

# State Bar Court Case Management System

## Request for Proposal: Questions & Responses

August 14, 2012

1. **The RFP has many document management requirements. For example, PF-041 asks about the time to retrieve documents and PF-022 asks about the scalability of it.**

**Should we respond that it depends on the court's DMS and its integration to the CMS or propose a DMS and indicate the answer related to that DMS?#5 of your minimum mandatory requirements on page 5. We are a COTS case management solution that offers the product as a web/browser client (thin client) but we are not a public facing web page and we would be hosted within your network/environment. We believe this requirement is not applicable to our solution but would like confirmation from you that since our software is hosted by the Bar this would not apply, do you agree?**

*The State Bar of California intends to employ Microsoft SharePoint for electronic content management on an enterprise level. The State Bar Court CMS solution should support the management of court case documents by this enterprise resource. The solution provider's proposal should consider this in response to the requirements of the RFP.*

*Please refer to the updated ATTACHMENTS E and F and for revised specific requirements.*

2. **Is the State Bar seeking a NEW Case Management System or an IMPROVED System? (RFP Reference: Page 1)**

*We are seeking a new, commercially available Off-The-Shelf (COTS) Case Management System to replace an existing in-house, custom developed application.*

3. **Long term Product Life Cycle – is this pertaining to strictly maintenance and/or something else? If not maintenance, please describe in detail.**

*This requirement is to ensure that your product has a history and a future. We require that your product be in production at least 1 year prior to the current year and that there is a roadmap for your product spanning at least 4 years beyond the current release. Your response should include a product development plan that addresses this requirement.*

4. **Submission Requirements -- #4 and #5 seem like the same question, just different wording. Can one question be eliminated? If not, can the same answer be used for both questions? Would that be sufficient?**

*The requirements are not the same. Requirement #4 requires that on an ongoing basis, your organization either directly supports your product or support is provided externally. Requirement #5 requires that you provide documentation that you are either the manufacturer of the product or that you are a certified reseller of the product.*

5. **What certificates specifically are we required to show?**

*Requirement #5 requires that your organization is either the manufacturer of the product or that you provide documentation that you are manufacturer-certified reseller of the offered product.*

6. **What is your current Budget for this project?**

*We expect that you propose a solution that offers the best value to the bar. The bar does not provide this information as a part of an RFP.*

7. **Do you currently have funding for this project?**

*Yes.*

8. **What is the estimated deployment date for this project?**

*The State Bar Court is interested in a rapid but prudent implementation. We expect the solution provider to propose a project schedule that will allow for a highly successful go-live as soon as possible.*

9. **Given that there are several Court case management system Request For Proposals (RFP)s already published that are due within the same time frame as this RFP, would the CALBAR consider extending the deadline by two weeks (September 12, 2012)?**

*Yes. In light of the revised attachments and a desire to receive the best possible responses from candidate vendors, we have extended the due date for the proposals until September 12, 2012 at 4:00pm PDT.*