

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

EDMS VENDOR CONFERENCE
HELD MAY 19, 2008
COMMENCING AT 2:06 P.M.

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUILDING
1111 E. COURT AVENUE
DES MOINES, IOWA

□

2

1 MR. BOYD: Okay. I guess we'll get started and my
2 apologies, being a little late. I'm back in the office for
3 the first day after a week's vacation, and the schedule's a

4 little fuller than I thought it would be.

5 My name is David Boyd, and I'm the State Court
6 Administrator, and I just want to welcome all of you here to
7 this vendor conference today. I'm not a New York Yankees
8 fan, but to use Yogi Berra as the example, I guess this is
9 like deja vu all over again. But there's another old
10 saying, I think, that's something like the third time is the
11 charm, or something like that, so I'm hoping that the third
12 time is the charm here.

13 I think that probably everybody who's in the room
14 maybe knows the fact, in essence, this is the third time
15 we've gotten to the point of being in the RFP process on
16 this project. I'm not going to dwell on the first two. One
17 was five or six or seven years ago now, and we were close to
18 moving forward when our then governor and then legislature
19 stole \$4 million from our technology fund. Since I accused
20 them of doing that face-to-face, I have no problem saying
21 that in this room, because that's literally what they did.

22 That put us on hold for a while and then a year
23 ago we put the RFP back out on the street, and we were
24 unable to successfully negotiate a contract. So that's what
25 gets us back here for the third time. And, like I say, I

□

3

1 don't want to dwell on the first two, but I do want to make
2 a couple of points that have to do with our resolve, I
3 guess, just in case anybody questions our resolve to move
4 forward on this project.

5 One thing that is common in both interludes in
6 between when we had to shut down the first time and then
7 this time when we were unable to reach a contract, one of
8 the things that's common in both instances is that we

9 continued to move forward on those things that we could move
10 forward on. I think it put us in a better position when the
11 day comes that we finally get where we want to be. We have
12 always continued to move forward.

13 I think we will describe a little bit today in
14 terms of our structure and committees and work groups that
15 we either have had in place or have in place now that
16 continued to move forward so that when we are successful and
17 have a vendor and we'll be ready to move forward. I think
18 we've used our time very wisely in each circumstance.

19 Today I think most of the session will be taken
20 care of either by Judge Mullins, who I'm going to introduce
21 in a moment, who is the current chair of our Court Judicial
22 Branch Technology Committee, or Ken Bosier, the Deputy
23 Director for IT operations for the Judicial Branch and who
24 is specifically the manager for the EDMS project. I think
25 with that, I'm going to turn it over to Judge Mullins and

□

4

1 let him take it for now.

2 Also with us today, just as a way of introduction,
3 is Grant Dugdale, who is an Assistant Attorney General and
4 advises the Judicial Branch on a number of projects,
5 including this one. So, Judge, I'll let you run with it.

6 JUDGE MULLINS: Thank you, Mr. Boyd.

7 Ladies and gentlemen, I'm Mike Mullins. I'm a
8 District Court Judge from Washington, Iowa. That's in
9 southeast Iowa, in a little rural district. I'm one of
10 those judges that travels a ten-county district. I'm real
11 excited about what EDMS can bring to me in how my work gets
12 done and how I can work more efficiently and better.

13 I'm also fascinated, have been for years, with

14 technology. One of the things that is most important about
15 this project, I think, for you to understand, and certainly
16 something that is ingrained in us, and that is that EDMS is
17 the technology solution, we believe, to a number of business
18 problems and business issues that we have. We do not
19 approach this from the standpoint of technology driving this
20 train, okay? Business and business decisions are what's
21 driving this.

22 You'll find in the RFP a list of some of the
23 business problems and issues that we've identified over the
24 years. As you look at those, I think you would probably see
25 those as not unique to Iowa. They probably would apply to

□

5

1 any court that has not gone paperless and even to some of
2 those courts who have gone paperless in some areas, but not
3 other areas. But it's real important, I think, for you to
4 recognize and acknowledge that there are specified business
5 issues and problems that we're looking to solve. You'll
6 also find a link on the website to a business plan that will
7 identify those as well. It should be about the same as in
8 the RFP.

9 The other thing that I think is real important for
10 you is to study the Rules. You've got to study the Rules,
11 because the Rules that you'll find on the website are
12 basically how we see technology ultimately solving our
13 business issues and problems. When you read the Rules,
14 you'll see how we think it ought to work. The job of the
15 vendors looks to me like is to be our bridge, is the bridge
16 between those solutions and how we think we need to solve
17 those.

18 The Rules were drafted by a committee that was

19 appointed by Mr. Boyd and the Supreme Court, and it was
20 comprised of a wide variety of stakeholders in the court
21 system, not just judges, not just Judicial Branch employees.
22 It included lawyers and other users; as I say, stakeholders
23 in the project. So everyone had input into these various
24 Rules, everything from when can we file to how is it going
25 to happen, how are we going to do groups of service, what's

6

1 going to happen. Once a document gets filed, how does it
2 start to flow through the system and those sorts of things.

3 The current status of the Rules, as I understand
4 them -- well, they were let out late last spring or early
5 last summer, you may recall. They went through a public
6 comment period. The Supreme Court has made a few changes.
7 The draft on the website is not the final approved draft,
8 but you can look at those with a great deal of confidence, I
9 think, that in principle there will be very little change.
10 We anticipate getting final approval probably sometime this
11 summer on the final. But it's real important for you to
12 look at those as to where this technology is going to take
13 you.

14 Now, from this Rules Committee, after its job was
15 done in the drafting, then Mr. Boyd appointed a Business
16 Advisory Committee whose job it is to help make the business
17 decisions that are necessary through the final planning and
18 implementation. Not just the pilot, but through the entire
19 implementation. The Business Advisory Committee is made up
20 of a core group of that Rules Committee, as well as some
21 members from the Judicial Technology Committee. That is a
22 group that is designed to be ready to respond quickly any
23 time a business decision needs to be made. So even during

24 the pilot phase, you're in the middle of pilot and at 10:00
25 some morning all of a sudden some problem develops that

7

1 wasn't anticipated. Somebody needs to decide what are we
2 going to do with this. The Business Advisory Committee, one
3 of our charges is to be ready to accept a conference call on
4 very short notice, to get in and make those decisions. So I
5 think it should be of some comfort to you folks to know that
6 you've got something like that in place.

7 A couple other committees that I want to
8 mention -- I've mentioned Rules Committee, and I've
9 mentioned Business Advisory Committee. I'm chair of the
10 Judicial Technology Committee, which provides overall policy
11 recommendations to the Supreme Court, and our involvement in
12 EDMS is, again, from the broader policy making and policy
13 decision point of view. The implementation will be more by
14 the Business Advisory Committee. But the Business Advisory
15 Committee has on it a representative number of the members
16 of Judicial Technology Committee. I'm one of the members of
17 the Business Advisory Committee as well, again, as are
18 several others.

19 The fourth committee to make you are aware of is
20 the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee is the
21 Judicial Technology Committee as a whole plus three members
22 of the Business Advisory Committee. And so those are the
23 folks who are actually the voting members, if you will, of
24 the Selection Committee. But when it comes time for
25 selection, come time for presentation, there will be a

8

1 number of other folks that will be involved. We will use a
2 number of resources, primarily other Judicial Branch

3 employees. Some of those will be highly technical folks;
4 some will be staff attorneys and other folks that we will
5 use as resources in that process.

6 But most importantly, Ken Bosier, he's the front
7 guy. Everything is going to go through Ken, and he will
8 decide in consultation, no doubt, with the chairs of these
9 other committees as to who will deal with certain issues as
10 those come up. But Ken certainly remains and is always the
11 front person contact.

12 I want to thank Karen Teig. Those of you who were
13 here last year may remember she was here last year to
14 provide court reporter services so that there is a verbatim
15 record of what's said here, both for your benefit and the
16 benefit of the public, because everything we do in this
17 process, at least at this point, is certainly available to
18 the public, and we want to be transparent in that way. One
19 of the things that is critical to making a good record,
20 whether it's in the courtroom during a court proceeding or
21 in this capacity here, is for you to identify yourself when
22 you speak and speak plainly and don't get going too fast.
23 Karen's good. She's quick, but sometimes folks get to
24 talking a little too fast. Especially since there's some
25 distance, be sure that you speak up so that she can get you

□

9

1 down and make a really good record of this.

2 I certainly want to thank all of you for coming.
3 We're excited about approaching this again. I'll echo some
4 of Mr. Boyd's sentiments. While we're excited to go through
5 this again, we're not very happy about having to go through
6 this again. This is a lot of work for this committee. But
7 we're committed to it. There was no hesitation from this

8 committee to say we're going to do this again, and we're
9 going to get it right. So we are going to work really hard
10 to get it right, and we're looking forward to good RFPs.

11 You've got questions as this process goes along.
12 I know there's a method by which you can submit those and
13 get answers to those questions, and we want to thank all of
14 you for your participation. We look forward to hearing from
15 you further as this process moves along.

16 I think that's all the things I needed to cover,
17 isn't it, Ken? I want to introduce Ken Bosier, Deputy
18 Director of IT and project manager of EDMS.

19 MR. BOSIER: Thank you, Judge.

20 Before we start, I just want to do a few
21 introductions. For those of you that don't know, Larry
22 Murphy is our Director. He's in the back of the room.
23 Larry is working on his retirement at the end of the year,
24 so I get to stand up here this time. Judge Mullins, of
25 course, is chair of the Judicial Technology Committee and

10

1 also a member of the Business Advisory Committee. Clay
2 Gavin back in the back; Clerk in Dubuque County. Clay is a
3 member of our Judicial Technology Committee as well as
4 Selection Committee. Diane Tott, Clerk in Story County;
5 again, one of the members you'll be working with as we go
6 through this, Judicial Tech and evaluation or Selection
7 Committee. Diana Swanson is a new member of our staff in
8 ICIS. Diana is a business analyst and will be helping us as
9 we go through this process as well. We also have Donna
10 Humpal. Donna is a staff attorney here at the State Court
11 Administration and Donna has been deeply involved with the
12 Rules Committee and helped us with this entire EDMS process.

13 when Judge Mullins was talking about the draft Rules that
14 are out there; you can be fairly certain to rely on those,
15 Donna was shaking her head yes. They are still in draft,
16 but they are pretty close.

17 JUDGE MULLINS: Ken, I forgot to mention that
18 Karen is also on the Judicial Tech Committee.

19 MR. BOSIER: Karen is also on Judicial Tech and is
20 recording this for us. And this will be posted on the
21 website. All of our postings go on the RFP site. The
22 history from last year is also out there. We have archived
23 it. It's kind of behind the scenes, but there is a link to
24 it if you want to get to it for any reason.

25 Grant Dugdale, of course, David already

11

1 introduced. And then Linda De Francisco is sitting outside
2 the back door where you signed in. Linda is our
3 administrative assistant and helps us with a lot of the
4 things we do with EDMS.

5 Larry touched on a lot of these points -- I'm
6 going to run through them fairly quickly -- from last year.
7 Last year we were in the process of selecting our pilot
8 sites when we went through this particular process. We
9 selected Plymouth County in northwest Iowa and Story County,
10 Diane's county, right north of Des Moines here, as well as
11 the appellate courts will be the third pilot. Those have
12 not changed. We're going to continue on with that. We're
13 not going to go out and look again. We believe we have a
14 good selection on that, kind of the sweet spot for doing
15 these pilots so that we good, fair and balanced pilot; can
16 make sure that we find the problems that we know we're going
17 to find, get them corrected and be able to move on.

18 We want to ensure as we go through this in the
19 pilot sites that we include the attorneys, the public, our
20 own staff and make sure that everyone gets involved. We
21 have been doing a lot of communications with attorneys.
22 we're working on some business work groups with them that
23 we're going to get started here shortly, and in this past
24 year we have not stopped our work in the court with working
25 with our workflow committees figuring out how we move things

12

1 electronically through the system.

2 There is a senior judge, Senior Judge Newmeister,
3 who is working with me, and we're working on the judges'
4 bench processes for both the bench and their chambers as we
5 speak to get the requirements of what they need documented.

6 Every day that goes by we accomplish a little more
7 so that when we do get to that point we're ready to go,
8 we're a lot closer to having the document that says this is
9 what we want from our perspective and taking that to the
10 vendors and moving forward. And we're continuing that
11 process.

12 Larry touched a little bit last year on how we got
13 to our philosophy through working with feasibility studies
14 with DDR in 1999, the National Center for State Courts in
15 2005, and one of the big pieces that National Center brought
16 up was it has to be a business project. It's not a
17 technology project. As Judge Mullins stated, the business
18 is driving this. When I need a decision, there's two
19 committees I'll go to, Judicial Technology and Business
20 Advisory. Those are the committees I'll reporting to
21 through the process. It won't be IT making decisions unless
22 it's maybe to add a disk drive or something like that, then

23 that would be our process.

24 we're looking for creativity in this. David has
25 funding for this to get started with the pilots and probably

13

1 to get into about 15 or 20 counties or so. Probably partway
2 through the project, maybe about two-and-a-half or three
3 years, we will have to go back to the legislature for
4 funding. That's why we plan on a successful project. They
5 will fund successful projects, and that's what we intend to
6 get to.

7 The Evaluation Committee, as the Judge touched on,
8 will go through this process again. It is a long process.
9 It's an arduous process, but they're committed to doing it
10 and making sure we do the right thing. And then the
11 Business Advisory Committee, as I mentioned.

12 David wanted to touch a little bit on one more
13 thing before we get to the Q and A. I'm going to turn it
14 back over to him and then we'll get to Q and A.

15 MR. BOYD: I just want to touch on an issue that
16 is probably like the 800 pound gorilla in the room or
17 something and that has to do with limitation on liability.
18 If you're familiar with the RFPs from last year, you'll
19 recall that at the time that we issued the RFP, there was no
20 provision for a limitation on the vendor's liability. We
21 found during vendor's conference, we later then amended the
22 RFP and we put in a five times or five X limitation on
23 liability, five X being five times the value of the contract
24 or project. That applied to the primary vendor, as well as
25 all of the subcontractors as well.

14

1 we should have noted in the current or this year's
2 RFP that we released we modified that somewhat, and we did
3 so at the very beginning before we released it. The
4 limitation on liability is set basically at 3.5 x, or
5 three-and-a-half times the value; and it doesn't apply to
6 the entire project for everyone but, rather, applies to the
7 value for a subcontractor. For example, it applies to the
8 value of their piece of the project.

9 Did I state that correctly?

10 MR. DUGDALE: Yes, you did.

11 MR. MURPHY: Yes, sir.

12 MR. BOYD: Rather than waiting for a question, I
13 just wanted to -- I think that is another example of our
14 effort to try to get ourselves to a successful contract.
15 I'm going to now turn it open to questions, and I'll give it
16 back to Ken.

17 MR. BOSIER: Thank you, David.

18 AS we go into the Q and A part of this, as Judge
19 Mullins said, if you would, when you have a question, please
20 stand up, state your name, your company, so that Karen can
21 get this all down and your question. If she doesn't get it,
22 we may ask you to repeat. I told her to make sure she prods
23 me if we don't do that. Questions open for you.

24 MR. BUBLITZ: Good afternoon. My name is Dave
25 Bublitz, and I'm with Global 360. I don't want to spend

15

1 time, too much time, looking at things that have transpired,
2 but would rather look at going forward. But you had
3 mentioned that last year you actually were in negotiations
4 with a vendor or a series of vendors, and you weren't able
5 to come to a successful resolution. Was the issue of

6 limitation of liability something that kind of put things to
7 halt last year with regards to those negotiations, or were
8 there other conditions that came into play last year that
9 would have been addressed with the revised RFP this year?

10 MR. BOSIER: I think, Dave, to your question, most
11 of those issues revolved around limitation of liability.

12 Grant?

13 MR. DUGDALE: I don't think so. Most of the
14 issues that were there, while limitation of liability at
15 some point were problems, a lot of it focused on issues
16 related to the actual drafting of some of the agreements
17 themselves. The escrow agreement played a particular role
18 that we had problems with in particularly the second
19 agreement, second round that we did. In large part there
20 was a lot of issues that focused on issues unrelated to
21 limitation of liability. We just couldn't reach agreement
22 on major key components even after we addressed the
23 limitation of liability provision issues. So it was broader
24 than just that. In particular, in the second round of
25 negotiations limitation of liability played no role

16

1 whatsoever. It was other business related issues, and the
2 agreements that you'll see attached to the RFP are designed
3 to reflect some of the changes and issues that we identified
4 during the first two series of negotiations to address some
5 of those issues up front. If you compare last year's RFP
6 with this one, I don't believe the agreements are nearly as
7 detailed as they are now. We are trying to address those
8 issues now up front so people know it. But in large part,
9 most of the driving issues were unrelated to the limitation
10 of liability provisions to do that.

11 MR. BOSIER: Next question?

12 MR. KARTHAN: Yeah, Elias Karthan with Zirous.

13 And my question is will any of the amendments from last year
14 be carried forward, or should we plan to re-ask the majority
15 of the same questions?

16 MR. BOSIER: Elias, a lot of the questions that
17 were asked last year pertained to particular paragraphs or
18 subparagraphs in the contract, and most of those would
19 remain all true. So paragraphs, some of them got renumbered
20 basically the way we moved some of the things around and
21 changed some of the wording, but for the most part, those
22 would apply and those are in the archive site right behind
23 the RFP site as well.

24 MR. KARTHAN: Okay, thank you.

25 MR. BOSIER: Okay.

□

17

1 Dave.

2 MR. BUBLITZ: Dave Bublitz, Global 360, once
3 again. I just want to clarify my understanding that the Q
4 and A from last year then can be referred to --

5 MR. BOSIER: Uh-huh.

6 MR. BUBLITZ: -- for content for this year's RFP.

7 MR. BOSIER: Right, unless if it refers to like
8 2.5(C)(1) and 2.5(C)(1) doesn't look exactly the same, then
9 you might want to ask your question, because a couple of
10 them did get renumbered. But there wasn't a lot of movement
11 in there. It's pretty close to the same.

12 Next question.

13 MR. ANDERSON: Norm Anderson with Tybera. Will
14 the Court be accepting any partial responses? Can we do
15 e-filing? Will they just accept EDMS response or just

16 e-filing response?

17 MR. BOSIER: There are allowances for that within
18 the RFP. If you read through that, it can be a whole or
19 partial.

20 MR. ANDERSON: There's integration involved with
21 our product, and then it will also need to be integrated
22 with -- there needs to be integration work done on the CMS
23 side. Does the Court -- with your database. Does the Court
24 expect the vendor to do that, or will they want the existing
25 CMS vendor to do that integration?

18

1 MR. BOSIER: I believe that's addressed in the RFP
2 as well. It will be a combination. In the RFP we do have
3 the vendor responsible for some of that, working with us to
4 do that. That's part of the reason we're laying out the
5 requirements for the workflow and so forth.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Is there any scanning integration
7 going on right now?

8 MR. BOSIER: Not currently.

9 MR. ANDERSON: Not currently. And do you expect
10 to have it?

11 MR. BOSIER: Scanning?

12 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah.

13 MR. BOSIER: That's a part of the RFP as well. If
14 you read down through the Rules, we address scanning because
15 some documents may come into the court. Maybe somebody
16 doesn't have a computer at home or something and they hand
17 it to the Clerk so it can be scanned in. So scanning is a
18 part of that.

19 MR. ANDERSON: Will the Court want to own their
20 hardware?

21 MR. BOSIER: Yes.

22 MR. ANDERSON: And how many current CMS instances
23 are there in the State of Iowa?

24 MR. BOSIER: We currently have one instance;
25 however, we have 100 schemas inside that instance and one

19

1 schema for each of the county courthouses.

2 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

3 MR. BOSIER: Next question?

4 MR. WOOD: Neil Wood with Sogeti. I know you guys
5 have mentioned that you've made some progress as far as
6 operational and policy roadblocks that came up for this and
7 focusing more on the business and not the technological
8 requirements. Can you speak a little bit about how much of
9 that is kind of solved within the committee structure versus
10 maybe some of the other issues that may come up in
11 operational or policy?

12 MR. BOSIER: Judge?

13 JUDGE MULLINS: I'm not sure I understood your
14 question.

15 MR. WOOD: In the feasibility study of 2005 they
16 identified it's more of a business problem and it's a policy
17 problem and there may be some organizational changes that
18 came about. The committees that are in place right now,
19 they are to solve those problems. The roadblock the vendor
20 comes in and implements and runs into what, essentially, is
21 a people problem and not a technology problem. Is that what
22 those are for?

23 JUDGE MULLINS: Yes. Yes. The Business Advisory
24 Committee will -- I might finish the title for that. It's
25 actually Business Advisory Committee for EDMS. That is its

1 sole purpose and function in life, all right? And it is
2 there to basically address any issue that's not a strictly
3 technology issue. If it's a personnel problem, if it's a
4 logistical problem, if it's an equipment location problem,
5 that's, again, not a technology issue, but more of a
6 management issue. All of those I would envision going to
7 the Business Advisory Committee.

8 MR. WOOD: One other question. In the pilot
9 counties that you selected, Story and, I think it was,
10 Franklin?

11 MR. BOSIER: Plymouth.

12 MR. WOOD: Plymouth, sorry. The 2005 feasibility
13 also addressed data analysis needs as far as the documents
14 that are filed daily, etc. Have those all been done for
15 those counties and subsequent pilots?

16 MR. BOSIER: We have posted some of those figures
17 from last year. They're on the website. The link is right
18 in the first paragraph or in the paragraph to that data.

19 MR. BRANT: Mike Brant, iDox Solutions. Following
20 this gentleman's question about selection of e-filing or
21 EDMS, I guess it's possible that you could have three or
22 four different vendors if you chose to select the best of
23 breed. What's your vision on how for the pilots they would
24 be managed? Would there be a lead integrator, or what's
25 your vision on that?

1 MR. BOSIER: I think probably, you know, there's,
2 let's say, an e-filing vendor under an EDMS vendor, that
3 direction would be funneled through myself with the business
4 questions going to our Advisory Committee. But I don't see

5 it necessarily as one vendor leading over the other. That
6 would be where I come in and where that integration happens.

7 Next question? Dave?

8 MR. BUBLITZ: Dave Publitz, Global 360. The RFP
9 indicated that the format that you want to be able to manage
10 the information is going to be PDF. The RFP doesn't
11 indicate, though, at what point in time is it a requirement
12 to have the information coming into the system to be in a
13 PDF format. From a vendor's perspective, there's additional
14 capabilities that can be performed on an electronic object
15 if it's in a TIF format and at a later point in time,
16 potentially at archive, convert it to a PDF format. Is it
17 possible to process the incoming documents as a TIF and then
18 when you get ready to archive them, convert them to a PDF
19 format?

20 MR. BOSIER: I believe the way this came about is
21 it is PDF at the onset. I believe we heard from some
22 vendors last year that they talked about, you know, a Trial
23 Information that may get changed before it's accepted, that
24 we may want to consider like word, but I don't think the
25 committees have made any specific final decision on that

22

1 other than most documents coming in are in PDF. PDF is the
2 chosen standard for them.

3 Any other questions? Quiet group.

4 MR. BUBLITZ: Dave Publitz, Global 360. My
5 question kind of is based on the area of training. When we
6 look at training, there's going to be systems administration
7 training, potential development training and then end user
8 training. For the RFP are we supposed to propose a training
9 recommendation just to support the RFP or something that

10 would be utilized throughout the whole state?

11 Then my following question is, potentially is the
12 State going to adopt the train the trainer program?

13 MR. BOSIER: The way the RFP is written is the
14 training for each of those pieces is included through the
15 pilots, and it's the train the trainer, as the Court will
16 gradually take that over and do the training for
17 implementation, and that's all addressed in the RFP itself.

18 Other questions? Going once.

19 MR. WOOD: Neil Wood, Sogeti, again. In terms of
20 infrastructure, there wasn't a lot in the RFP that kind of
21 struck me you would need additional hardware to support the
22 system. Is the view that there will be needed additional
23 hardware for the system, and will that have to be reflected
24 in the cost in the RFP?

25 MR. BOSIER: Yes. We see the EDMS system is

23

1 basically separate from the case management, but they do
2 work together.

3 MR. WOOD: So mostly just servers, and not like
4 the network infrastructure or anything like that.

5 MR. BOSIER: The network we have. We're talking
6 servers, recommendations on scanners, the scanning
7 capabilities.

8 Sir.

9 MR. THERURU: Manohar Theruru, Satyam
10 Technologies. How big is your IT team and court
11 technologies have mostly been working on your existing
12 obligations that are supposed to be integrated to the EDMS
13 when it's implemented?

14 MR. BOSIER: Okay. Our existing technologies and
Page 19

15 how big our IT team is and what we're working on and what
16 would have to be integrated. On our IT team right now, the
17 Judicial Branch's team is about 53 people. And we see that
18 increasing and we'll probably look to the vendors to help us
19 grow that staff and will contract for some of that as we get
20 through that.

21 The technologies we use now are currently in
22 Oracle shop. Our databases are in Oracle and our web front
23 end is an Oracle app. We have a CJIN application for the
24 judges that is built in Oracle as well. It is currently in
25 form 6.0 and will gradually move to a web enabled

24

1 application.

2 The projects in process now are user enhancements
3 to the case management system. The case management system
4 is an Iowa built and managed system. When Larry started the
5 project back in the late '80s, there weren't a lot of case
6 management systems on the shelf, so we built our own, and
7 that was built on Oracle and forms. About five years ago,
8 six years ago, we started moving the forms, the ASCII based
9 forms application, the green screen app to a web enabled
10 application; and we pretty well completed that about a
11 year-and-a-half, two years ago.

12 We have a jury package that's off the shelf. It's
13 a system from SCT, and we do a lot of enhancements and
14 upgrades as the users desire. So those are a lot of the big
15 things that we're working off of.

16 Other questions?

17 MR. BUBLITZ: Dave Bublitz, Global 360. Do you
18 have any enterprise licenses, for example, with Oracle or
19 Microsoft that the vendors can take Advantage of?

20 MR. BOSIER: We do have enterprise licenses with
21 Microsoft, and we have enterprise licenses with vendors --
22 or with Oracle. I'm sorry. We may not have the right
23 licenses, depending on what's proposed. So I would think we
24 would need to have that included in the proposal as well.
25 Other questions?

25

1 MR. BUBLITZ: Dave Bublitz. My question speaks to
2 the issue of warranty period. Is it okay if we -- you were
3 asking, I believe, for a one-year warranty period. Is it
4 acceptable for the vendors to put a charge associated with
5 that warranty period?

6 MR. BOSIER: I think that would be included in the
7 cost of the product, would it not? I mean either that or
8 it's a separate cost that's documented.

9 MR. BUBLITZ: Right.

10 MR. BOSIER: We typically pay for warranty work
11 one way or another.

12 Other questions?

13 JUDGE MULLINS: Just a moment, please.

14 (A discussion was held off the record.)

15 MR. BOSIER: I want to go back to your question on
16 single vendor. I think there's some risk to that, proposing
17 alone, because you may have the right product, you may have
18 the right approach; but if we don't have the whole package,
19 then we probably won't move forward.

20 MR. ANDERSON: I understand.

21 MR. BOSIER: We just wanted to make sure we
22 clarified that.

23 VENDOR: Can you -- I think was 3.4(B). Could you
24 just clarify that? Because I think if you're changing it,

25 that's fine. But I think the way it's written 3.4(B)

26

1 describes that as making a selection. So we need some
2 clarification on that.

3 MR. DUGDALE: Three four what?

4 MR. BOSIER: B.

5 MR. DUGDALE: Three dot four B, "...whether the
6 contractor or contractors seek an award for implementing an
7 EDMS platform, for implementing the required e-filing
8 platform, for implementing the required the required
9 integration, for implementing a suitable adapter framework,
10 or some combination of the four."

11 So the wording seems to indicate that you could do
12 one or multiples or all.

13 JUDGE MULLINS: And I think our answer is
14 technically, that is still correct; but if we don't have
15 proposals from other pieces that could match up, then we
16 can't very well let that contract. You know, again,
17 technically, yeah, if we had all those vendors out there,
18 then Ken would become the manager and pull those pieces
19 together. But we didn't want you to walk out of here not
20 understanding that there's some risk of separate if there
21 aren't other separate pieces. I hope that helps a little
22 bit.

23 MR. ANDERSON: You could choose an e-filing vendor
24 and sign a contract, but you won't implement e-filing if you
25 don't get EDMS working. So I think that's your point.

27

1 JUDGE MULLINS: Thank you.

2 MR. BOSIER: Other questions?

3 MR. BUBLITZ: Dave Bublitz, Global 360. I've got
4 two questions. One has to do with recommended hardware. A
5 lot of times the State has purchasing vehicles in place
6 where you have the ability to leverage a collective buying
7 power to reach more favorable pricing for components. Would
8 it be acceptable for responding vendors to provide you with
9 the hardware recommendation in terms of configuration, or do
10 you want the price associated with that and the associated
11 warranty periods?

12 Then my other question comes to there's various
13 systems within your infrastructure that, you know, we need
14 to integrate with. Would it be possible to get the
15 technologies associated with those different applications in
16 terms of how the State would like to see the vendors
17 integrate to those applications?

18 MR. BOSIER: Okay. Your first question first.
19 That's addressed specifically in the RFP as to hardware.
20 You know, if we think it's lower level or something, we can
21 purchase our own, but we look for a whole package. Okay?

22 The second question I'm not sure quite how to
23 answer. I mean we use Oracle Technologies, we use Java
24 based servers for the application front ends and so
25 forth, so I'm not quite sure what piece you're after.

28

1 MR. BUBLITZ: When you get to look at specific
2 applications, vendors probably have an API setup that would
3 match up with your API setup. We have web services. I mean
4 if there's preferred methods for integration, we would want
5 to leverage what your preferences would be.

6 MR. BOSIER: Sure. As we move through time, we
7 gradually want to get to a service-oriented type of

8 architecture, and I would say we would look at those APIs to
9 try and figure out how to interface to the case management
10 system so, you know, for an example, if the users within
11 the case management system they can click a button and see
12 their document. So that integration piece -- I don't know
13 how to describe that here and now, but maybe we can answer
14 that better in the Q and A on line. I think some of that
15 may have been one of the questions that was out there,
16 something close to that last year as well. Does that help?

17 MR. BUBLITZ: Yeah. Thank you.

18 MR. BOSIER: Other questions. Going once, twice.
19 Okay. Thank you for coming. And we will post the recording
20 on line as soon as Karen has it transcribed so that
21 everybody can take advantage of it. Thank you.

22 (The EDMS vendor conference concluded at
23 2:51 p.m.)

24
25