

## EDMS RFP

### Questions submitted by Vendors

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.*

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

*Response: OCR capability is required.*

5. Section 3.2.A.10 refers to document storage. Can the Judicial Branch estimate document volume? Has the Judicial Branch established retention policies for electronic case files? How many years worth of storage should be included in the cost proposal?

*Response: Question # 1 - Please refer to the Clerks Stats for EDMS document posted on the Judicial Website under RFP. Question # 2 - Please refer to the answer to Question # 157. Question # 3 - Please refer to the answer to Question # 38. In addition to that we are looking to the vendors for suggestions.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

11. If the answer to #10 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 #10 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.*

13. If the answer to #10 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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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](http://www.ncsconline.org)).*

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.*

22. What "adapter framework" is section 3.4.B referring to?

*Response: Adapter framework refers to those instances where an adapter between two or more dissimilar systems is required to enable proper operations.*

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.*

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.*

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).*

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.*

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.*

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.*

32. Pg. 32, Sect G, #2: “*The proposed solution must be capable of utilizing Data Transfer Facilities*”. – Please define Data Transfer Facilities.

*Response: Data Transfer Facilities would be secure ftp sites or other such secure transfer facilities.*

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.*

35. Will you be posting the signup sheet and minutes of the bidder’s conference on the RFP site?

*Response: They will be posted on the Judicial Branch website under RFP.*

36. Section 2.29 indicates that the vendor must provide an unlimited user license for the EDMS. Can you please clarify? Are you looking for a site license for the EDMS

software? If so, what is the total number of expected users that should be considered as potential users?

**“2.29. Toolsets**

The toolsets involved with the implementation of the requirements of this RFP **must** be included as a deliverable under a perpetual, royalty-free license for use by an unlimited number of the State’s employees or its agents in performing EDMS related activities.”

*Response: As stated the license for the toolsets must be included with the requirements listed in section 2.29 for an unlimited number of State’s employees or it’s agent.*

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.*

38. Can you please provide more details on the scope of the implementation services to be priced? Section 3.3 B.1 indicates two 90 day pilots. Are the services limited to just the pilots?

*Response: The implementation costs should be staggered. Refer to RFP 3.3.D.3. Please refer also to the Vendor Conference minutes (Pg 13) on purchasing the elephant one leg at a time.*

39. What county (or counties) will be included in the pilots?

*Response: Two counties and the Clerk of the Appeals Court. At present 3 counties have applied and only 2 will be selected. Counties under consideration are Clinton, Plymouth and Story. A final selection is anticipated about June 1st, 2007.*

40. Please provide number of users and document volumes for the identified counties in the pilots.

*Response: Document volumes can be found in the Clerks Stats for EDMS document posted on the Judicial Website under RFP. For the number of users for the possible pilot counties Clinton 60 or more, Plymouth would be 50 or more, Story 80 or more.*

41. Do all counties in the state use the same case management applications? Will the EDMS need to be integrated with all of them?

*Response: Yes, case management applications are all the same in all 99 Iowa counties. These systems will all need to be integrated into the EDMS project. Some of the applications are case processing, jury program, scheduling, reports. We also have many*

*programs that interface with the state system. For examples, the Treasurer's Interface, DOC, DOT, DCI, DPS, DHS, CSRU, ECCO, Department of Revenue and Finance.*

42. How does the State of Iowa – Criminal Justice Information System Integration Plan affect this procurement?

*Response: CJIS is independent of EDMS, however, they will use the same data and do "talk" to one another.*

43. Would a hosted (ASP) solution be considered favorably?

*Response: Reference the RFP Cover Page statement, "This Request for Proposal (RFP) seeks a qualified Contractor or Contractors to implement a solution to facilitate automated, real-time, statewide information sharing between disparate State and local criminal justice information systems. The successful solution or solutions will conform to the State of Iowa Judicial Branch Business Plan adopted and the solution will use technologies, methodologies, and deliverables already procured under that plan."*

*Also refer to 3.2.A.1 which states "The successful Contractor must deliver a technical environment necessary to implement EDMS stateside. This environment must be consistent with the technologies and strategies as defined in the Judicial Branch Business Plan."*

44. Will the E-Filing software be required to run under Netscape? If so, what versions?

*Response: The proposed solution should not disallow users of the system due to the tools they use to access the internet or website. For example; Mozilla-Firefox current version plus 2 versions back; Safari - current version plus 2 versions back, etc.*

45. What are the expected filing totals per year for appeals and general jurisdiction?

*Response: Approximately 2000 appeals per year from the district to the appellate court. For general jurisdiction please refer to the Clerk Stats for EDMS document posted on the Judicial Website under RFP.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

60. Chapter 3, Sec. 3.2 – A – Please share the past data around number of cases registered/filed per year.

*Response: Please refer to the Clerks Stats for EDMS document posted on the Judicial Website under RFP.*

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

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

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.*

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.*

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.*

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).*

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.*

79. What will be the average size of the document?

*Response: Please refer to the Clerks Stats for EDMS report on the Judicial Branch website under RFP.*

80. Please give the distribution of the documents in terms of size: (a) less than 100 kb, (b) around 1 MB, (c) around 5 MB

*Response: The Judicial Branch does not have the data in the format requested in this question. However, please refer to the Clerks Stats for EDMS report posted on the Judicial Website under RFP.*

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

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

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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.*

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 efilng. 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 efilng 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 efilings security model. Some state agencies are actually filing documents to the courts and use the efilings 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 efilings 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 efilings 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 efilings/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).*

121. 3.3 – D4 - In a previous section the court refers to the desire to own and control the servers the solution is running on. We have seen some courts where the bandwidth and network availability time is not as strong as it could be. Does the court desire to use a collocation facility with high bandwidth redundant power, load balancing, and off-site backup as part of the cost proposal or optionally part of the proposal?

*Response: You have read the previous section mentioned in your question correctly.*

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.*

124. Section 2.22, Release of Claims: Is it the State's intention for this section to preclude a vendor from filing a bid protest in accordance with applicable law?

*Response: The vendor asks whether section 2.22 precludes a vendor from filing a bid protest under applicable law. The Judicial Branch does not intend that provision would preclude a bid protest under applicable law, if any.*

125. Section 2.24.A.2, Drafting the Proposal: Does the term "Amendment" as used in the context of this section apply to a scenario other than a proposal that is submitted, subsequently withdrawn and resubmitted with changes appropriately marked and initialed (all prior to the proposal due date)?

*Response: No.*

126. Section 3.4.C.2: Please provide a definition for "Project Principal".

*Response: Those persons that may work for the selected vendor on the contract.*

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.*

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.*

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".*

132. Page 38, 5.a – are the estimates requested for the State to implement each proposed phase of the integration implementation schedule or for the vendor to do so? Also, the section mentions estimates to complete each phase in the Contractor’s workplan – please confirm that the workplan will only include the first phase for the three court pilot.

*Response: Question # 1 - for the vendor to do so. Question # 2 - the work plan is for the pilots as well as entire implementation. However, this may be revised based on funding and staffing levels for both the selected vendor and the Judicial Branch.*

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.*

134. (Sec 3.2.B.1 and 3.2.B.2) In 3.2.B.1 there is some emphasis on ease of use, “...yet providing for lawyers and citizens ease of access based on roles within the environment”. In 3.2.B.2, and in several other locations in the RFP, it is made clear that electronic filers must have, at a minimum, an assigned username and password used to authenticate the user and authorization to submit. Does the State of Iowa Judicial Branch (SIJB) envision that electronic filers can register on-line without “manual approval” of an EDMS administrative user, or must an EDMS administrative user approve all electronic filers?

*Response: Both registered users and registered filers will be able to register on-line without manual approval of an EDMS administrator.*

135. (Sec 3.2.A.17 and 3.3.D.4) There is a small, but significant discrepancy between the availability specified in these two sections. In 3.2.A.17, the requirement is “... must be available on the Internet for electronic filing and acknowledgement of filings 24 hours a day and seven days a week”. In 3.3.D.4 the requirement is “... a minimum of 99.99% EDMS server’s availability”. The cost difference between true 24x7 availability and 99.99% availability is huge – the latter allowing for occasional scheduled maintenance and upgrade periods. Does SIJB really want a hardware infrastructure proposal supporting continuous availability with no scheduled downtime?

*Response: Please refer to RFP 3.3.D.4 the entire paragraph . . . EDMS server’s availability is defined as the availability of the operating system and server hardware used to support the EDMS excluding factors outside the control of the proposed solution such as facilities and/or internet service provider outages. Options and recommendations for measuring and reporting on availability as defined are encouraged. A factor to*

*consider in architecture design includes the availability of a primary data center with secondary, geographically remote site for disaster recovery and business continuity. Please also refer to the RFP 3.2.A.10. . .The electronic storage of court records shall be redundant with business continuity strategies in mind. The vendor must provide a SAN solution in redundant data centers. Additionally the Judicial Branch intends to define standard maintenance windows in order to maintain maximum availability for the users.*

136. (Sec 3.2.A.20) This requirement seems to suggest an implementation strategy whose costs may outweigh its benefits. The requirement states "... must provide for the *pushing* of assigned court cases to the judge's PC device using the network" [emphasis by question author]. In order for EDMS to literally push information to a user's PC (or any other device), there must be application software installed on the user's device. This obviates one of the major advantages of browser-based web applications – no software to install or update on user's machines. Does this requirement really require that EDMS "push" this information to a desktop, or would a design providing alternative, real-time notification (e-mail, cell phone, etc.) with request to log in to EDMS suffice?

*Response: The Judicial Branch is looking for methods that allow a Judicial Officer to login to the Judicial Network and have her/his assigned cases with electronically filed information available to them. "Push" may be an incorrect word, as the information should be there, although if the Judicial Officer wishes to "take a copy of the file(s)" along with them electronically this capability should be available as well as the capability to return to the network at a later time and have the information they may have added or changed "flow" to the appropriate file(s).*

137. (Sec 3.2.B.5) The Global Justice XML Data Model (GJXDM) is huge and covers a wide variety of types of information related to law enforcement and the courts. As part of the DOJ's GJXDM offering, there is a tool, the Schema Subset Generation Tool (SSGT) for defining valid subsets of the model. Will SIJB consider, without penalty in evaluation, a response proposing the use of SSGT to reduce the size and complexity of the XML Schema adopted for the EDMS – as long as the subset schema fully meets the information needs of the EDMS?

*Response: Yes – as long as the subset schema fully meets the information needs of the EDMS, and providing that the subset schema does not negatively impact any other SIJB GJXDM modeling efforts.*

138. (Sec 3.2.B.8) The first sentence in the Wikipedia entry for "electronic signature" is "The term **electronic signature** has several meanings." The confusion is often made with the term "digital signature". Again, quoting Wikipedia, "... use 'digital signature' to refer to a digital signature protocol using cryptographic techniques, as is sometimes applied to an 'electronic document'. Just for clarification, does the RFP's use of "electronic signature" refer to the specification as set forth in The Uniform Electronic Transactions Act of 1999, or is there another connotation for "digital signature" in the context of this RFP?

*Response: The definition for digital signature will be as set forth in the rules for electronic filing (rule 16.306). The proposed rules may be found on the Judicial Branch website.*

139. (Sec 3.2.B.15 and, possibly, the preceding point) This requirement refers to “sealing” documents and particular subsets of documents. Specifically, what is the technical requirement for such sealing? Must sealed portions of documents be electronically signed? Must they be digitally signed? Or will any design ensuring that sealed portions of documents simply cannot be edited once sealed? Once a portion of a document, or the entire document, is sealed can it be unsealed?

*Response: The procedure for the sealing of documents is set forth in the proposed rules for electronic filing (rule 16.405).*

140. (Sec 3.2.B.24) Ahh, the usual RFP responder’s dilemma. In order to provide a reasonably accurate estimate of the infrastructure required to meet the performance requirements (e.g., 99.99% availability), additional information on the expected load on the system is required.

How many documents per year will be filed with the EDMS and what is the average size of the documents in MB’s?

What is the anticipated number of users of the system, i.e., the total number of registered users?

What is the expected number of concurrent users of the system, i.e., how many concurrent logins to EDMS should be supported (with industry standard response times)?

How many concurrent transactions should EDMS be able to support? In other words, how many simultaneous requests from logged in user’s browsers should the system support (with industry standard response times)?

*Response: Question # 1 - Please refer to the document Clerk Stats for EDMS posted on the Judicial Website under RFP. We do not have the data on average size in MB. Question # 2 & # 3 - refer to the answer to Question # 37. Question # 4 - We do not know the number for concurrent transactions, but it could be unlimited.*

141. (Sec 3.3.A.2) What is meant by the last sentence in this requirement, “The State of Iowa must own the code for the *routing of this deliverable*” [emphasis by question’s authors]? Does this mean that the State of Iowa must own the business rules for the routing, or that the state of Iowa must own not only the business rules, but also the “rules engine” code and the workflow software?

*Response: The State of Iowa will own the business rules for the workflow routing (this workflow will be determined by Judicial Branch Business personnel). All licensing for the rules engine and workflow software based on standard off the shelf software or software modified to meet the needs of the State of Iowa will adhere to the appropriate licensing rules as shown in Attachment 6 of the RFP (Sample Software Licensing Agreement).*

142. (Sec 3.3.C.3) What is meant by “document integrity”? What does this mean, in a technical sense?

*Response: Document integrity is defined as the inability to modify the (an) original document. Adding notes to the document, redaction, or other appropriate activities performed on the document would not permanently alter it but would be managed otherwise.*

143. (Sec 3.3.E.1) What is meant by “compatible with existing applications and operating environments”? Does this refer to the server-side environment, the client-side environment or both? What are some example applications with which the EDMS must be compatible, and in what sense must they be compatible? What are some of the operating environments with which the EDMS must be compatible?

*Response: This refers to both the server side and client side environment. The EDMS must be compatible with the current Judicial Branch CMS which is a Web-enabled Java application that operate on Dell servers running Red Hat 4 ES Linux, and Oracle 10.1.2 Application Server software. The Court’s internal standard for Web access to the CMS is Internet Explorer 5.5 or newer. The EDMS will need to operate on IE 5.5 or newer up to and including Microsoft Internet Explorer 7, as well as PCs operating on the Windows 2000 or newer operating systems up to and including Microsoft Vista.*

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.*

145. (General) Was there a consultant or consulting company used in the preparation of this RFP? If so, area they eligible to respond to the RFP?

*Response: Work on the current RFP was handled internally by the Judicial Branch. The original EDMS study was done by DDR and that company is no longer in business.*

146. (General) Does SIJB have a preference for any particular implementing technologies, e.g., Microsoft vs. Open Source solutions?

*Response: Open source solutions are the preferred implementing technologies.*

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.*

148. The State of Iowa currently owns software (OnBase) from the company Hyland. The OnBase Software has Enterprise Document Management, Document Imaging, Workflow Management, Records Management and Application Extender Modules. What is it about the Hyland software that does NOT meet the requirements and or needs of this RFP?

*Response: This product was purchased for an imaging project within the IT offices. We are looking to the vendors to suggest solutions.*

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 the 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 verse the departments needs actual needs?

*Response: The RFP was drafted in house.*

153. Who is that states final decision maker for the vendor of choice?

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

154. Will there be a listed 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.*

155. 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.*

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.*

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.*

158. 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.*

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.*

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

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

163. 3.1.A - Does "The Plan" referred to here mean the Electronic Document Management System – Judicial Branch October 2005 which is referred to as "Electronic Document

Management System Business Plan - Business plan for EDMS” on the courts RFP web site?

*Response: Yes.*

164. 3.2.A.2 - Same question - Does “The Judicial Branch Business Plan” referred to here mean the Electronic Document Management System – Judicial Branch October 2005 which is referred to as “Electronic Document Management System Business Plan - Business plan for EDMS” on the courts RFP web site?

*Response: Yes*

165. 3.2.A.4 - What are the major business practices being utilized by legal practitioners in Iowa that must be enhanced?

*Response: Law firms are doing more and more electronically from storage to research. Additionally, general public access to nonconfidential files or documents electronically; ability of registered users to view and download nonconfidential files and documents; opportunity for registered filers (such as lawyers) to view and download any nonconfidential files and documents, and all documents in cases in which they are a party, from the convenience of their homes or offices.*

166. 3.2.A.7 - How often per day, month or year might an average clerk of court use this method? What would be the typical document page count be?

*Response: The Judicial Branch anticipates the largest volume of this to be mail from Post Conviction Relief requests, prisons/jails that are treated as filings and pro se litigant filings. The amount varies, but is substantial.*

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.*

169. 3.2.A.12 - Has the Court identified specific integration requirements with the ICIS case management system? Are there expectations that EDMS documents are available directly within ICIS screens, or that EDMS documents linked to a particular case be queried directly from the ICIS system?

*Response: The Judicial Branch is working on the workflow processes that will identify integration points with ICIS. The documents in EDMS should be 'linked' to the ICIS case so they are displayed based on the business rules defined. Those data elements that are defined on cover sheets, etc. will be stored in ICIS as they are today.*

170. 3.2.A.18 - By document integrity are you referring to maintaining the original content as submitted? For example Adobe pdf's of MS-Word documents can be created with or without the original Word document's metadata intact.

*Response: Document integrity is defined as the inability to modify the(an) original document. Adding notes to the document, redaction, or other appropriate activities performed on the document would not permanently alter it but would be managed otherwise.*

171. 3.2.A.23-26 - In the instance of possible conflict among: the RFP, EDMS Business Plan, EDMS Feasibility Study, NCSC 2005 report and Proposed rules for electronic filing, which documents take precedence over which? Or should the vendors note any inconsistencies and provide their own interpretation, rationale and explanation for the approach? This is important because you are requesting a total, all-inclusive, not to exceed cost.

*Response: The vendors note any inconsistencies and provide their own interpretation, rationale and explanation for the approach.*

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.)*

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.*

174. 3.2.B.6 - Are the multiple documents to be filed limited to one case or cause number?

*Response: No, but multiple cover sheets would be required.*

175. 3.2.B.14 - Do you desire hyperlink capabilities which would link TO a given document in the repository or do you desire hyperlink capabilities allowing linking FROM a hyperlink in a document to external documents? Your example appears to be the latter.

*Response: Reference also Page 7 of the Proposed Rules on Hyperlinks.*

176. 3.2.B.15 - For security reasons, the redaction involved with sealing a paragraph or part of a document would involve deliberately changing the document integrity as mentioned in item 18 on page 27. Is this acceptable if redaction results in the creation of a separate altered version of the document?

*Response: Sealing or protection of information within the record does not result in the elimination of the data, but restricts access to the authorized users. Reference the Proposed Court Rules.*

177. 3.2.B.19 - Will the use of paper-only stenography machines be prohibited, or do the courts desire a method for scanning paper steno files?

*Response: No final decisions have been made regarding court reporter issues. The proposed rules will not ban paper-only machines. However, we will require that vendors provide a method for storing court reporter notes electronically for those reporters who*

*have the ability to provide their notes electronically. We do not envision scanning the paper notes.*

178. 3.2.B.19 - In addition to the court reporter's notes, is there a requirement for the trial court (clerk's) record to be filed with appellate courts?

*Response: Yes*

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.*

181. 3.3.B.1 - Is the Court committed to providing sufficient resources to support acceptance testing?

*Response: Yes, although the vendor needs to provide their view of "sufficient resources" within their proposed response.*

182. 3.3.D.1 - The RFP does not say the proposed architecture must "be capable of adapting to..." it says "must flexibly adapt to..." which seems to imply the need for inherent capacities and capabilities at the time of delivery of the original system. Should the cost of providing this capability be included in the requested Total, All-Inclusive, Not to Exceed cost?

*Response: Yes this should be included and identified in the response.*

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. 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.*

189. 3.4.D.3 - Is this TCO to include all non-state costs such as hardware, software, services and support, or do you want the respondent to include State costs such as facility costs, salaries, utilities, internal communications charges from ICN and related costs? If State costs are to be included can you provide some cost estimates to include?

*Response: Should include "non-state" costs as used by the vendor. Should not include state costs as written by the vendor.*

190. Pg. 68 – Sample Contract – 11.4 - Would the State consider allowing language limiting vendor's liability by 1) capping vendor's liability for direct damages in a manner consistent with commercial practices, such as capping liability at the amount paid by the State to vendor, and 2) excluding liability for consequential and indirect damages?

*Response: Yes. See Judicial RFP website for posting.*

191. What are the expected numbers of filings by county by fiscal year from 2007 through 2011?

*Response: Please refer to the Clerk Stats for EDMS report posted on the Judicial Branch Website under RFP. Please refer to the response to Question # 38 on staggered cost and sizing.*

192. What type, size, and number of filings are required between the intermediate Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court?

*Response: The Supreme Court Clerk handles all appeals for both the Appeals and Supreme Court. Please refer to the response to Question # 45. The size of documents received at the Supreme Court Clerk's office varies widely, from 2 pages to 1000(+) pages depending on the appeal.*

193. How much has the Judicial Branch budgeted for the EDMS project?

*Response: Please refer to the Vendor Conference Minutes posted on the Judicial Website under RFP.*

194. 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.*

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.*

196. Does the Judicial Branch intend to provide any infrastructure hardware EDMS applications and if so, what components will be provided?

*Response: Reference RFP section 3.2.A.1, 3.2.A.3, 3.2.A.5, and particularly 3.2.B.24.*

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

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

198. Does the Judicial Branch require electronic service of copies before or after clerk acceptance?

*Response: Proposed Rule 16.317.1 governs the service of electronically filed documents. When a document is filed, the EDMS system will serve the filed document on all other parties who are registered users. No other service will be required except for (1) non-electronic users and (2) those who are registered but for whom electronic service fails. The filer will be provided notice by the EDMS of failure of service.*

199. Does the Judicial Branch require electronic transmission of citations to process servers?

*Response: If this is in reference to traffic citations specifically the answer is no.*

200. Does the Judicial Branch require electronic service of copies that are not electronically filed with the Court?

*Response: The system will generate a notice of filing but will not provide a copy of the document.*

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. Is there a document conversion requirement for current files, and if so, what are the formats and sizes of the files to be converted?

*Response: No.*

203. 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.*

204. Does the Judicial Branch require configurable file stamping?

*Response: A method for affixing a date and time to the filing is required and must be viewable by the user. Refer to the Proposed Court rules.*

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.*

209. Does the Judicial Branch have access to any existing software licenses within the Judiciary or within the rest of State government which can be leveraged to provide Security, Workflow, Forms, Document Repository, database or other similar technology.

*Response: The Judicial Branch licenses a variety of Oracle products (RDBMS, Application Server Software, Grid Control), and Microsoft Office Products, Lotus Notes DomDoc, and OnBase, as well as other standard off the shelf products.*

210. Are there any software products or technologies in use elsewhere at the State which the Judicial Branch has examined and definitely would or would not want to consider using in this project?

*Response: No.*

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.*

212. Pg. 21, Item 2.31: Warranty Period Required – For the required one year warranty period, will the State agree to pay for that support period? What must this warranty cover? Is this limited to the customer implementation services or is the intent to cover the EDMS software and associated hardware needed to host the proposed environment?

*Response: Question # 1 - This should be included in the response. Question # 2 - This warranty covers software and integration. Question # 3 - Hardware should be covered by the Hardware warranty.*

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.*

214. Pg. 26, Item 6: Electronic Filing Repository – What is the volume of electronic filings that must be provided for? What is the retention period that must be addressed? Will the State accept storing these filings on a magnetic storage device such as provide with a SAN? Will the State agree to procure that SAN outside the requirements of this RFP?

*Response: Question #1 – Please refer to the Clerks Stats for EDMS document posted on the Judicial Website under RFP. Question # 2 – Please refer to the answer to Question # 157. Question # 3 – The Judicial Branch will not accept storage on magnetic tape, or platter type devices. Question # 4 – Please refer to the RFP Section 2.32.D, 3.2.B.24, and 3.4.D.4.*

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.*

217. Pg. 26, Item 10: SAN – In order to size the amount of storage needed for the SAN, can the State indicate the storage requirements that need to be provided for and the number of years in which the State wants to purchase in advance for? Would it be acceptable for the vendor to indicate the amount of SAN storage needed and request that the State purchase the SAN directly?

*Response: Question # 1 – Please refer to the answer to Question # 38. Question # 2 – Please refer to the answer to Question # 214, sub-Question #3.*

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.*

219. Pg. 27, Item 21: Training – Can the State indicate the number of users and locations in which the requested training would occur? Does this training consist of end-user training

or would this also include product training for administration and development of the EDMS software?

*Response: The selected vendor is intended to be responsible for training the 3 pilot locations on process and documentation, as well as product training for administration and software development training. Training for the pilot counties is planned in those counties. The administration (if you are asking about product administration) and development training would take place in the Judicial Branch Building in Des Moines. Please refer to the RFP Section 3.3.B.1(f) also.*

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-faceted 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.*

229. Pg. 30, Item B.1: Implementation – Can the Judicial Branch provide additional workload parameters for the sizing of the EDMS deployment for the three locations?

*Response: The final Pilot counties will be selected around June 1st. Please refer to the document Clerks Stats for EDMS posted on the Judicial Branch Website under RFP for volumes.*

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.*