

EDMS RFP No. JB050508
Questions submitted by vendors

- 1. How does this EDMS RFP relate, if at all, to the earlier EDMS RFP No. JB041707?**

Response: No contract was signed for the RFP #JB041707. RFP #JB050508 is a new separate procurement.

- 2. Did the court award the earlier EDMS RFP No. JB041707 to a vendor? If so, did the vendor begin or complete any of the services requested under EDMS RFP No. JB041707?**

Response: No contract was signed for the RFP #JB041707. RFP #JB050508 is a new separate procurement.

- 3. Does the court have an approved budget for this RFP? What is the current budget allocation?**

Response: Please refer to the Vendor Conference Minutes posted on the Judicial RFP website.

- 4. Please describe an architectural overview of the current case management system (ICIS) for which integration is required. What integration capabilities does the CMS currently have? Who will update the CMS code if necessary to complete the EDMS/EFILE integration?**

Response: ICIS is built on Oracle's Real Application Cluster technology using a single Oracle instance with 100 individual schemas (one schema for each courthouse) running on (4) clustered servers and a SAN. The Web Interface to the databases is built to use Oracle's Web Application Server and is Java based. Integration capabilities will be managed in the project to make the CMS application work appropriately with the EDMS solution. The CMS code updates will be managed and coordinated as a part of the project in accordance with RFP Section 3.4.B(2).

- 5. Is the court open to accepting a SAAS remote hosted solution for the EDMS or EFILE modules whereby the vendor will contract with each filer independently, or does the court require a locally hosted and court managed solution? (section 3.2(A)(10) p.29) If the requirement is to provide a locally hosted solution, should bidders include the cost of infrastructure hardware (servers & network) and software foundation (operating systems, database, and web server) necessary to support the EDMS/EFILE software?**

Response: The solution must be court hosted and locally managed. Users access will require registration with the Judicial Branch, not by registration or contract with a vendor. Bidders should include specifications and cost proposals for hardware and software, for a total solution which will be owned and managed by the judicial branch.

- 6. How many Judicial staff users will be accessing the system?**

Response: Approximately 2200 - 2400.

- 7. Will a vendor be disqualified if it has not previously implemented a project which meets all requirements included in the courts EDMS RFP? (section 3.1(A) p.28)**

Response: No.

- 8. Can it be expected that legal firms may be required to make small adjustments to their current workflows in the interest of a more efficient system? (section 3.2(A.4) p.28)**

Response: Mandatory implementation of EDMS for the Judicial Branch as well as lawyers will cause some workflow adjustment. If vendors determine that system and user efficiencies can be enhanced by some minor adjustments those suggestions should be included.

- 9. Are the archive and purge capabilities required to be via database administration, or via a custom tool? Scheduled or only on demand? (section 3.2(A.11) p.29)**

Response: 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. Preferably this functionality is built into the document management tool. The system should allow for scheduled or on-demand archiving and/or purging.

- 10. Can the court define the existing registration strategies which would be leveraged by the vendor to provide for user registration? (section 3.2(B)(1) p. 31)**

Response: Citizens can self register for public access through the EPA (Electronic Public Access) application which runs on the Executive Branch ITE's Enterprise A&A (authentication & authorization program), which is backed by ldap servers. (Roles are handled by custom ldap attributes which get passed to the custom java code on the application servers.)

- 11. Will the court allow the vendor to convert a document from the format it was originally created in to a PDF upon filing? (section 3.2(B)(11) p.32)**

Response: Certain documents that enter the court system are not final until accepted by the judge (e.g. Trial Information, Proposed Order). These documents would not be required to be in pdf, but could come in a Word readable format and when accepted by the judge would be converted to pdf. The documents that this would apply to will be specifically identified by the Judicial Branch.

- 12. 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.

- 13. Does the court expect to purchase scanners or other hardware to support paper imaging as part of this RFP? (section 3.2(A)(7) p.29)**

Response: Yes scanners will be required for court staff and public kiosks to scan documents that may be hand carried to the court or are not electronically generated documents. The implementation is not for back file scanning, except for cases that are approved for conversion to electronic case in accordance with the proposed rules for electronic filing.

- 14. RFP states that Contractor must push assigned cases to the Judges PC, this implies something more than a pure web based application. Does the court require / allow a PC client installed application (i.e. not a web browser)? (section 3.2(A)(22) p.30)**

Response: The Judicial Branch is looking for suggested solutions from the vendors for this capability.

- 15. What level of support is required for self-represented (pro se) litigants? (p.32)**

Response: The level of support will be the same as it is for attorneys and other court personnel.

- 16. What are the product requirements necessary to allow a clerk to certify electronic records? (section 3.2(A)(18) p.32)**

Response: Proposed Rule 16.408 indicates the clerk may certify documents by digital signature and seal. Also see Rule 16.316(2) re Clerk's certification of original notice.

- 17. What is the anticipated timeframe a vendor would have to provide the Clerk of Court subpoenas in paper form? Would the paper form subpoenas have to be delivered by vendor? (section 3.2(A)(19) p.32)**

Response: The ability for the clerk to create an electronic subpoena or create it on paper must be available on demand. Delivery in paper form must be available immediately through printing devices in each clerk of court office.

- 18. Does the Judiciary currently have written documentation outlining the business rules for each business process? Can those be shared as part of the RFP process? (p.33)**

Response: The judicial branch has worked with various "workflow" groups and has defined the "flow" of the various documents used in the courts. The business rules are still being worked on as this process is moving forward. The current workflow document (still a work in process) is posted on the Judicial Branch website under RFP.

- 19. Will the business processes need to be configurable by the court staff or once established in the system, would they rarely need to change? (p.33)**

Response: The judicial branch intends to provide a "default" set of business processes (work flow) to each county at implementation. Based on the county's work volume, number of staff or courthouse layout these processes may need to change. The ability to change these business processes may need to be granted to certain "power" users in some counties.

- 20. May the vendor charge non-court users a transactional fee for filing, service, and electronic access to court records?**

Response: No. The vendor may not charge any fees to users.

- 21. Will the vendor be permitted to charge fees during the three (3) 90 day Pilot projects? (section 3.3(B)(1)(b)&(c) p.34)**

Response: No. The vendor may not charge any fees to users.

- 22. Electronic Service: Typically, electronic service documents are delivered to recipients that are specified by the filer. The rules seem to describe an automatic notification feature. Is the court open to considering workflow alternatives that allow the filer to affirmatively designate service recipients?**

Response: Certain recipients should be automatically notified per the business rules, but having the capability of allowing a filer to designate additional recipients of particular documents may be appropriate in some circumstances. Reference proposed Rule 16.317 and 16.320.

- 23. Can the court provide the number of filings and number of documents filed per case type (civil, criminal, family, etc.) for 2006 and 2007?**

Response: Please reference the Clerk's Stats for EDMS document on the Judicial Branch website under Administration/Information Technology.

- 24. How is this RFP related to the RFP that went out last year # JB-041707? Was the contract with Datamaxx Group cancelled, or is this a completely separate procurement?**

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #1.

- 25. Page 28, Section 3.2, subsection A, question 1 - Please describe in detail the integration points that are needed with the existing case management system at the trial and appellate courts. Are there specific API's for each system? If so, please provide.**

Response: The Judicial Branch continues to define 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. The same answer applies to the Appellate Case Processing System. Currently there are not specific API's for each - those will be defined with the selected vendor. Also reference the response to Question #18.

- 26. Page 28, Section 3.2, subsection A, question 3 and Page 42, Section 3.4, subsection D, question 4 – Please provide a current bill of materials or list of government furnished hardware and software that reflects the current Iowa Courts technology environment.**

Response: Please review the response to Question #4.

- 27. Page 30, Section 3.2, subsection A, question 15 - Please describe in detail the integration points with the Courts EPA software?**

Response: The integration points may depend on the solution provided by the selected vendor; however, an example would be the ability of a registered filer to "see" the documents in their case that are associated with a specific event.

- 28. During what time period(s) can the EDMS system be taken off-line for maintenance and upgrades?**

Response: This will be determined as the system is developed and piloted.

29. Page 31, Section 3.2, subsection B, question 1 - Please describe the “existing registration strategies”

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #10.

30. Page 32, Section 3.2, subsection B, question 16 - When a document or part of a document is ‘sealed’, how is access to the document restricted? Is it hidden (redacted)? Visible but not updatable? Please explain.

Response: Security levels will dictate the ability of certain individuals to view certain documents or parts of documents. Once filed, the document must remain as is in the system, but all or a portion of the document may be "sealed" from access by certain users. Thus, multiple copies of a sealed document may be in the system, with access to certain versions allowed to specified users or filers. See Proposed Rules for Electronic Filing sections 16.405 for sealing of documents and 16.603 for redactions as they apply to sealed documents.

31. Page 33, Section 3.2, subsection B, question 24 - What plan is ‘The Plan’ that is referenced?

Response: The Plan referred to is the EDMS Business Plan on the courts web site under Administration, then Information Technology.

32. Page 33, Section 3.3, subsection A, question 1 - How many court processes exist? Please provide a listing of the processes and the detailed work steps.

Response: Please refer to the responses to Questions #18 & #25.

33. Page 37, Section 3.4, subsection B - Based on the requirement in this section, the state offers the opportunity for a contractor to bid on one or more options. Does the state intend to make 4 separate awards? Who will manage multiple contractors? How would coordination be accomplished?

Response: The optimal solution would be a solution provided by one vendor or a prime contractor with sub-vendors as necessary; however, in the event that the best solution is a combination the judicial branch would manage the vendors and coordination through the judicial branch project manager.

34. What 3rd party Records Management tool is used for the Opinions Research portion of the ICIS application?

Response: There is no records management tool used for opinions research within the case management system.

35. In the ICIS Functional Description, Section 8- Interfaces is blank. Please provide the specific integration interfaces available with ICIS.

Response: Current interfaces with ICIS include (this is not all inclusive) Department of Transportation, Department of Public Safety, Department of Revenue & Finance, Department of Health, Department of Human Services, Department of Corrections, Department of Human Rights, & the Secretary of State as well as other government agencies.

- 36. Page 33, Section 3.3, subsection A, question 1 – Based on the requirement for workflow and that the business rules are not finalized, what guidance can you provide on determining the level of effort for the workflow configuration?**

Response: Please refer to the responses to Questions #18 & #25.

- 37. Page 24, Section 2.35 Toolsets – Can the Judicial Branch define what is meant by the term “Toolsets”?**

Response: Toolsets would be the software required to implement the EDMS solution; e.g. EDMS licenses; software components to manage the EDMS; software required to perform activities related to the EDMS.

- 38. Page 29, Item 10 – Can the Judicial Branch confirm that this requirement is for the vendor to propose *both* the servers as well as the Storage Area Network (SAN) for storage of electronic documents?**

Response: Yes the vendor is to propose both servers and SAN hardware solutions for storage of the electronic documents.

- 39. Page 30, Item 15 – Can the Judicial Branch confirm that the reference to “Courts EPA” in this section is for the Electronic Public Access?**

Response: Yes this refers to EPA.

- 40. Page 30, Item 23 – This requirement indicates that the vendor is to provide training to the users for the two county pilot sites and the Appellate Courts. Can the Judicial Branch provide information as to the number of users, with a breakdown of each type of user? For example, the number of lawyers, business users, judges, clerk of court staff, case schedulers, law clerks and juvenile court services personnel.**

Response: Story County pilot response: Attorneys and staff: 100 - 125 / Business users: 25 - 50 / Judges: 11 / Court Reporters: 8 / Court Attendant: 3 / Law Clerk : 1 / Clerk staff: 17 / Case schedulers: 2 / Court Admin: 2 / JCS: 6 / Law Enforcement: 12 ||| Plymouth County Pilot response: Attorneys and staff: 40 - 60 / County Attorney and staff: 6 / Clerk's staff: 12 / Court Administration: 6 / Public (small claim routine filers): 20 - 50 / Law Enforcement: 10 / DHS: 6 / JCS: 8

- 41. Page 35, Architecture and Technology Requirements, Item 3 – This section indicates that the RFP applies to the first phase of the EDMS project. This statement seems to imply that the vendor is to propose only the hardware, software and services required to meet the Pilot**

phase of the project. Dialogs which occurred during the vendor bid conference lead us to believe that the desire of the EDMS RFP is to have vendors propose the complete project to be delivered ultimately to all Iowa Judicial Branch locations. Can the Judicial Branch clarify it's intend for the RFP? Should vendors propose all hardware, software and services required for a full Judicial Branch deployment or only for the Pilot Phase of the project?

Response: Reference Section 3.3.D.3 (page 35) in your question. "the proposed solution must have the potential to be scaled in the future . . ." You heard correctly that we are looking for a complete solution, however, the Judicial Branch wants scalability so costs can be spread over time versus purchasing everything at once. Refer to the vendor conference minutes from 2007 and the reference to buying "the elephant one leg at a time:".

42. Reference the Vendor Q&A from the previous RFP, May 11, 2007, q/a 173.3.2.B.5 regarding initial exchanges. Does the Judicial Branch wish to implement the same initial exchanges as the original bid, or have the requirements changed?

Response: This is item 3.2.B.7 in the current proposal and the initial exchanges would be the same.

43. Page 115, Schedule C – Often third-party escrow agents utilize their own contracts and are unwilling to utilize alternative contract language. In the event that this becomes an issue for contract award, would the State be willing to act as the escrow agent for the EDMS project?

Response: Yes, provided the State determines that the terms of the source code escrow agreement are acceptable.

44. Page 33, Mandatory Technical Requirement, Item A.3 – Regarding functionality of access and control of documents, are there any known search parameters that will affect the performance of the system? For example, number of documents or number of systems where documents may currently reside.

Response: First question: Since the Judicial Branch does not currently have a document management system we do not know of document search parameters that may affect the system. Second question: Since the Judicial Branch documents that are currently put in case files are identified in the CMS by specific docketed codes - yes. Third question: These docketed events are classified based on an event type (e.g., order, motion, etc.) which could be classified in the information science definition as ontologies. Since these may not be all encompassing as the EDMS solution is defined there may be others that are created.

45. Does the Judicial Branch anticipate sharing information outside of the system to other agencies (other states, court entities, etc.)?

Response: Information within the CMS is currently shared with various government entities as well as the public. Sharing of EDMS information will be based on the Rules for Electronic Filing.

- 46. Page 32, Item 16 - Are there any document security classification issues (documents that require a particular clearance to view)?**

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 on sealed documents and access.

- 47. PDF has been chosen as the format for documents stored in EDMS and Adobe Acrobat is a widely available, commercial, desktop software product that the Judicial Branch and the State of Iowa already have a means of purchasing, and have purchased in the past.**

We anticipate including various editions (Reader, Standard, and Professional) of Adobe Acrobat as part of our proposal.

Given the above, and as long as we include license cost estimates in our cost proposal, is it acceptable for us to include one or more editions of Adobe Acrobat in our technical solution without Adobe Systems Incorporated being classified as a Third Party Vendor as described in Section 5.1 of the RFP and being subject to the Third Party Vendor Certificate provided in Attachment 1A?

Response: If a product or products you are proposing are an integral part of the proposed solution and the solution will not operate without them then the product or products must be included in the proposed solution. If the product or products are not required for the proposed solution to operate then they may not be required (e.g. including Microsoft Internet Explorer may not be an integral part of a proposed solution as some other web browser could be used instead of Internet Explorer, like Safari or Firefox).

- 48. Is there an expected SLA for the amount of acceptable time it takes for a new or updated document to reach a Judge's desktop? How is this related to electronic presentation as defined in the proposed rules?**

Response: The new document needs to be accessible to the Court in real-time.

- 49. What are the names and titles of the evaluation committee members? If some members are not known at this time what is the expected makeup of the committee, for example the # of judges, attorneys, clerk staff, technical staff, etc.**

Response: The RFP specifies communication with the Issuing Officer only during the RFP process; reference RFP Section 1.3.G. The Evaluation committee members are: Clay Gavin, District 1 Clerk of Court; Diane Tott, District 2 Clerk of Court; Gary Niles, District 3 Chief Juvenile Court Officer; Kent Wirth, District 4 District Court Administrator; Doug Staskal, District 5 District Court Judge; Robert A. Hutchinson, District 5 District Court Judge; Karen Teig, District 6 Court Reporter; Mark D. Cleve, District 7 District Court Judge; Michael Mullins, District 8 District Court Judge; Fred James, Attorney; David Beckman, Attorney. The evaluation committee invites selected court personnel to the vendor presentations.

50. Is the requirement for OCR to be done at scan time through the scanner or done in the EDMS system after physical scanning?

Response: Current thought would be at the time the document is scanned. The Judicial Branch is however, looking to vendors for efficient solutions.

51. What is the current messaging/e-mail system for the judicial branch?

Response: The Judicial Branch currently uses Lotus Notes Email Version 7.

52. What is the current CMS software that is being utilized by trial and appellate courts? What database platform?

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #4.

53. When providing documents to the public, is there going to be the need for a redacted copy of court documents to be maintained for privacy of sensitive information?

Response: The Judicial Branch seeks a system that is able to mask protected information automatically as well as manually. See Proposed Rules for Electronic Filing sections 16.603 & 16.604 for redaction of protected information. Also reference the response to Question #30.

54. What are the core components and database for the EPA software being utilized? Is it off the shelf software or is it custom developed by the State of Iowa?

Response: EPA is the custom solution for the Judicial Branch's public access based on IBM's WebSphere technology utilizing a java based front-end for querying the ICIS Oracle databases.

55. This potential bidder has a long history of successful contracting with the State of Iowa, operating under limitations of liability that are consistent with industry standards. Although we are fully qualified to execute this work on behalf of the Judicial Branch, we will be unable to submit a proposal because of the limit of liability included in the RFP, as well as the prohibition against taking exception to the limitation of liability. To enable this bidder to bid on this RFP, will the Judicial Branch agree to not reject proposals that propose a lower limit of liability and appropriate exclusions, and agree to negotiate those limits and exclusions with the vendor who is ultimately awarded the work?

Response: No. Please refer to Section 5.3 of the RFP. Based on your statement that you will be unable to submit a proposal, the Judicial Branch will not respond to the questions numbered 56 through 67.

56. Section 4.8 of the RFP requires Vendors to pass through manufacturer's warranties, and sections 4.7 and 12.36 of Appendix A1 contemplate a similar arrangement, yet there is a separate license agreement for third party vendors included in the RFP. Will the Judicial Branch agree that the proposed third party hardware and third party COTS vendors' standard end user license, maintenance, and/or other comparable terms will be the basis for the licensed/delivered third party products?

57. Will the Judicial Branch agree to cap liquidated damages for a particular instance to thirty days?

58. Will the Judicial Branch agree that if liquidated damages are not the sole and exclusive monetary remedy for the particular failure, that the liquidated damages paid by Vendor will be deducted from any actual damages that may be awarded?
59. Will the Judicial Branch agree that for purposes of acceptance and warranty, a materiality standard will be applied to deviations from acceptance criteria or specifications?
60. Where can bidders find the performance standards referenced in Section 4.4 of Attachment A1?
61. Will the Judicial Branch agree that certain Deliverables, depending on their complexity, may require more than ten (10) days to correct defects that prevent acceptance?
62. Will the Judicial Branch agree that Vendor should not be precluded from using any ideas or know-how created by it prior to or learned during the performance of services?
63. Will the Judicial Branch agree to include an industry standard disclaimer of all implied warranties, and all other warranties arising from course of dealing or usage of trade?
64. Will the Judicial Branch agree to protect Vendor confidential information in the same manner that Vendor is required to protect the confidential information of the Judicial Branch?
65. Under termination, will the Judicial Branch agree to pay for work in progress performed in compliance with the terms of the agreement?
66. Will the Judicial Branch agree to remove the time is of the essence provisions, and agree that both parties will comply with the timeframes set forth in the mutually agreed project plan?
67. Will the Judicial Branch consider extending the proposal due date by two weeks. Pending responses to the contract-related clarification questions we have submitted, if we are able to participate, this additional time would provide us with the time necessary to prepare a quality proposal response.
68. Section 3.2/A3 - Ref: The technology must leverage existing infrastructure and capability in the current Iowa technology environment as identified in the Judicial Branch Business Plan. Need more information regarding the current infrastructure and the technologies that's been used in IOWA

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #4.

69. Section 3.2/A5 – Ref: The technology must utilize the State's Iowa Communications Network (ICN) data circuits where allowable by statute. The vendor must review existing network for capacity for EDMS and if necessary provide recommendations to the Judicial Branch. Need more clarification on this. Should be able to evaluate the existing network.

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.

70. Section 3.2/A7 – Ref: The technology must provide for OCR capable scanning of paper documents in the Clerk of Court's office. The method will be the exception provision in the

event a document needs to be filed. Do the OCR capable scanning is required for only Clerk of Court Office. Shall be assume the OCR scanning is out of scope for the people those who are filling the documents through internet? Need to understand the existing infrastructure. Can we use Case 360 Scan manager for this?

Response: First: OCR capable scanning is required for internal court users, including public access terminals with scanning capability. Second: OCR scanning for internet e-filers is out of scope. Third: For existing infrastructure please refer to the response to Question #4. Fourth: Vendors may propose any product they believe will fulfill the requirements set forth in the RFP.

71. Section 3.2/A10 - Ref: The technology must provide for electronic storage of electronically stored court documents within our records management rules. The electronic storage of court records shall be on state owned servers. The electronic storage of court records shall be redundant with business continuity strategies in mind. The vendor must provide a SAN solution in our redundant data centers. Please provide the Storage System need to be implemented.

Response: The documents that are electronically filed with the court or that are scanned in the courthouses will need to be stored in accordance with the vendors proposed document management solution.

72. Section 3.2/A11 - Ref: The solution proposed must be scalable as retention of electronic document grows. The solution proposed must allow archiving as well as purging capability. 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 Iowa Code and Clerks Manual. With reference to above point, do IOWA expects the following to be achieved by the proposed solution? -Scalable storage medium; Capability to store and delete the documents pertaining; Notifications through email while processing a case. Do the notification has to be implemented when a case gets new documents or any documents pertaining to that case is deleted

Response: First: Scalable storage medium - Yes. Second: Capability to store and delete documents pertaining - Yes. Third: Notification through email while processing a case - No - notification of an archiving or purging action would be sent to a workflow queue for action by an appropriately assigned staff member. Forth: Do the notification has to be implemented when a case gets a new document or any documents pertaining to that case is deleted - Yes - newly filed document would flow to a work queue of an appropriately assigned staff person (not email) - and the same response applies to deletions.

73. Section 3.2/A12 - Ref: The technology must provide for acknowledgement of electronically received documents with an e-mail to the lawyer or citizen of receipt of the document. The technology must leverage the existing messaging/e-mail system of the Judicial Branch. What kind of messaging (IBM OR Microsoft) and email systems available in IOWA? Whether the request has to be sent from the proposed system or the Proposed system will retrieve the input from IOWA messaging service?

Response: First: Please refer to the response to Question # 51. Second: An email will be sent to the filer for various reasons during the life of a document.

74. Section 3.2/A13 - Ref: The technology must integrate with the existing case management system at the trial and appellate courts. Costs to integrate with the Courts CMS software

should be included. What the base technology that's been used in CMS system? Is there any specific consideration or technology that the proposed system needs to handle to integrate with CMS system? Please provide information regarding the current mode of communication Does CMS Software has the capability to expose web service?

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #4.

- 75. Section 3.2/A14 - Ref: The solution must incorporate providing the documents on the existing Electronic Public Access in accordance with existing law and Court Rules. Do we need to search the EPS system for documents based on some limited fields from the proposed system? Do we need to display the retrieved documents from EPA system in the proposed solution? Does existing technology have the capability of exposing web service?**

Response: First: The current system does not contain any electronic documents. Second: No. EPA will be modified to display documents from the proposed EDMS system. Third: Reference the response to Question #4.

- 76. Section 3.2/A15 - Ref: Costs to integrate with the Courts EPA software should be included. What the base technology that's been used in CMS system? Is there any specific consideration or technology that the proposed system needs to handle to integrate with CMS system?**

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #4.

- 77. Section 3.2/A15 - Ref: The technology must integrate with the existing citizen access to court dockets and financial records. The proposal must include adding documents for access through this web portal. This access must be based on the registration role with the case and based on security access. Does this context mean that the proposed solution should integrate with IOWA's existing citizen access system? Does the citizen access system have to be integrated with the proposed application for authentication purpose? What the base technology that's been used in CMS system? Is there any specific consideration or technology that the proposed system needs to handle to integrate with CMS system? Does the user registration have any reference with this citizen access system?**

Response: First: Yes, this access should be leveraged and may need additional security based on user role and security in a case. Second: Reference the response to Question #10. Third: Please refer to the response to Question #4. Fourth: Please refer to the response to Question #4. Fifth: Yes the Judicial Branch wants to leverage the existing registration system as much as possible.

- 78. Section 3.2/A16 - Ref: The technology must integrate with the existing citizen access to court dockets and financial records. The proposal must include adding documents for access through this web portal. This access must be based on the registration role with the case and based on security access. Need to understand the mode of integration. Can we have a web services call for this?**

Response: The Judicial Branch is looking to the vendors for suggestions and proposed models.

- 79. Section 3.2/A17 - Ref: The Electronic Filing solution must work with commonly used operating system I.E., Windows and Mac. Case 360 doesn't support Mac. However do we need application to be deployed in Mac environment?**

Response: The solution must work with commonly used operating system I.E., Windows and Mac.

80. Section 3.2/A22 - Ref: The EDMS contractor must provide for the pushing of assigned court case(s) to the judge's PC device using the network. The developed scripts must be able to detect when new filings assigned to a judge are available and push them to the judge's device. The developed script must be able to detect when an opinion is ready for filing and push the opinion to the case file and docket the event. Do the judges access the proposed system as a thick client (VB or VB. NET application) or thin client (Web browser)? Need to understand the existing mode of assigning cases. If there is no existing system, what will be the browser for judge's PC?

Response: Not all judges currently access the CMS. For those that do it is a Web interface. Also please refer to the response to Question #14.

81. Section 3.2/B7 - Ref: The proposal must provide for electronic data provided by agencies in state and local government who provide data for filing in a Global Justice XML Data Model (GJXDM) or National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) format. An example of this would be the electronic citation (electronic traffic tickets). This data interchange must be part of the electronic filing proposal. Need clarification on the above mentioned Data model and information exchange model.

Response: For information on the GJXDM / NIEM data models refer the National Center for State Courts website at "<http://www.ncsconline.org/>" and "<http://www.niem.gov/>".

82. Section 3.2/B9 - Ref: The proposal must provide for a method of payment for filing. The methods must include credit cards and electronic check. Do the IOWA state have any electronic gateway system that can be integrated with the proposed application.

Response: Yes. The Judicial Branch EPA system has an online payment model and payment engine hosted by the Executive Branch ITE.

83. Section 3.2/B14 - Ref: The proposal must provide for a method of posting notice to electronic filers if the web access is unavailable. Does it mean that the proposed system should have the capability to notify the users before the system is down?

Response: Yes the proposed system must have the capability to notify users of maintenance windows or unexpected downtime.

84. Section 3.3/A1 - Ref: The proposed workflow software must provide the functionality of workflow in accordance with the business rules of each court process. The Judicial Branch will provide the business rules for each business process. How many processes can be expected? What will be its complexity level?

Response: Please refer to the response to Questions #18 & #25.

85. Section 3.3/A4 - Ref: The proposed technology must provide for secure access to transactions over the internet. "secure access to transaction" -Is this context referring payment transactions?

Response: This is referring to online access to case files and information.

86. Section 3.3/E2 - Ref: The proposed solution must support access and control for Information exchange. In this context – need more information on "information exchange."

Response: The exchange of information between a filer or filers and the system.

87. Section 3.3/F1e - Ref: The proposed solution must require a minimum of 128-bit encryption with NIST, CSL certification of the cryptographic module to ensure it meets FIPS Publication 140-2 for "Security Requirements for Cryptographic Modules." Systems that transmit data over radio frequencies to a network with access to EDMS data must also be subject to this encryption requirement. Need to understand the existing encryption process. Need to understand the existing encryption process.

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

88. Section 3.3/F1c - Ref: The proposed solution must conform to Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) Internet Protocol Security (IPSEC) Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP) protocol as specified in RFC 2406. The solution must be capable of utilizing cryptographic modules that are compliant with Federal Information Processing System (FIPS). Elaborate more on this. Does EDMS should utilize the existing cryptographic models?

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

89. Section 3.3/G2 - Ref: The proposed solution must be capable of utilizing "Data Transfer Facilities". Need more clarification, are we talking about existing data transfer facilities?

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

90. General - What is the meaning of OCR capable?

Response: Wikipedia defines OCR as "Optical character recognition, usually abbreviated to OCR, is the mechanical or electronic translation of images of handwritten, typewritten or printed text (usually captured by a scanner) into machine-editable text."

91. General - What is the meaning of Adapter Framework?

Response: Wikipedia defines an adapter as "An adapter allows classes to work together that normally could not because of incompatible interfaces by wrapping its own interface around that of an already existing class. The adapter is also responsible for handling any logic necessary to transform data into a form that is useful for the consumer". The proposed system(s) will need to be adapted to work with the Judicial Branch CMS & EPA systems.

92. General - What are the pilot sites?

Response: Please refer to the Vendor Conference Minutes.

93. General - Is Data Migration is within the scope of the proposal?

Response: No.

94. General - We understand that the prime bidder is not required to have an existing contract with the State of Iowa for submitting a response to this RFP. Please confirm.

Response: Reference EDMS RFP No. JB050508, Section 3.4.C.1(a)(viii).

95. General - We understand that the prime bidder is required "to show registration to do business with Iowa State" before an Award is made to the successful bidder.

Response: Reference EDMS RFP No. JB050508, Section 3.4.C.1(a)(viii).

96. General - Does the State from its evaluation till have any pre-defined priority to select any EDMS product in the market?

Response: No. The Judicial Branch will evaluate each proposal on it's own merits.

97. General - If the answer to # 96 is 'YES', than please list the products.

Response: The response to Question #96 is not yes.