

## Enclosure E.1- Vendor Questions Form

Questions							
<b>Query #1</b>	<b>Topic Context:</b> Please place an X in the appropriate box or boxes	General/Other	MSA	Pricing/ Fee Exhibit	Fee Reductions Exhibit	Contract Relationship Management Exhibit	Deployment Services SOW
		X					
	<b>Document Name:</b>	Request for Proposal Instructions <i>File Name: ccms-rfp-inst.doc</i>					
	<b>Page:</b>	14					
	<b>Section Name &amp; No.:</b>	3.1 Point of Contact					
	<b>Vendor Question:</b>	Please clarify that vendors are permitted to be in contact with the courts and AOC staff in order to carry out activities that are not directly related to this RFP. In addition, we would ask that vendors be specifically permitted to contact court and AOC staff expressly for the purpose of obtaining reference authorization and information associated with the proposal.					
<b>AOC Answer:</b>	<p>If a vendor has contractual obligations to conduct work with a court or the AOC outside the scope of this RFP, then the vendor can contact the court or AOC to conduct that business only.</p> <p>Vendors may not under any circumstances contact court or AOC staff with questions relative to the this RFP</p> <p>If a vendor desires to contact a court to request permission to use that court as a reference, the vendor should do so in writing or via email and should not contact court or AOC staff by phone.</p> <p>Any questions related to obtaining reference materials should be directed in writing to the defined POC.</p>						
<b>Query #2</b>	<b>Topic Context:</b> Please place an X in the appropriate box or boxes	General/Other	MSA	Pricing/ Fee Exhibit	Fee Reductions Exhibit	Contract Relationship Management Exhibit	Deployment Services SOW
		X					
	<b>Document Name:</b>	Enclosure A – RFP Response Template <i>File Name: ccms-rfp-enca.doc</i>					
	<b>Page:</b>	19					
	<b>Section Name &amp; No.:</b>	4.1.4 Individual Court Deployments, Question 5					
<b>Vendor Question:</b>	Question 5 eludes to a critical dependency between application configuration and data exchanges. Please provide a more complete discussion of the nature of the critical dependency as it is not clear from the material provided in the RFP?						

	<b>AOC Answer:</b>	AOC currently plans for two standard configurations. It is contemplated that additional configurations may be required that have not yet been identified. In either circumstance an entire business process may span to/from the CCMS instance, the ISB, and the partner agency systems, as well as possible local integration infrastructure. Vendors should anticipate that use cases and traceability matrices for the entire business processes would encapsulate all these components to be able to end-to-end test this business function that may have been impacted by configuration, data exchange (and data conversion, etc). An example of this is in e-filing, where much of the interface data is dependant on court configuration data regarding such topics as document naming conventions, filing fees, location data, and other jurisdiction-unique information required for the delivery and processing of exchanges.					
<b>Query #3</b>	<b>Topic Context:</b> Please place an X in the appropriate box or boxes	General/Other	MSA	Pricing/ Fee Exhibit	Fee Reductions Exhibit	Contract Relationship Management Exhibit	Deployment Services SOW
				X			X
	<b>Document Name:</b>	Enclosure D, Exhibit A – Deployment Services Statement of Work <i>File Name: ccms-rfp-encl-exa.doc</i>					
	<b>Page:</b>	7					
	<b>Section Name &amp; No.:</b>	2.4.4. Application Configuration Services					
	<b>Vendor Question:</b>	Enclosure D, Exhibit A section 2.4.4 outlines a requirement for a configuration gap analysis between As Is CCMS and To Be CCMS.  Is this work intended to be conducted individually for each court or just once for each classification of courts (Very Small, Small, Medium, Large, Very Large)? Enclosure A contemplates configuration analysis being done for each court however the pricing table only allows for a single unit of configuration analysis per court classification. If this work only applies to 5 classification specific configurations, then where would the AOC expect to see costs associated with the analysis of localization configuration that would be undertaken at each of the courts?					
<b>AOC Answer:</b>	This work is to be conducted individually for each court.  The classifications assume that the local configuration work for courts of “like” size and complexity will require similar scope and effort to configure. The unit pricing will then be used to calculate the total costs. For example, Small court unit price = x * number of small courts would equal the total configuration pricing for all small courts.						
<b>Query #4</b>	<b>Topic Context:</b> Please place an X in the appropriate box or boxes	General/Other	MSA	Pricing/ Fee Exhibit	Fee Reductions Exhibit	Contract Relationship Management Exhibit	Deployment Services SOW
		X		X			X
	<b>Document Name:</b>	Enclosure A – RFP Response Template <i>File Name: ccms-rfp-enca.doc</i> -and-					

		Enclosure D, Exhibit A – Deployment Services Statement of Work <i>File Name: ccms-rfp-encd-exa.doc</i>					
	<b>Page:</b>	Multiple					
	<b>Section Name &amp; No.:</b>	Multiple					
	<b>Vendor Question:</b>	<p>We have been unable to find a clear mapping from Enclosure A Response Template to Enclosure D, Exhibit A to the Provided Pricing Schedule.</p> <p>Can the AOC provide more clarity on whether these sections should map directly to one another? Further, specifically where in the pricing schedule should the costs for the line items in the tables in Enclosure D, Exhibit A be represented?</p> <p>For example, Enclosure A Section 4.1.3 Statewide Deployment Planning maps partially to Enclosure D, Exhibit A Section 2.3 Statewide Deployment Planning which maps to a Statewide Deployment Planning line item in the pricing table. However, Exhibit A in Section 2.3 includes preparation of training materials that have their own line item in the pricing table. Training materials are not contemplated in Enclosure A Section 4.1.3.</p> <p>Further, Exhibit A Section 2.3 alludes to but does not specifically lay out requirements for project/program management services throughout the deployment project. Exhibit A Section 2.5 Deployment Program Management does outline a set of program management activities to be completed during the deployment program. The pricing schedule does not have a clear space to include pricing for activities associated with Deployment Program Management Services although it might be construed that these costs should be included with the costs from section 2.3 in Statewide Deployment Planning.</p> <p>Further, Exhibit A Section 2.4.1 Deployment Project Management Services falls within the section denoted for specific court deployments. However, the pricing schedule provided does not provide a clear place to include project management services associated with a specific court deployment.</p>					
	<b>AOC Answer:</b>	<p>Most activities identified in the SOW have a corresponding pricing sheet component either at the statewide level or at the individual court deployment level.</p> <p>Training materials are to be developed once at the statewide level and therefore are priced once. The training itself will be conducted on a court by court basis and therefore is to be priced by court. The expectation is that the training materials will be reused statewide.</p> <p>Program and project management tasks that do not have individual pricing line items are assumed to be factored into vendor pricing. In other words, there will not be a project management pricing line item for an individual court deployment. It is assumed that the vendor will include or “build in” program and project management and associated overhead costs in statewide planning activity pricing or individual court deployment component line item pricing as appropriate.</p>					
<b>Query #5</b>	<b>Topic</b>	General/Other	MSA	Pricing/	Fee Reductions Exhibit	Contract Relationship	Deployment Services SOW

	<b>Context:</b> Please place an X in the appropriate box or boxes			Fee Exhibit		Management Exhibit	
				X			
	<b>Document Name:</b>						
	<b>Page:</b>						
	<b>Section Name &amp; No.:</b>						
<b>Vendor Question:</b>	<p>Enclosure D, Exhibit A Section 2.4.2 indicates that the vendor is responsible for procuring and paying for hardware and software.</p> <p>Can the vendors assume that they can purchase these products through their internal procurement processes and not use an AOC procurement process but still pass the costs for these products through to the AOC as part of their invoicing process? Please also confirm that the 10% holdback will not be applicable to these components of the project.</p>						
<b>AOC Answer:</b>	<p>Section 2.4.2 is not intended to imply that the vendor is responsible for procuring and paying for court hardware and software. If through the course of discussions and planning it is determined that having the vendor purchase equipment on behalf of the AOC is more beneficial, then the AOC may opt to do so. The vendor may pass the costs through to the AOC. There will be no holdback on such purchases. The AOC will release payment for such purchases based on receipt of invoice and physical inspection and acceptance of such equipment.</p>						
<b>Query #6</b>	<b>Topic Context:</b> Please place an X in the appropriate box or boxes	General/Other	MSA	Pricing/ Fee Exhibit	Fee Reductions Exhibit	Contract Relationship Management Exhibit	Deployment Services SOW
							X
	<b>Document Name:</b>	Enclosure A – RFP Response Template <i>File Name: ccms-rfp-enca.doc</i>					
	<b>Page:</b>	20					
	<b>Section Name &amp; No.:</b>	4.1.4 Individual Court Deployments, Question 6					
	<b>Vendor Question:</b>	<p>Enclosure A, Section 4.1.4, Question 6 refers to 70 legacy applications for which AOC does not have access and cannot provide other specifics on those databases.</p> <p>For data conversion/migration purposes, access to these databases is critical. How does AOC anticipate their vendor gaining access to these systems? Further, how does AOC anticipate their vendor gaining the data schema and structure of these commercial products?</p>					
<b>AOC Answer:</b>	<p>From this question it is not clear whether the vendor is referring to the need for information for the purposes of this response or for the purposes of deployment after award.</p> <p>For the purposes of RFP response, no additional information will be provided relative to these application databases. Vendors are expected to utilize their experience and knowledge of commercial applications and databases to</p>						

		<p>determine pricing for this activity.</p> <p>As part of deployment planning, is anticipated that the selected vendor would include gathering of more detailed information as part of their knowledge transfer and/or deployment activities as required.</p>					
<b>Query #7</b>	<b>Topic Context:</b> Please place an X in the appropriate box or boxes	General/Other	MSA	Pricing/ Fee Exhibit	Fee Reductions Exhibit	Contract Relationship Management Exhibit	Deployment Services SOW
		X					
	<b>Document Name:</b>	RFP Instructions Enclosure A – RFP Response Template <i>File Name: ccms-rfp-inst.doc</i>					
	<b>Page:</b>	2 and 12					
	<b>Section Name &amp; No.:</b>	2.0 Introduction and 2.6.3 Term					
	<b>Vendor Question:</b>	<p>The Introduction indicates that all courts will be deployed by 2012 and section 2.6.3 contemplates a 5 year contract from January 2009 to January 2014 with two one year options.</p> <p>A 2 year deployment cycle would be very different (from a cost and scope perspective as well as impact on the Courts and the AOC) from a four year deployment cycle. Can the AOC clarify their intended deployment timeframe?</p>					
<b>AOC Answer:</b>	<p>The timeframe is as stated in the RFP documents with a goal of fully deploying all courts by the end of calendar year 2012. The additional years have been added to the contract term as a contingency in the event of unforeseen delays.</p> <p>The AOC fully expects, as courts are deployed, that the vendor will become more and more proficient in the execution of the deployment process so that the timeframe to deploy subsequent courts is reduced over time. The AOC expects to see this learning and improved timeframes reflected in the statewide planning.</p>						
<b>Query #8</b>	<b>Topic Context:</b> Please place an X in the appropriate box or boxes	General/Other	MSA	Pricing/ Fee Exhibit	Fee Reductions Exhibit	Contract Relationship Management Exhibit	Deployment Services SOW
				X			X
	<b>Document Name:</b>	Enclosure D, Exhibit A – Deployment Services Statement of Work <i>File Name: ccms-rfp-encl-d-exa.doc</i>					
	<b>Page:</b>	8					
	<b>Section Name &amp; No.:</b>	2.4.6. Data Integration Services					
	<b>Vendor Question:</b>	<p>Enclosure D, Exhibit A section 2.4.6 items 1, 2 and 3 contemplate a component of work potentially based on the LIAM assessment methodology that would be conducted at each court.</p> <p>However, the pricing schedule does not seem to provide a place for the cost of this component of work to be provided. Can the AOC provide guidance on how they intend that vendors account for costs associated with this work?</p>					

	<b>AOC Answer:</b>	Although assessment tasks are called out separately in the SOW, the pricing is for completion of the entire integration process for each exchange. Therefore, the assessment is expected to be included in the single line item price for each exchange.					
<b>Query #9</b>	<b>Topic Context:</b> Please place an X in the appropriate box or boxes	General/Other	MSA	Pricing/ Fee Exhibit	Fee Reductions Exhibit	Contract Relationship Management Exhibit	Deployment Services SOW
		X					
	<b>Document Name:</b>	RFP Instructions <i>File Name: ccms-rfp-inst.doc</i>					
	<b>Page:</b>	13					
	<b>Section Name &amp; No.:</b>	2.7. Minimum Requirements to Qualify					
	<b>Vendor Question:</b>	<p>Section 2.7 outlines a requirement that the Vendor must be willing to locate key employees in the Burbank and San Francisco areas.</p> <p>Can the AOC provide more specific guidance on numbers and types of key employees that they wish to have located in one or the other location and what would be an acceptable distance from the AOC facilities in those cities for the vendor facility that would house those people?</p>					
<b>AOC Answer:</b>	<p>Burbank - The AOC expects at a minimum that the key vendor personnel required to conduct day-to-day business will be located in Burbank. This includes Vendor Program Manager, administrative staff and other key management roles.</p> <p>San Francisco - The AOC's IS Department is located in San Francisco. Vendor key personnel responsible for the technical and integration aspects of the project and will be located in San Francisco.</p> <p>Vendor facilities must be located within a five mile radius of the AOC Burbank or San Francisco offices.</p>						