

****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 15, 2007

9. The RFP does not specifically mention digital signatures to implement section 3.2.A.18, but is this the intent? Would it be expected for filers to have software to generate signatures or would this need to occur on the EDMS server?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 138 as well as the Proposed Court Rules.

11. If the answer to #8 is yes, to what degree must the local cache be protected to prevent access to case files in the event of a lost computer or unauthorized access to the judge's computer?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 136 for the offline question. Disk encryption of laptops is out of scope for this project.

12. If the answer to #8 is yes, what are the encryption and authentication requirements for the content cached on the judge's computer?

Response: Encryption/authentication for content cached on the Judge's computer is out of scope for this project.

15. Is end-user PDF generation software to be included in the cost proposal or will this be acquired by the Judicial Branch separately?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 224.

20. We cannot find a reference to the ECF 1.2 specification mentioned in section 3.3.C.3 on the provided website. Can a direct link be provided?

Response: Information on the ECF filing specifications can be found at the National Center for State Courts website (www.ncsconline.org).

23. Section 3.4.C.4.a states that pilot rollouts are targeted for December 3, 2007. What is the proposed schedule for vendor selection, contract signing and contract start?

Response: The following are Target Dates and may be changed at the discretion of the Judicial Branch. Vendor selection target date is late July. Target date for contract signing and start is late August.

27. Pg. 26, Sect 3.2, A.5: “The Vendor must review existing network for capacity for EDMS and if necessary provide recommendations to the Judicial Branch.” - Is there documentation that provides an “in-depth” layout of the ICN network infrastructure?

Response: The current ICN network is as follows: IP based network, T1 circuits to each County Clerk of Court Office, except Judicial District Clerk of Court offices which are wireless or fiber at 4MB or 7MB. LANs within the courthouse operate on HP switches, over CAT5 or CAT6 cabling.

30. Pg. 30, Section B, 1b-c: RFP calls for 90 day pilots tests in two counties and the Appellate Court. Are these pilots to be conducted concurrently, or in a phased implementation?

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

31. Pg. 32, #10: “Vendor must provide a SAN solution in our redundant data centers.” – Does the State of Iowa Judiciary have a standardization for this type of hardware, I.E. HP, Dell, etc.?

Response: The Judicial Branch is looking to the vendors for suggested solutions. The current SANs used in the Judicial Branch are HP SANs.

37. For software pricing, how many concurrent users should be used as a basis for our proposal?

Response: Internal Court users would number 2000. External users would be unlimited.

52. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – A – Please elaborate on the existing infrastructure setup in terms of servers, software, utilization, archives, etc.

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 222.

53. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – A – Please provide the details around ICN in terms of bandwidth, layout, etc.

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 27.

64. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – B – Is there any preference related to implementation of electronic signatures? (E.g. Login credentials/Public-Private key)

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 138 and # 221.

74. Please provide inputs on the number of users based on the category, i.e. number of clerks, number of attorneys, etc.

Response: The number of Attorneys could be up to the number licensed or allowed to practice law in Iowa (8,400), Judicial Branch personnel (2000), State Government (30,000), Other personnel/external users/filers (unlimited).

84. (3.2.A.3) – Can a more detailed schematic/inventory of the current technical environment be provided? Please include specific points of intended interface with the EDMS.

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 169 & # 222.

85. (3.2.A.5) – Can additional information be provided related to existing data circuits and bandwidth in use by the Judicial Branch?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 27.

96. (3.2.B.8) – Does electronic signatures in this item mean digital electronic signatures, or signatures resulting from an electronic signature pad?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question #'s 138 & # 221.

108. Do all counties use the same docket codes?

Response: Docket event codes are standard in the Clerk's databases. However, depending on some local business practices some events are used slightly different from one county to the next, but for the most part the use is fairly standard.

109. Are the procedures and rules as well as document requirements and document ordering consistent across all counties?

Response: Generally yes with some differences generally due to staff size of a particular office.

110. 3.2 – A8 Does the court anticipate enhancing ICIS so that a user can click on a link from within the ICIS interface to retrieve the documents stored in the new document repository?

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

111. 3.2 – A12 - Do the trial courts use a single installation or are there multiple installations for the trial court CMS servers? Do the trial courts and the Appeals Courts use the same ICIS installation or are they separate installation?

Response: Question # 1 - Please refer to the answer to Question # 222. Question # 2 - No. They are separate applications, installations and databases.

112. 3.2 – A13 - Is the current Public Interface an interface to the existing CMS? Can you give us a web link to that interface so that we can see what it offers or provide us with more details of what it can do? Does the court anticipate maintaining a document repository mirror for the public to use to download documents?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 91. Please go to 'www.judicial.state.ia.us' and follow the link(s) to "Online Court Records". Question # 3 - Please refer to the answer to Question # 90.

113. 3.2 – A14 - Our experience shows that almost all CMS products need some enhancement to support the interaction with efilings. Does the court anticipate supplying the development resources to make the CMS / Financial internal table enhancements, store procedure interactions, Web Services Interfaces, and queries for the existing systems that are needed to interact with the efilings system?

Response: No. This should be a part of the proposal. Please refer to the RFP Section 3.4.B(2).

114. 3.2 – A21 - Will the court provide the facilities and workstations for training the filers? Does the court anticipate the training to take place in Des Moines or will the training for filers take place at various locations? How many training sessions does the court anticipate for the initial trial courts? Does the court anticipate the same training sessions will support the appeals process or will the appeals process be statewide?

Response: Question # 1 & # 2 - Please refer to the answer to Question # 219. Question # 3 - The number of sessions for the initial courts is unknown at this point. Question # 4 - The appeals process - moving information to the Appellate Court from a county - would be Statewide. Training the Appellate Court would be in Des Moines.

115. 3.2 – B1 - Does the court anticipate non-case participants to use the existing public interface to view docket history and documents or do they anticipate having the public use the efilings system?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 90. Public users should be able to view docket history and documents.

116. 3.2 – B5 - Our experience shows that most courts interactions with law enforcement use a trusted network for the communication of the GJXDM / NIEM data. This allows them to by-pass the e-filing security model. Some state agencies are actually filing documents to the courts and use the e-filing api when that occurs. Does the court have any current Integrated Justice program functioning to support the law enforcement communications? Does the court anticipate this project will support the foundation for their integrated justice system as well? Does the court desire to make the e-filing api support the integrated justice interface to the courts.

Response: Question # 1 - Please refer to the answer to Questions # 19, # 42, & # 173. Question # 2 - EDMS will support the foundation for CJIS. Question # 3 - That could be a line item in the proposal.

117. 3.2 – B7 - Does the current CMS for trial as well as appeals have draw down accounts where attorneys (filers) can deposit money and use that draw down account to pay for court fees as an alternative to credit cards and e-checks?

Response: No.

118. 3.2 – B14 - Where the documents filed to the court are created by the attorneys/filers it is unclear how the e-filing system can support links the filer embeds in a PDF document to interact with a database such as Thompson / West Law. We anticipate the linking behavior is dependent on the Acrobat Reader not the e-filing/EDMS system. In addition, depending on how the filer generates the PDF embedded links determines whether those links are active or not. Can the court clarify if the system needs to support some linking features other than what is supported in the Acrobat Reader or whether this requirement is really a training issue for the filers?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 175. It is the desire of the Judicial Branch to use embedded hyperlinks in PDF's appropriately.

119. 3.2 – B14 - We can understand how to manage the security on a document or case level however where the documents filed are PDF documents generated by the attorney/filer it is unclear how security can be applied on a paragraph or word level. Based on the Proposed e-filing rules May 2007 Rule 16.603 it is the filers responsibility to redact or omit information from a document. Will the court

support the assumption that the e filing/EDMS system does not have to worry about paragraph and word level security for the documents efiled by attorneys/filers?

Response: Please refer to the answers to Questions # 170, & # 176, as well as Proposed Court Rules (May 2007) Rule 16.608(2) . It is the desire of the Judicial Branch to have the capacity to protect information and to be able to restrict viewing of very discreet amounts of data.

120. 3.2 – B14 - Other than a stamp on the documents filed does the court have any other ideas about what they are expecting with certification of an electronic copy of a PDF document?

Response: If you are referring to 3.2 B17 the certification is Iowa Code section 622.46 requirement to provide certified copies of public records upon request. Refer to the Proposed Court Rule 16.316(2) (certification of original notices), 16.408 (certification of documents by the clerk).

122. 2.32 E – Does the court expect the weekly meetings to be in person or is a mix of conference and on-site attendance acceptable?

Response: A mix is acceptable, however, in person meetings are mandatory when required and deemed necessary at the discretion of the Judicial Branch.

123. 3.3 – F2 - Can the court be more specific on what they mean by credentials?

Response: Credentials are a method of identification in an electronic transaction and may be a part of the authentication process.

133. Page 38, 5.c – please define ‘exchanges’?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 173. Also reference the RFP Page 28, 3.2.B.5; An example of this would be the electronic citation (electronic traffic tickets). This data interchange must be part of the electronic filing proposal. This ‘exchange’ happens between the Judicial Branch and other governmental entities.

144. (Sec 3.3.F.1(d)) Along with the other encryption requirements enumerated in section 3.3.F.1, requirement (d) refers to “security policies and requirements of the Judicial Branch”? What are the security policies and requirements of the Judicial Branch? Is there an available document in which these policies and requirements are stipulated?

Response: Please refer to the security policies posted on the Judicial Web Site under RFP.

156. 3.2. A. #.6 Since the State has stated the system must allow for lawyers and citizens to file documents, how many Citizens would that number calculates to?

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

172. 3.2.B.4 - Is there a requirement for the EDMS to generate, store, or print, a form for the cover sheet XML data or is the requirement only that the cover sheet XML data be exported to the ICIS?

Response: Data elements are all that are required. The cover sheet will also need to provide the information which is currently provided by the cover sheet required by Iowa R. Civ. P. 1.301(2). (Refer to the Proposed Court rules lines 14-16 of page 3 of the commentary.)

183. 3.3.D.3 - Could the other agencies mentioned potentially include agencies with business needs unrelated to the courts, such as the commerce department, IWD, DOT or Human Services? Are you referring to the possibility of implementing EDMS as a shared service, extended to supporting functionality other than the Court's?

Response: Question # 1 - Yes. Question # 2 - No. They could use our contract as a licensing vehicle.

184. Is the budget for 2007 - 2011 in the October 2005 Powerpoint presentation solely for the contract or does it include State labor and other State expenses?

Response: For the EDMS contract.

211. Pg. 20, Item 2.29: Toolset – Does this requirement include all of the software for the EDMS system: imaging, workflow, scanning/capture software and for the repository management? Does the State require fixed pricing for support for the initial warranty period and subsequent four years? How is the State planning to pay for the EDMS software?

Response: Question #1 - please refer to the answer to Question # 38. Question #2 - Yes. Question # 3 - Please refer to the answer to Question # 150.

213. Pg. 26, Item 5: Utilizing ICN data circuits – Would the review exercise form a part of the project (included within the main costs) or should it be marked separately?

Response: This can be included with the proposal or as a line item within the project.

215. Pg. 26, Item 7: Scanning of paper documents – The State needs to provide additional information on the scanning requirements for the various Clerk of Court offices. What is the daily volume that these offices plan to scan? Will the State purchase the scanners if the vendor provides a recommendation to address this requirement? Does the State require the capture software for all possible deployment areas?

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

216. Pg. 26 – Item 9: Workflow – What is the State’s vision of the number of concurrent users that will need to have workflow functionality? How is the vendor to propose the effort associated with the deployment of the various workflows without an understanding of the various processes that will leverage workflow? Can the State indicate the number of workflows and the requirements of those processes?

Response: Question #1 - Please refer to the response to Question # 37. Question # 2 & # 3 - Please refer to the answer to Question # 169.

218. Pg. 26, Item 11: Email system – What email system and version is the Judicial Branch currently utilizing?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 82. Currently migrating to Version 7.

220. Pg. 28, Item 1 of Section B: User Registration – The requirement mentions the existing user registration strategies – can you provide more detail on these strategies?

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

221. Pg. 28, Item 8: Electronic Signatures – Can you please expand upon this requirement and what is intended by electronic signatures? Is this the ability to scan in a digitized version of a signature of an individual or providing some sort of “approval” step? Where would this take place/be needed – can you provide a case scenario?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 138. In addition "Electronic signature" is defined by the rules (page 11 lines 22-24). A registered filer's login name and password will serve as the filer's signature on a document. (Rule 16.306(1), 16.705(3), 16.803(3)). In some respects the systems recognition of the username and password would be the "approval" of the signature by the system. The system does envision some scanning in of signatures made nonelectronically. (See rules 16.306(2), 16.306(3), 16.306(5)(b)(1), 16.705(1), 16.803(1)). Scanners may be needed at the kiosk so filers who do not have scanning capabilities can scan the document with the nonelectronic signature into the system. Scanners may also be needed in or near the courtrooms. Particularly in juvenile or criminal cases where parties may need to sign documents that are to be immediately filed into the system (written guilty plea, acceptance of service of termination hearing date are two examples).

222. Pg. 28, Item B-4: Case Management System – Need more clarification on existing case management system.

Response: The Iowa Court Information System (ICIS) is a custom Case Management System (CMS) designed & developed on contract by Honeywell Bull in the early 1990's. Implemented between 1991 & 1997 this system is used by all 100 Clerk of Court Offices. It covers all case types including traffic and juvenile, people maintenance, financial, court scheduling, application flow, noticing, email notices, tickling, reports and various interfaces to other state agencies. Since 2003 the application has been Web-enabled and runs on Oracle's Application

Server software, which runs on top of Red Hat Linux 4. The databases reside in a single Oracle RAC instance and are replicated to a secondary instance using Oracle's Data Guard product. The application operates on Dell servers while the RAC system operates on an HP server set and SAN. All data since implementation is currently maintained online.

The Appellate Case Processing (ACP) system is currently in the process of being re-fac'd to a web-enabled system. It currently runs on an IBM AIX system in its own Oracle instance using Oracle GUI Forms for a user interface and supports approximately 30 users. All data since implementation is currently maintained online.

223. Pg. 28, Item B-5: GJXDM or NIEM – Need more information on these standards.

Response: Please refer to the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) website for additional information on GJXMD/NIEM.

224. Pg. 29, Item 9: Document Format – Please confirm – it would be the duty of the citizen to have software to convert any format to PDF prior to uploading? (Versus provided some sort of server-side conversion of other common types such as word, etc.) Should even scanned images be converted to PDF?

Response: Yes PDF capability is required for internal use, but this is not required of the external users. Refer to Proposed Court Rules 16.409. Scanned images should be converted to PDF.

225. Pg. 29, Item 11: Electronic File Stamp – Can you provide more detail on this requirement – is this the storage of date-time-stamp metadata of when filed and the fact it was received via the electronic channel, or some sort of actual markup on the digitized file?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 204. In addition the time stamp must also be visible on a printed copy of the document.

226. Pg. 29, Item 15: Document Security – Does the state request this functionality to be provided on TIFF images or PDF files? Please indicate your definition of

“seal” as it relates to the various information types? Does this requirement imply security access to certain electronic objects?

Response: PDF files. Sealing - please refer to the answer to Question # 139. Yes.

227. Pg. 30, Item 24: Hardware – Is it acceptable to the State to have a vendor propose the EDMS solution and the integration consulting services to deploy the solution while providing the State with recommended hardware configurations needed to support the solution, with the understanding that the State would purchase the hardware?

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 214, sub-Question #4.

228. Pg. 30, Item 3.3 A.1: Workflow – Can the Judicial Branch provide the business rules for each of the business processes so the vendor can better understand the requirements for the deployment of workflow?

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

230. Pg. 31, Item B.1 (g): Support Plan – Can the Judicial Branch provide us an idea as to what level of support they would be expecting from the service provider? Do they already have an IT support team looking after existing IT infrastructure and the service provider would be just required to train the existing resources, support & augment the team? Or the service provider implementing the EDMS solution would be the sole support provider for this? If so, for how long? Does it need to be a 24*7*365 support?

Response: Question # 1 – Please refer to the answer to Question # 195. Question # 2 – The Judicial Branch has internal resources to support existing applications and internal users. We will augment for support of the EDMS project with additional resources. Question #3 – Please refer to the answer to Question # 69.

231. Pg. 34, Item 3.4, A.1: Software Toolsets – Will the Judicial Branch agree to purchase software and hardware items not being proposed by the vendor if the vendor specifies what additional items are needed to support the EDMS solution? In order to determine the required infrastructure to support the EDMS solution, the vendor needs to understand the total workload that will be generated by those

who will utilize the EDMS solution. The complexity of the various workflows will greatly impact the infrastructure requirements.

Response: Question # 1 - Please refer to the RFP Section 2.29. Question # 2 - Please refer to the answer to Question # 57.

232. Pg. 26, Item 3.2 A – It is specified that solution must integrate with the existing citizen access to court dockets and financial records. More information on the system is required (like technology of the system, database used, type of integration that system supports – APIs, Web services or database)

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

233. Pg. 33, Item F, 1(e); Encryption: Need more inputs on existing encryption techniques and requirements.

Response: The system must meet at least the minimum of this specification.

234. Iowa Court EDMS Vision.pdf – Pg. 2 – It is stated that electronic filing aspect of EDMS needs integrate into the Courts case management system (ICIS). More information on the ICIS system is required.

Response: Please refer to the answer to Question # 222.