendor should have Court experience, I.E., knows the terminology of the Court. (e.g. knows the difference between and Arrest Warrant and a Voucher warrant).

28. Pg. 29, #16: “*The proposal must include the ability to intervene or become a party to a case which is confidential.*” – Please clarify what exactly the above statement means.

Response: An example would be a trade secret case where much or most of the materials in the case would be sealed documents. The system must provide a mechanism whereby a party who wishes to intervene in the case may file the requisite intervention pleadings but could not then gain access to the sealed materials with court approval of the intervention. Other examples might be juvenile cases or divorce cases, where by filing an appearance an attorney would get access to a file otherwise confidential.

29. Pg. 30, Sect 3.3, A.1: “*The Judicial Branch will provide the business rules for each business process*”. – Are the above-mentioned rules the same as listed in the “Request for Public Comment Regarding Rules for Electronic Filing”? If not, where are these rules listed?

Response: No. These are in process and not complete at this time.

33. Does the 2005 Feasibility Study have precedence over the 1999 study, especially in the areas where they conflict in standard practices?

Response: The 2005 Study builds on the 1999 Study.

34. In Section 1.2 Purpose, you state "seeks the technology infrastructure that will allow electronic filing and electronic access...." In particular, are you looking for hardware infrastructure, hardware and software infrastructure, or a complete system including the application. The RFP seems to ask for a complete solution, yet the sentence mentioned above has caused us to seek clarification.

Response: The Judicial Branch is seeking a complete solution.

49. Chapter 1, Sec. 1.1 – C – From the details given in the RFP, it seems that the proposed EDMS system is going to act as the initial interface for various users and the output would be archived in ICIS. It will provide features to file new cases, move the documents as per the legal processes, etc. Please confirm whether our interpretation is correct.

Response: Specific Data Elements collected would be held in the ICIS databases, however, the documents filed would be housed within the EDMS system. Yes, the EDMS system would be the initial interface for various users and will provide features to file new cases, move the documents as per the legal processes, etc.

50. Chapter 1, Sec. 1.1 – C – Will there be any authentication involved for providing access to documents to general public?

Response: Refer to the Proposed Court Rules, Rule 16.305(1).a.

51. Chapter 1, Sec. 1.1 – C – Will the system be limited to the citizens of State of Iowa?

Response: No. This could be used by anyone with Internet access.

54. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – A - How many documents would be scanned on an average during the day?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 166.

57. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – A – How many business processes would be there in a system?

Response: The Judicial Branch is currently working on the workflow processes that will be required to manage the various business processes within the various roles in the Court. This is unknown at this time.

58. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – A – Please detail out integration points with ICIS.

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 169.

59. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – A – Will a judge access the case documents in an offline mode? Will there be a need of reverse synchronization where the updated documents from a judge’s PC would be transferred to a central server?

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

61. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – B – Please provide the detail around “existing registration strategies”.

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question #91.

65. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.3 – A – What will be the average number of tasks in a business process?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 57.

66. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.3 – A - What will be the number of human tasks in a business process?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 57, however, should be as few as possible.

67. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.3 – A - Please provide the details around the various roles that could be involved in a process.

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 57.

68. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.3 – B – Is any time gap planned between the pilot testing at two courts and the pilot testing at the Appellate Court?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 130.

69. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.3 – B – After the completion of EDMS implementation and its rollout, the system will be supported and maintained by Judicial Branch IT team. Please confirm if our interpretation is correct.

Response: Yes with Judicial resources.

70. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.3 – D – Shall the proposal consider the setup of a Disaster Recovery site as a core task? Or shall the proposal contain the recommendation around the setup?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 135.

71. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.3 – D – Shall the development environment also include the requisite development tools?

Response: Yes.

72. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.4 – Shall the cost proposal contain the pricing of requisite hardware and software or only recommendation has to be outlined under the technical proposal?

Response: The cost proposal should include the pricing.

73. Please detail out the number of courts present within the state.

Response: There are 100 clerk of court offices in 99 counties and the Supreme Court Clerk's Office.

75. How many users will access the system concurrently?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 37.

76. Is there any peak usage time during a day/week/month?

Response: 9AM - 10AM, 3:30PM - 5:00PM, 11:00PM - 11:59PM, Monday through Friday.

77. What is the strategy for document archiving?

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

78. How many documents will be accessed simultaneously?

Response: Unlimited.

81. Apart from ICIS, do you envision EDMS integration with any other system?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 41.

89. (3.2.A.12) – What is the existing case management system in place? What are the expected integrations between the EDMS and the case management system if more than being able to access associated documents from within the case management system?

Response: The current case management system is the Iowa Court Information System (ICIS) which is a custom CMS built for Iowa. For the integrations answer please refer to the answer to Question # 169.

94. (3.2.B.1) – What are existing registration strategies in place? How is security currently supported?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 91.

99. Will the State of Iowa Judicial Branch accept, review and answer additional vendor questions regarding the RFP after May 4, 2007?

Response: Generally no. Vendors can however, submit and the Evaluation Committee will determine whether or not the question will be answered or not.

100. Would the State of Iowa Judicial Branch be willing to extend the current June 1, 2007 bid response deadline?

Response: Please refer to the Extension posted on the Judicial Branch Website under RFP. The extension posted is for all bidders. There will not be any individual extensions.

101. Can the court define the existing registration strategies which would be leveraged by the vendor to provide for user registration?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 91.

102. Must all access to the EDMS system be through the court's website?

Response: Yes.

103. Will the court permit attorneys to choose to file through the vendor's website?

Response: No.

104. If the attorneys must file through the vendor website, may the vendor advertise on the court's website?

Response: No.

105. Will the court allow the vendor to convert a document from the format it was originally created in to a PDF upon filing?

Response: The Judicial Branch does not anticipate the selected Vendor being involved in the filing of the documents.

106. Will the court consider a phased implementation approach as opposed to implementing all case types at once? If so, would the court consider implementing general civil case types first?

Response: No. Implementation considerations will be the decision(s) of the Judicial Branch not the selected vendor.

107. Will a vendor be disqualified if it has not previously implemented a project which meets **all** requirements included in the courts EDMS RFP?

Response: Please refer to the EDMS RFP No. JB041707. Reasons for disqualification are defined within various sections of the RFP.

130. Page 30, 3.3, B – do each of the two County Courts and the Appellate Court need to be piloted in a serial fashion or can their 90 day pilots run concurrently?

Response: The pilot counties will have staggered startup dates but will run concurrently for part of the pilot. After the county pilots the Appellate Court pilot will begin.

147. (General) With what other custom software solutions providers does SIJB have a current business arrangement? In particular, who is the current provider of SIJB's Judicial Branch web site? Who are the current service providers of the systems with which the EDMS must interface, including, but not limited to, the case management system at the trial and appellate courts, court docket systems and the financial systems with which EDMS must interface?

Response: Judicial Branch Web Site is hosted by Midland Hosting. Case Management System – ICIS is an integrated CMS for the Iowa trial courts which includes all case types, the docketing, noticing, tickling, financial for those case types as well as interfaces to other state government agencies. Appellate Case Processing (ACP) is the appellate case management system and includes those functions required by the appellate courts. Both are owned and maintained by the Judicial Branch. The current Software Development contract holder is CISCO, Inc. of West Des Moines. Juror/eJuror software is licensed from ACS.

154. Will there be a list available of all vendors who have confirmed a response to this RFP?

Response: Please refer to the Vendor list posted on the Judicial Branch Website under RFP.

154. 1.1.A - What is the name of the company and/or vendor who developed and installed the States case management software (ICIS)?

Response: The Judicial Branch CMS was originally developed by Honeywell Bull who also assisted in the initial implementation of ICIS in the early 1990's.

159. 3.2A # 12 – What does the States definition as integration into the existing case management system at the trial and appellate courts?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 169.

162. 3.3G # 3. What does the state define as “large” data sheets?

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

167. 3.2.A.8 - This seems slightly at odds with item 10 on the same page. Does “within a court” mean you wish to have a repository of the given court’s documents located on the court premises or available for retrieval from a remote repository location assuming a reliable and adequate connection exists to the repository? Does the Court feel there is still any need to follow the cluster concept outlined in the 1999 feasibility study, or does the Court believe the network infrastructure is capable of supporting a centralized repository accessed remotely?

Response: For 3.2.A.8 “Within a court” means the users must be able to retrieve the documents from a repository which depending on the selected vendors’ solution may be remote or local. The vendors’ assessment of the Judicial Branch network may determine whether or not the cluster concept should be followed. The Judicial Branch is open to suggestions and are not necessarily tied to the cluster concept from the 1999 feasibility study. Each county courthouse is connected to the ICN network via a IP based T1 line. Each district court site (8) is connected to the ICN network via fiber or wireless at 4 or 7MB.

168. 3.2.A.11 - Will there be any requirements for electronically acknowledging receipt of these e-mails?

Response: The Judicial Branch needs to know if there was an error in transmission of a document/email when sending to a filer, BUT do not need notification if the transmission is successful.

195. Does the Judicial Branch require help desk and call center support? If so, what hours of operation are required?

Response: Yes. Hours of operation will be 7 AM - 11:30 PM Monday through Friday.

205. Does the Judicial Branch require both web services and ftp for document and data transport?

Response: Web services will be required and secure ftp will be required. Refer to the Proposed Electronic Filing Rules, page 7 the definition of "Download".

206. Does the Judicial Branch require document services such as virus scan, watermarking, and conversion services, as well as re-try queues for processes?

Response: Virus scans will be required. Watermarking – see answer to Question # 204. Conversion services – see answer to Question # 202 also reference Proposed Court Rules # 16.102. Re-try queues for processes – yes.

207. Does the Judicial Branch require a re-try process for document transfer, filestamping and other document services?

Response: Yes these services will be required.

208. Are there specific architectural standards that the new EDMS/eFiling must conform with? For example, is the State only interested in a J2EE-based solution, consistent with their ICIS architecture, or is it open to other architectures as long as they can be integrated in the manner described in the RFP?

Response: Please reference the response to Question #'s 143 & 146.

