

**RFO # 212-4-0672 for Court Case Management System**

**Q&A**

Questions 4-12 are transcripts of questions and answers asked at the Offeror's Conference on July 8, 2014. The recording of the full conference can be found at

[http://www.txcourts.gov/contract/CMS\\_RFO\\_070814.MP3](http://www.txcourts.gov/contract/CMS_RFO_070814.MP3).

| <b>Question</b>  | <b>Response</b>  |
|--|--|
| 1. Is there is a dial-in number for the Offeror's Conference scheduled on July 8, 2014?  | No – the conference will be available in-person only. However, any questions asked at the conference will be posted along with their answers to the OCA website and the Electronic State Business Daily website. |
| 2. What day was RFO # 212-4-0672 for Court Case Management System posted online and what is the RFO due date?  | The RFO was posted online on July 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2014. See section 4.1 of the RFO for the Schedule of Events.   |
| 3. Can specific sections, such as Section 2.3.1.1 General System Requirements, be provided in Microsoft Word format?   | Yes – the Microsoft Word version is now posted.  |
| 4. Regarding Deliverables 2 and 3, are the prices we are to provide the cost that will be assessed per county for each category? It is not one total cost per quarter based on the percentage of counties participating – a cost that is not multiplied by the number of counties actually participating? [Note: this question has been paraphrased by OCA. The question can be heard in its entirety on the audio recording of the Pre-Offer Conference available at: <a href="http://www.txcourts.gov/contract/CMS_RFO_070814.MP3">http://www.txcourts.gov/contract/CMS_RFO_070814.MP3</a> | You should list Deliverables two and three as cost per county in those columns and rows and we understand that if 20 of them participate, that's a cost times 20.  |
| 5. Do you have a date for Deliverable number one?  | Deliverable one would need to be in place by January 1 so that a county could be online, but other than that, there is no specific deadline for that Deliverable.  |
| 6. Will acceptance testing be done by OCA?   | Yes.   |
| 7. Regarding individual pricing per county when it comes to equipment, the variations and size of the office, maybe just one or two people in one particular office, another office might have seven, so is that desktops, printers?   | No – You would not be providing equipment at the courthouse. You would only be providing the back end equipment, the hosting equipment for the software. The counties will have to come                          |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>up with the equipment outside of this contract.</p> <p>The RFO requires bidders to state the minimum configuration requirements (operating system, etc.) for the counties equipment to run the system in the cloud.</p>   |
| 8. Questions are due by the 11 <sup>th</sup> of July?  | Yes.   |
| 9. When do you expect to have a response to those questions?   | We will try to have those out by July 14 <sup>th</sup> . Depending on the difficulty of the questions we may not be able to have them all out but we will do our best to get them out as quickly as possible.  |
| 10. Could you consider extending the due date at least seven days, maybe 14?   | The deadline for submission of offers is extended to July 30, 2014, at 3:00 pm.  |
| 11. As you are evaluating the scoring criteria, what are you looking at? Are you looking at the under 20,000 population specifically or in its entirety?   | We're looking at overall. The focus on the counties under 20,000 population is a strong consideration when it comes to meeting all the functional requirements, the pricing, everything involved in the scoring categories. However, we've asked for all the others for a reason, because some of the other counties may be interested in getting on board, so the overall package is very important. All the categories are important but as stated very clearly in our RFO the counties under 20,000 are our primary focus for the purpose of the RFO. |
| 12. Do you think this is a priority for the Legislature? Do you have any general idea what their expectations are for a budget or will it be totally dependent on the RFO responses as far as requesting?  | It is reasonable to believe that there will be funding available for these type of projects.   |
| 13. At the Pre-Offer Conference a few reasons were given for the purpose of this RFO, however it seemed fixing the "hodge-podge" of different vendors was the primary goal. Is this really OCA's place? Wouldn't it be more appropriate to put together a list of those who meet | Please refer to Section 1 of the RFO.  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>certain requirements and then offer smaller counties grants to help pay for the software they want off that list rather than having such a great impact on the current market?</p>  |   |
| <p>14. Looking over the list of requirements there seem to be some functions the very small courts wouldn't necessarily need, and some vital functions that seem to be missing. Was there any input from actual clerks, especially from the smaller counties?</p>  | <p>Yes, clerks were involved in the development of the requirements, including clerks from the less than 20,000 population-sized courts. Vendors are welcome to include additional functionality that they determine is essential. Vendor should note that in its response and include a list of any functionality that the system will not provide. See Section 2.3.11 of the RFO.</p> |
| <p>15. Regarding 1.1.1 Availability. The Offeror must guarantee a 99.9% monthly average of scheduled availability for each of the application components listed. The proposed system must also be able to scale based on the system load. Offeror should consider longitudinal statistical information to predict the case load for the counties. The system must have high availability for daily operations, including a fault-tolerant architecture to protect against catastrophic failures. In the event of a system failure, the system should have the capability to recover quickly, minimize loss of data and limit impact on operations. The Offeror must provide information not already covered that relates to the following topics, including recovery time objectives, both from a system-wide perspective as an information technology professional and from the perspective of an end-user inside a high-volume courtroom:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fault Tolerance</li> <li>2. Fail-Over</li> <li>3. Hot Backups</li> <li>4. Disaster Recovery</li> <li>5. Point-in-Time Recovery</li> <li>6. Version Rollback</li> </ol> | <p>No, however, OCA will work with the vendor to determine what scheduled availability means. Generally, the system must be available for production use during business hours of the court. Planned maintenance activities do not count against the 99.9% availability.</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Would you consider allowing 99.5% availability as it would allow this vendor to provide a compliant and compelling proposal?</p>  |  |
| <p>16. Can you please provide some further clarification on the following requirements as outlined in Section 2.3?</p> <p><b>119</b> – identify official “ court record data”.</p> <p><b>120</b> – define the status (official and unofficial) of data elements.</p> <p><b>167</b> – electronically accept/upload Accounting (Receipting/Bookkeeping) information with Criminal Support functions ( e.g., Conditions for Release from Custody) to collect and generate receipts for bail monies, disburse funds (e.g., to defendant who posted bail, to other participants, victim(s), or both for restitution), suspend disbursements, record bail forfeiture monies as revenue, disseminate bail register.</p> <p><b>432</b> – attach a reason to each assignment and reassignment and view the history.</p> | <p>119 and 120 - these are capabilities intended to allow a clerk or court official to designate data elements as part of the official court record and similar items that should not be part of the official court record.</p> <p>167 - this is a capability that will allow automation of the financial records with certain processes specified in the text.</p> <p>432 - this is a capability that will ensure that a history is maintained for changes in a person or entity relationship status.</p> |
| <p>17. The RFO states that initially the system will be provided to the 56 counties with population below 20,000 but does not specifically state what would be vendor, state and/or county responsibilities as part of this rollout. Please provide additional details associated with the scope of the rollout and the responsibilities of each of the parties.</p>   | <p>Vendor responsibilities are listed in Section 2. The state’s responsibility is to manage the contract and provide funding. The participating county’s responsibility will be to identify a project team and have clerk staff and other system users attend training. If any limited data conversion is done, the county will provide the source data.</p>   |
| <p>18. The RFO states that in addition to the initially scoped interfaces, those interfaces may potentially change or new ones may be added. Furthermore, there is an assumption that since the system is required to have the ability to export data in an XML format, the selected offeror must update interfaces within a reasonable time. Please clarify if this requirement applies to interfaces required by each of the counties the system is expected to be rollout to or if it applies to future interfaces. Please provide guidance on how the offeror can scope the required changes or additions to the initially specified interfaces?</p>   | <p>This requirement applies to interfaces to entities outside the county and not to internal county systems.</p> <p>See Section 2.3.9, requirement 913 for a list of reports required of clerks to outside entities. At some later date, these may turn into electronic interfaces.</p>  |
| <p>19. The RFO states that a full listing of eFileTexas.gov API technical documentation is available upon request. Please provide a copy of the API Technical Documentation or a link to where it can be found.</p>  | <p>The current versions have been posted to the RFO website.</p>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>20. The RFO requires ongoing conformance of the solution with ECF 4 and NIEM as they evolve. Can we assume that the required conformance applies only to the system's base code and not to the interfaces already implemented which do require additional effort to be re-platformed and re-tested?</p>  | <p>This pertains to new interfaces generated. If the receiving end of an existing interface is upgraded to conform, then the Offeror will need to update their interface to conform as well. The inner workings of the system (parts that do not interface with outside entities) do not have to conform.</p> |
| <p>21. The scope of the RFO requires limited data conversion. Please provide information on the type, complexity and size of data which is expected to be converted? If this information is not available at the moment would you accept an offer which specifies the number of hours which are available for data conversion?</p>                            | <p>Since each county can choose which system to use, OCA does not know the type, complexity or size of data. We would accept an offer that specifies the number of hours available for data conversion.</p>   |
| <p>22. The RFO requires the offeror to configure the system in accordance with the JCIT standard system configuration as part of the scope of the proposal. Please provide information of this configuration?</p>   | <p>OCA will work with the selected Offeror to review system configurable options with JCIT to determine the standard system configuration.</p>  |
| <p>23. If a vendor has an existing Master Services Agreement ("MSA") with the State of Texas Department of Information Resources (DIR), is OCA amenable to using this MSA to govern the terms and conditions under which we would perform our services if awarded a contract under this RFO?</p>  | <p>If an Offeror has an existing MSA, they are welcome to propose that to govern terms and conditions. OCA retains the right to add/modify/remove terms and conditions from the MSA for this contract.</p>  |
| <p>24. RFO Section 2.1 (Page 11) states interfaces not associated with electronic filing be compliant with the National Exchange Model (NIEM) standard. Many partner systems within Texas do not communicate in accordance with those standards. Can vendors assume NIEM is only required for interfaces capable of directly consuming the NIEM standard?</p> | <p>Any existing partner system defined in Section 2.5 should be implemented using the existing interface (regardless of its compliance with ECF or NIEM). OCA will work justice partners to highly encourage NIEM compliance when developing new interfaces.</p>  |