

The State Bar of California
Court Case Management System
Request for Proposal: Questions & Responses

Posting Date: October 26, 2012
Questions from SBC Bidders' Conference: November 15, 2012

1. Is converting the convictions application included in scope?

Yes, and for the most part the data elements in the Convictions are subset of data stored in the existing case management system.

2. Where does the data in the Accept program come from?

The data currently is populated through an interface from the State Bar's Office of the Chief Trial Counsel. We anticipate e-filing to replace this interface.

3. How many court users are in Los Angeles vs. San Francisco? The response below excludes visitor offices, multiple-use work stations, courtrooms and IT personnel.

*Los Angeles: 25
San Francisco: 18*

4. How many court rooms are there and where are they?

*Los Angeles: 5 (1 large, 4 small)
San Francisco: 2*

Note: The number of court rooms may be reduced to 4 in Los Angeles as a result of the relocation of the bar offices – scheduled for the fall of 2013.

5. What is the difference between Sections II.A – items 4 and 5 in the RFP?

Item 4 was intended to highlight your public sector references. The same references can be used for both.

6. Does Attachment B – Business History and Financial Viability need to be a separate electronic submission? Do you want the principals noted for the company or for the project?

No, please include it as part of the proposal. Principals are for the company.

7. Is the proposed CMS meant to interface with your new Integration Software?

Yes .

8. Where are the Probation, State Bar Court, and Convictions database? Are they separate conversions?

They are separate data structures requiring separate conversions. All of the data is stored on an iSeries in a DB2/400 database.

9. Are there currently imaged documents that need converting?

The State Bar Court stores at least 15,000 documents for both open and closed cases in a Kwiktag image database. We do not anticipate converting these images. We anticipate storing documents on a day one forward basis. However, we are open to proposed options for document image conversion that adds value to the State Bar Court.

10. What is the anticipated project duration? Is there a deadline?

There is no hard deadline for project completion or go-live. However, we would prefer a "rapid but prudent" implementation approach with targeted go-live in calendar year 2013.

11. Is there an expectation of how many documents will be e-filed? 100%? What is the percent of electronic files you pick up now?

We currently do not receive e-filed documents. However, we receive approximately 90% of our filings (hard copies) from the Office Chief Trial Counsel (the State Bar's prosecutorial entity) with a few of the data elements provided electronically. We anticipate that nearly 100% of these submissions will be e-filed in the future. In contrast, many of the other outside litigants (respondents) either cannot or will not file electronically. (Their capacity to address such administrative matters may be the subject of the proceeding). E-filing by these participants will be much lower.

12. Will e-filing be mandatory?

Although we would like to have 100% e-filed, some of our litigants may not be capable of e-filing, so we need be able to receive paper filings as well. It is anticipated that many waivers would be submitted under a mandatory e-filing policy.

13. Can you view current scanned documents?

Yes, but users must access the current case tracking system and document management system separately because they are not integrated.

14. Is there a preference for running in a virtualized environment?

Yes, we use VM-ware.

- 15. What is the WAN capacity? [Comment: we might have sufficient capacity now, but we still have slower performance for all LA based users. In 2009, progress was made to improve performance somewhat, but further optimization is still necessary especially for LA users.]**

The existing capacity is substantial. We currently only utilize an average of 10% of the current capacity (with the exception of when backups are being performed). We would not anticipate any issues. However, all vendors need to consider performance when designing their solution. Performance needs to be optimized. The existing system currently resides in the SF data center. Is it possible however, that the new system will reside in the LA data center, where the majority of users are located.

- 16. Does the transcript accounting need to interface with backend finance systems?**

No.

- 17. Are the interface requirements defined in Attachment G the only interfaces?**

No, Attachment E, Technical Requirements Compliance Matrix, calls for interoperability with the Enterprise Content Management System (ECMS). They are the only ones in scope for this project. All of the currently defined interfaces are described in Attachment G- Data Sharing Details and Attachment E: Technical Requirements Compliance Matrix, Interoperability section.

- 18. How do we handle a different answer in a sub-requirement from the main requirement in Attachment F - Functional Requirements since the cells in the sub-requirements are locked?**

Record the appropriate answer in the comment field along with any explanation of why there is a difference.

- 19. For the external facing pages of the CMS, will the links need to be public. Will some users need a secure access to their case information?**

Most information is public, however we will need to have case parties have controlled access to confidential cases and data.

- 20. How complex is the Probation application?**

It is a basic monitoring and compliance tracking system.

- 21. When is the last day to submit questions?**

November 28, 2012.

22. Will you accept a hosted or SaaS solution?

Yes. If your organization provides both hosted and on-premise solutions, please provide alternative information in your responses to the following sections of the RFP:

- *III.A.7 General Description of Techniques, Approaches, and Methods*
- *III.A.8 Services*
- *III.A.9 Functional Capabilities and Data Sharing*
- *III.A.10 Technical Solution*
- *III.A.11 Work Plan and Schedule*
- *III.A.12 Cost*

In addition, please provide your standard licensing and subscription agreements if available.

23. Will you please share with us why the State Bar re-released this RFP? Is there any difference or differences with this new RFP than the previously released RFP?

The reason the bar decided to repost the RFP was solely due to too few responses. We solicited information from the vendors regarding why they chose not to respond and the most frequent response was competing/conflicting priorities. There are changes in the reposted RFP. We made it clear that we are looking for an off-the-shelf solution or a highly configurable platform solution and not a development effort. We also changed the sample approach to eliminate a multi-phase pilot scenario.

24. Attachment C – Statement of Work provides the bar’s description of the expected approach for system implementation, but does not solicit specific responses. Is there an additional reason to submit Attachment C?

There is no requirement to submit Attachment C back to us. All descriptions of your implementation approach can be included in the body of your response.

25. Is there a total page limit for the narrative?

No.

26. The RFP indicates that you are considering on-premise and hosted solutions. Is one of those methods preferable to the other?

There is not a preference per se, we allow vendors to propose either solution. For vendors who provide both solutions, we may request that you submit pricing for both approaches. For vendors proposing on-premise solutions, we require that you submit the recommended technical configuration for an appropriate environment, but you are not expected to provide the costs to implement the environment. We will use our best available pricing to calculate the cost and use this when evaluating total cost to implement.

27. Is there a backend database preference? (e.g., oracle, db, MSsql, etc.)

The State Bar is a “Microsoft shop”. However, there is no requirement for one database over another. Basically, we are looking for the best solution.

28. What portions of the RFP must be replicated in order to propose both options for on-site and remote hosting?

As noted in 22 above, please note that you can offer an alternative solution and itemize differences in your proposed approaches.

29. Under Section III. A. 10. H. the RFP says that there are 25,000 court cases and 14,500 Probation Department cases that will require conversion. Will there also be Conviction cases that will need to be converted?

Yes, but these are a subset of the existing CMS data. There are approximately 5,000 associated conviction records to be converted.

30. Is the SharePoint Document Management System in place today? Is the intent to have this DMS be the source for all documents for the court?

No – but the DMS will be in place by the time the CMS projects are ready to integrate. The intent is to have SharePoint as the host of an enterprise DMS and there is a separate initiative to get SharePoint installed and a DMS implemented. The CMSs for the prosecutorial entity and the court will be the first utilization of the new DMS.