

**Michigan State Court Administrative Office  
Statewide e-Filing System and Integrated EDMS RFP  
RFP Addendum #2**

Date of Addendum: October 13, 2016

**NOTICE TO ALL POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS**

The Request for Proposals (RFP) is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original RFP Documents and any previously issued addenda remain in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the RFP. Proposer shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting its Proposal.

**PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL DEADLINE**

The Proposal submittal deadline remains the same and is not changed by this Addendum.

**1.0 – RFP**

Item	Section	Title	Description of Change
1.1	A.3.5	Proposer Quality Certifications	This section duplicates section A.3.8 and should be removed from the Proposal Response Template. Numbering for the remainder of Section A.3 must not change as a result of this deletion, e.g., <i>Relevant Corporate Experience</i> remains section A.3.6; <i>Project Team Personnel</i> remains Section A.3.7, etc.
1.2	B.93	Attachment B: Application Specifications Response Workbook	Replace this requirement with the following language: <u>“System shall comply with current State of Michigan and Michigan Trial Court Guidelines and Standards for Digital Imaging requirements for document imaging and storage, and shall have the ability to support future requirements”</u>

## 2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following questions and answers are provided as a matter of information to clarify issues raised about the RFP. To the extent that changes to the RFP are required based on the questions received, the RFP has been modified as noted above in the RFP section of this Addendum.

Item	Questions and Answers	
2.1	Q:	What is the funding source for the E-Filing System and EDMS procurement?
	A:	The e-Filing System and EDMS procurement is being funded by the fees established in Public Act 231 of 2015, which can be found here: <a href="http://legislature.mi.gov/doc.aspx?2015-HB-5029">http://legislature.mi.gov/doc.aspx?2015-HB-5029</a> .  For additional information about this legislative initiative, see also <a href="#">PA 230</a> , <a href="#">PA 232</a> , <a href="#">PA 233</a> , <a href="#">PA 234</a> , and <a href="#">PA 235</a> .
2.2	Q:	What is the expected contract value?
	A:	No expectations have been set with regard to contract value.
2.3	Q:	In order to derive at a licensing cost estimate we are seeking the total number of named users that will access the solution.  a. What are the anticipated total number of internal users that will require access to the solution (e.g., SCAO, Judges, Clerks, Court Administrators, IT Support Staff, etc.)?  b. What is the volume of external users (Public Filers, Michigan State Police, Prosecutor Offices, Litigants) that will be accessing the solution on a monthly basis? For each of these user types, please provide the breakdown of the total number of users, and not just number of users accessing the system at any one time.
	A:	a. Per the RFP, Attachment A Section A.6.11 (Training): Approximately 1,288 Clerks, 559 Judges, 264 Magistrates and 1,670 judicial staff will need to be trained. These numbers may be used to calculate the anticipated number of internal users.  b. The volume of external users is not currently available. To calculate licensing costs which include external users, please provide pricing in increments of 5,000 users.
2.4	Q:	Would SCAO be willing to acquire the solution licensing through a State Contract vehicle with established terms and conditions?

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
	A:	Yes, SCAO would consider acquiring the solution licensing through a State Contract vehicle with established terms and conditions. Note: if the number of users added via this project moved the State into a further discounted bracket, SCAO expects that it be accounted for during negotiations.
2.5	Q:	Attachment B, General and Technical Specs, #B.117 Can SCAO further elaborate and define “integrated forms management tool” in this requirement?
	A:	The integrated forms management tool supports the future vision for e-Filing as described in Section 5.4.3 in the RFP (Future Environment). The tool would allow the filer to complete and file documents electronically and also support the transfer of data entered to the court's Case Management System, eliminating manual data entry. The ideal solution will support the creation and maintenance of forms without modifications to the e-Filing system.
2.6	Q:	Attachment B, General and Technical Specs, #B.94 Can SCAO please provide a copy of the “Michigan Department of Correction encryption requirements” for vendors to review so they can respond with the correct code in Attachment B, General and Technical Specs, #B.94?
	A:	The Michigan Department of Corrections requires adherence to the encryption protocol revision that currently meets CJIS requirements (TLS 1.1 or greater).
2.7	Q:	Questions - 01 Purpose: In order to satisfy the required “...systems and services for the creation and implementation...” can the solutions (EFSP portal and EFM), instead of brittle coded artifacts, be a flexible set of configured assemblies of reusable building blocks with logic, templates/forms, input/capture, output/doc generation, process and case management functions? If so, can all these elements be delivered in a highly integrated platform with adapters (for data integration) and tools for designing, configuring, testing and deploying applications which favor an adaptive case and/or process management approach?
	A:	Proposers are expected to recommend the solution design they feel will be most effective in providing the required functionality.

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
2.8	Q:	<p>Question – 02 Communication Channels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Which communication channels should be used for capturing content and for output/notification (ex: HTML, PDF, SMS, AFP)? And when, during in the process, the final output channel can be selected?</li> <li>b. Is it safe to assume that mobile input of scanned/photographed documents is included?</li> <li>c. Is an Omini communication model to be enforced? One in which an eFiling transaction or EDMS event starts in any of the available channels and, in addition to trigger the opening or creation of a case (data &amp; content + process), can continue its lifecycle in any channel chosen by the customer, ensuring transaction continuity through conclusion?</li> </ul>
	A:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Regarding capturing content, per Specification B.80 in Attachment B (Application Specifications Response Workbook): System shall have the ability to perform all functions (i.e., prepare and submit filings, review filings, access documents, etc.) from any computer and supported mobile device with internet access. Regarding output / notification, per Specification A.131 in Attachment B: System shall have the ability to send notifications to users according to the modes of communication selected by users at registration (i.e., email, text message, social media systems (e.g., Twitter), etc.). The Proposer is asked to describe the mobile devices supported by the system in Section A.4.12 (Mobile Device Support) of the Proposal Response Template.</li> <li>b. Mobile input of scanned / photographed documents is included.</li> <li>c. Yes, the ideal solution will support a Omni-channel communication model where the user experience is consistent regardless of the input channel type. Transactions may begin in one channel and conclude in another.</li> </ul>
2.9	Q:	<p>Question – 03 Solution Scope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is the integrated solution an addition to an existing portal or new portal development?</li> <li>b. From which sources (technological environment and/or SGBD) the data that must be integrated for use in both, EFSP and EFM systems will come? (Integration requirements?)</li> <li>c. Is it safe to assume that by stating “file documents” ink-signed paper docs (scanned), electronically/digitally signed pdf and other electronic format are included? Which?</li> <li>d. What “mobile functionalities” should court clerks have, if any?</li> </ul>

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>	
	<p>A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. SCAO does not have an existing portal to which an e-Filing solution can be integrated. The expectation is that this would either be a new portal or an existing Provider portal.</li> <li>b. Technical details regarding the systems with which e-Filing will need to integrate (identified in Section A.4.7 of the Proposal Response Template) will be obtained by the Provider during the Detailed Design phase of the project.</li> <li>c. As stated in Specification A.57 of Attachment B (Application Functionality Response Workbook): "System shall have the ability to accept multiple file formats in a filing including PDFs, MS WORD documents, JPEGs, PNGs, TIFs, including documents which have been scanned in and saved in any accepted format". Additional formats may be identified during the Detailed Design phase of the project.</li> <li>d. Any mobile functionality not explicitly identified in Attachment B or elsewhere in the RFP is up to the Provider to indicate in their proposals as they see fit.</li> </ul>
2.10	<p>Q: Question - 04: Self Service vs. Approval Required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Can citizens execute any "self service" type of transaction, such as submitting a missing document's photo, or changing their contact information or even setting duration of temporary unavailability due to health, WITHOUT court clerk approval?</li> <li>b. Or a different, and potentially convoluted, approval process must be executed before a new document is formally added to an existing court case?</li> </ul> <p>A: Unless otherwise stated in this RFP, "self-service" transactions that create and/or update data without court staff approval are limited to the creation and maintenance of account information.</p>
2.11	<p>Q: Question - 05: Migration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is it safe to assume that courts which do not currently have an EDMS and those which choose to replace an existing EDMS, both, will HAVE TO MIGRATE existing documents to the new EDMS as part of the scope of this bid?</li> <li>b. Or, on the contrary, this effort will it be explicitly exclude from this RFP's scope and become object of another procurement bit focused on migration of existing documents?</li> </ul> <p>A: Document migration activities are in scope for this RFP per Section 6.2.7 (Document Conversion and Migration), but only applicable to courts with a current EDMS that choose to convert to the statewide EDMS. Courts without an EDMS will not have documents to migrate.</p>

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
2.12	Q:	<p>Question - 06: Multi-tenant Architecture</p> <p>a. Is it safe to assume that each tenant will have similar types of assets and functionalities (interfaces, data integration, access and CRUD logic), just varying their location attributes, transaction/data volumes, infrastructure and other non-functional demands?</p> <p>b. Is a “cloud-based” architecture viewed as a beneficial delivery approach, or the scalability, functional extensibility and pay-per-use feasibility associated with it are not considered priority?</p> <p>c. Can the “delivery support and operation” be provided in person, when necessary and, remotely (24x7 support) when sufficient?</p>
	A:	<p>a. Yes, it is expected that every tenant will have access to all functionality and that the solution can be configured to meet each tenant's needs.</p> <p>b. There is no predetermination as to the architecture for the solution. Proposers are expected to recommend the architecture they feel will be most effective in providing the required functionality.</p> <p>c. Proposers are to describe the level of support they are providing and the approach.</p>
2.13	Q:	<p>Please provide elaboration and examples regarding requirement A.3.5 Proposer Quality Certifications? Section A.3.5</p>
	A:	<p>This section duplicates section A.3.8 and should be removed from the Proposal Response Template as noted in Item 1.1 of this Addendum. As stated, numbering for the remainder of Section A.3 must not change as a result of this deletion.</p>
2.14	Q:	<p>Please clarify and provide examples regarding requirement A.3.8 Certifications? Section A.3.8</p>
	A:	<p>Please provide any certifications that your organization holds (e.g., ISO 9001) and any that you require your employees hold (e.g., PMP for Project Managers, Six Sigma Green Belts or higher for Business Analysts).</p>
2.15	Q:	<p>What is the total number of active users expected to use the application at any given time? Attachment A, A.4.8</p>
	A:	<p>Please see response to Item 2.3.</p>
2.16	Q:	<p>What is the peak number of user sessions expected to be active at any time? Attachment A, A.4.8</p>
	A:	<p>The peak number of user sessions expected to be active at any time is not currently available.</p>

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
2.17	Q:	Are there specific times of year/month/week when a spike in usage occurs (i.e. due to deadlines, holidays, etc.)?
	A:	It is possible that there will be spikes in usage at the end of a business day. Currently, filers have until the court's close of business to file - this will likely change with the implementation of e-Filing. Additionally, a spike may occur during the time period in which tax garnishments are filed.
2.18	Q:	What user growth (YoY) is expected? Attachment A, A.4.8
	A:	Annual user growth is dependent on the selected implementation approach, which will incorporate factors such as jurisdiction and case type. The Proposer should estimate growth if required to support its proposal.
2.19	Q:	Is e-File a brand new type of system for Michigan, or is there a similar system currently in use?
	A:	As stated in Section 5.3 of the RFP (Current State of Electronic Filing and Document Management within the Michigan Courts), e-Filing programs in the State of Michigan date back to 2007. There are five courts currently using systems that will be replaced by the statewide solution.
2.20	Q:	Is there any existing e-Filing or EDMS system with data, documents or application functionality that needs to be migrated?
	A:	As stated in Item 2.19, there are five courts utilizing an e-Filing program that will require migration to the new system. The scope of that migration will be dependent on whether or not the court chooses to convert from their local EDMS to the statewide EDMS.  In addition to the courts with e-Filing programs, other courts with a local EDMS (see Attachment H) will require document migration if they choose to convert to the statewide EDMS.
2.21	Q:	If data migration is required, what are the data entities/objects is to be migrated? What is data volume per entity/object?
	A:	At this time, data migration is expected for courts that elect to convert from a local EDMS to the statewide system, which will include the transfer of trial court documents and data (where applicable) as stated in Section 6.2.7 of the RFP (Document Conversion and Migration). Volume details may be obtained by the Provider while developing each court's deployment plan.
2.22	Q:	Is there any documentation, elaboration or examples available on the different registration requirements and processes required? Attachment B, A.02

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
	A:	As an example of varying requirements, attorneys would be required to provide more information during the registration process, such as their Bar Registration Number and firm name, while a self-represented litigant would not.
2.23	Q:	Is there an SSO system is available for use with e-File? What authentication protocol / flows does it support? Attachment B, A.02
	A:	There is not a single SSO system currently available for use with the e-Filing system. Specification B.82 refers to the integration of e-Filing with a court's single sign on system; the details and actual integration would be a part of each court's deployment plan.
2.24	Q:	What is the slowest bandwidth that the system should support? (i.e. court locations with slow connections) Attachment B, A.02
	A:	As stated in Addendum #1, Item 2.5: Alternatives are under review for the replacement of services currently providing network connectivity between trial courts and JIS. As requested in Section A.4.3 of the Proposal Response Template (Network Infrastructure), please provide anticipated bandwidth requirements for the proposed solution that will result in an exceptional user experience.
2.25	Q:	How many legacy systems which cannot be retired will require data operations (CRUD) related to e-File processing?
	A:	For information regarding the number of legacy Case Management Systems, please refer to Attachment G (Michigan Courts Case Management System Inventory). The requested information is not available for other systems referenced in Section A.4.7 of the Proposal Response Template (Integration Architecture and Information Exchanges).
2.26	Q:	Should customization such as creating new fields which utilizes drag and drop development features be considered G or I? Attachment B, All
	A:	It depends on how the capability is provided. If the capability to perform a function is provided through an integrated tool, it should be coded an 'I', Integration. If the capability to perform a function exists as an inherent element of the system but requires an individual (e.g., SCAO staff, Court staff, County IT staff) to configure it (e.g., via drag and drop), it should be coded a 'G', Configuration. If the capability requires a programming change to the Provider's software, it should be coded a 'C', Customization.
2.27	Q:	Are all required processes listed out and documented as process maps or using other descriptive process documentation method? Attachment B, All

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
	A:	No additional documentation is available regarding the specifications provided in Attachment B.
2.28	Q:	What are the largest file sizes the system needs to accommodate? What is the e-File frequency? Are there performance SLAs related to transfer speed?
	A:	<p>a. The system should accommodate file sizes of 20 MB plus. A maximum value has not been set; Section A.4.13 of the Proposal Response Template requests that Proposers identify any file size limitations.</p> <p>b. In regards to e-Filing frequency, the Proposer should provide assumptions based on estimates included in Section 5.1.5 of the RFP (Michigan Court Case and Document Volume Estimates).</p> <p>c. Performance SLAs related to transfer speed should be included in the proposal and provide for an exceptional user experience.</p>
2.29	Q:	What web browsers are supported by the state for use with enterprise applications? Browsers that this system would need to support?
	A:	Per Specification B.72 in Attachment B: System shall be browser-based and accessible by any browser (e.g., Chrome, Internet Explorer, Firefox, Safari and Edge) running on any operating system platform.
2.30	Q:	Can you provide technical details for each one of the systems requiring integration with the e_Filing System? (i.e. Operating System, Data Base, API available if any, protocols supported, etc.? Attachment A, A.4.7
	A:	The Provider will obtain this information during the Detailed Design phase of the project.
2.31	Q:	Regarding PCI, our understanding is that there is currently an external entity processing credit card payments, does credit card information will be stored in the e-Filing System? Attachment A, A.4.7
	A:	Though it is correct that e-Filing payments will be processed through the State of Michigan’s enterprise-wide Centralized Electronic Payment Authorization System (CEPAS), the Provider must still be PCI compliant. The integration approach selected will determine whether the Provider will need to meet requirements listed in PCI Self-Assessment Questionnaire SAQ D, SAQ A-EP, or SAQ A. Ideally, no credit card information will be stored in the e-Filing system.
2.32	Q:	Does the Integration with Local Court Document Management System requires to be real time or batch? If batch, what is the frequency? (hourly, daily, weekly, etc.) Attachment A, A.4.7.1

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>	
	<p>A: For courts that elect to stay with their local EDMS rather than convert to the statewide EDMS, real time integration is preferred between the e-Filing system and the local EDMS. If in batch, the frequency must be hourly or less and the documents time stamped upon receipt in the e-Filing system to ensure proper adherence to filing deadlines.</p>
2.33	<p>Q: How many cases / messages per unit of time (daily, hourly, per minute, etc.) will flow between the e-Filing system and the Local Court Management Systems? Attachment A, A.4.7.1</p> <p>A: The number of cases / messages per unit of time that will flow between the e-Filing system and the local Court Management System will vary by jurisdiction, court, and case type. Proposers should provide assumptions based on estimates included in Section 5.1.5 of the RFP (Michigan Court Case and Document Volume Estimates).</p>
2.34	<p>Q: What kind of User Interface is provided by the current Local Court Document Management Systems? Are they web based or a fat client ? Attachment A, A.4.7.1</p> <p>A: There are a variety of systems in use. The Provider will obtain this information during the Detailed Design phase of the project.</p>
2.35	<p>Q: How many documents will flow between the e-Filing System and the Local Court Document Management System per unit of time? (daily, hourly, per minute, etc.) Attachment A, A.4.7.1</p> <p>A: The number of documents per unit of time that will flow between the e-Filing system and the local Court Management System will vary by jurisdiction, court, and case type. Proposers should provide assumptions based on estimates included in Section 5.1.5 of the RFP (Michigan Court Case and Document Volume Estimates).</p>
2.36	<p>Q: What are the current platforms for the Local Case Management Systems? What kind of data base is used? Are the schemas documented? Do they provide any sort of API (Application Programming Interface)? Attachment A, A.4.7.2</p> <p>A: There are a variety of systems in use as identified in Attachment G (Michigan Courts CMS Inventory). The Provider will obtain technical information regarding each system during the Detailed Design phase of the project.</p>
2.37	<p>Q: Are the document formats standardized across Local Case Management Systems? Attachment A, A.4.7.2</p>

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
	A:	Information regarding document formats in each Case Management System is not available at this time as there are multiple systems in use (see Attachment G, Michigan Courts CMS Inventory). The Provider will obtain this information during the Detailed Design phase of the project.
2.38	Q:	For exchanging information with external organization, are there any specific protocols required? Is encryption required? Does the exchange need to be real time or batch oriented? If batch, what is the frequency (hourly, daily, weekly, etc.)? Attachment A, A.4.7.3
	A:	The set of exchanges with external organizations could be either real-time or batch. If batch, the frequency of exchanges would be determined during the Detailed Design phase of this project. Encryption is required and must be compliant with FIPS 140-2 security requirements.
2.39	Q:	What are the hours of coverage required for Help Desk Services? Attachment A, A.7.2
	A:	The RFP requests that Proposers identify the hours they will provide support in Section A.7.2 of the Proposal Response Template.
2.40	Q:	Does SCAO currently have Help Desk Services that can be leveraged to provide Help Desk Services for the eFiling solution? Attachment A, A.7.2
	A:	No, SCAO does not currently have any Help Desk Services that could be leveraged for the e-Filing solution. As stated in Section A.7.2 in the Proposal Response Template (Help Desk Services), the Proposer is asked to describe their organization's ability to provide first point of contact support for system users.
2.41	Q:	What other EDMS solutions would the courts be using? 6.2.4
	A:	There are a variety of systems in use. The Provider will obtain this information during the Detailed Design phase of the project. Per Attachment H (EDMS Inventory), the following vendor systems are known to currently be installed in the state: CherryLAN, Hyland, and Laserfiche.
2.42	Q:	Can we make it a requirement that the courts use the EDMS solution that we recommend? 6.2.4
	A:	No, we cannot require that the courts use the statewide EDMS. As stated in Section 5.4.3 of the RFP (Future Environment), a key tenet of the e-Filing system is the: Ability for courts with local document management systems to continue using their local systems, while allowing the use of a shared EDMS by courts that desire it.

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
2.43	Q:	What other EDMS solutions are the courts currently using? 6.2.7
	A:	Attachment H (EDMS Inventory) identifies solutions currently in use. Though an inventory of the vendors for each county is not available, the following vendor systems are known to be installed in the state: CherryLAN, Hyland, and Laserfiche.
2.44	Q:	What kind of documents are currently being stored and what are the metadata fields? 6.2.7
	A:	At this time, the primary content being stored is case file documents. The Provider will obtain metadata information during the Detailed Design phase of the project as there are a variety of systems in use.
2.45	Q:	What format do you want all of the documents to be converted too? 6.2.7
	A:	The format that documents will be converted to will be determined during the Detailed Design phase of the project.
2.46	Q:	Please provide your definition of a file plan and what it contains? Attachment B, A.208
	A:	A file plan provides detailed information about documents such as their organization, locations, retention and disposition instructions, and other details that help manage records.
2.47	Q:	Please define your definition of an archival format? What format would that be other than the original? Attachment B, A.212
	A:	An archival format is one that supports long-term preservation of electronic documents. PDF/A is an example of an archival format, differing from PDF in that it prohibits certain features (e.g., font linking) that are not suitable for long-term archiving.
2.48	Q:	Define how you currently Seal documents? Attachment B, A.230
	A:	There are a variety of systems in use. The Provider will obtain this information during the Detailed Design phase of the project.
2.49	Q:	Please provide the SOM image and storage requirements document? Attachment B, B.93

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>	
	<p>A: Via Item 1.2 in this addendum, Specification B.93 in Attachment B (Application Specifications Response Workbook) has been revised to include the need for adherence to Trial Court Guidelines and Standards for Digital Imaging in addition to the State of Michigan requirements.</p> <p>Trial Court Guidelines can be found here:  <a href="http://courts.mi.gov/Administration/SCAO/Resources/Documents/standards/di_stds.pdf">http://courts.mi.gov/Administration/SCAO/Resources/Documents/standards/di_stds.pdf</a>;</p> <p>State of Michigan requirements are located here:  <a href="http://www.michigan.gov/documents/hal_mhc_rms_st_for_digitizing_125531_7.pdf">http://www.michigan.gov/documents/hal_mhc_rms_st_for_digitizing_125531_7.pdf</a>;  <a href="http://www.legislature.mi.gov/mileg.asp?page=print&amp;objName=mcl-act-116-of-1992">http://www.legislature.mi.gov/mileg.asp?page=print&amp;objName=mcl-act-116-of-1992</a></p>
2.50	<p>Q: Could you provide the types of documents, approximate sizes, and total volume estimates? Attachment B</p>
	<p>A: As described in Section 5.1.6 of the RFP (Overview of Current Business Processes), examples of the types of documents submitted include forms (SCAO approved or court created), freeform pleadings, required attachments, proofs of service, motions, and answers. Annual volumes and per document file size estimates based on number of pages per document are specified in Section 5.1.5 of the RFP (Michigan Court Case and Document Volume Estimates).</p>
2.51	<p>Q: In the Attachment D – Corporate References document, information related to “Number of Courts and Users Involved” has been requested.</p> <p>Is it mandatory to provide Court references Or can we provide other agency references with details of number of users involved?</p>
	<p>A: While court references are preferable, if the Proposer has other, equivalent references, they may be provided in this section. If doing so, details regarding relevance to this project should be included in the response for Description of the Solution Implemented.</p>
2.52	<p>Q: Are updates to/from CMS required to be done in real-time or nightly updates are acceptable?</p>
	<p>A: Please see response to Item 2.32.</p>

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
2.53	Q:	<p>Section 6.2.7 Document Conversion and Migration</p> <p>We are assuming that all the filing records, associated documents, and data for the filed cases needs to be migrated into the new eFiling system from the local court systems. If this is true, how far back in terms of years do we need to migrate this data? If some courts manage their filings in paper form, is vendor expected to digitize all the documents and load it into the new e-Filing system?</p>
	A:	<p>Though it is expected that filing records, associated documents, and data for filed cases will need to be migrated for courts choosing to convert, specific details such as the number of years will not be available until the Detailed Design phase of this project. It is anticipated that the retention schedules provided in Attachment H (EDMS Inventory) will factor into this determination.</p> <p>The digitization of paper documents is out of scope for this RFP as stated in Section A.6.9 in the Proposal Response Template (Document Conversion and Migration).</p>
2.54	Q:	<p>If the local courts current CMS and/or EDMS systems needs to be modified/enhanced to support integration with the new eFiling system, then who would be responsible for such modification to the court’s current systems?</p> <p>Can vendor assume that Court will work with their current vendor supporting such systems to modify the system as per the requirement?</p>
	A:	<p>Modifications to existing systems to support integration with the new e-Filing system will be the responsibility of the courts (and their vendors).</p>
2.55	Q:	<p>What could be the total count of Direct and Indirect Stakeholders to access EDMS Application?</p>
	A:	<p>The total number of stakeholders accessing the EDMS will depend on the chosen solution. If documents are stored in the EDMS only, please refer to the response provided in Item 2.3. If documents are stored in the e-Filing solution, external users will not need to access the EDMS and the number will be the total of those provided in Attachment A Section A.6.11 (Training): Approximately 1,288 Clerks, 559 Judges, 264 Magistrates and 1,670 judicial staff will need to be trained.</p>
2.56	Q:	<p>What could be the total number of Scanning &amp; Indexing users?</p>

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
	A:	Per the RFP, Attachment A Section A.6.11 (Training): Approximately 1,288 Clerks, 559 Judges, 264 Magistrates and 1,670 judicial staff will need to be trained as they are potential users of the system. It is expected that scanning and indexing will be limited to clerks and judicial staff.
2.57	Q:	Are you expecting the rotation of document stage or after the document has been stored in the final repository (Reference A.188)?
	A:	The document should be stored in the repository in its rotated state, regardless of when that rotation is completed.
2.58	Q:	Do you currently have Redaction functionality in place ? or should it be part of new EDMS Solution (Reference A.237).
	A:	As a part of developing the deployment plan for courts that have a local EDMS, the selected Provider may ascertain whether redaction functionality is available (and in use). Regardless of current capabilities, the proposed solution is expected to include redaction functionality.
2.59	Q:	Can attachments be stored separately or should it be part of email itself while storing ? (Reference A.220)
	A:	Attachments can be stored separately as long as the email and its attachments can be presented holistically during retrieval.
2.60	Q:	Are you willing to accept better solution if we provide better structure instead of foldering ?
	A:	Proposers are expected to recommend the structure they feel will be most effective in providing the required functionality.
2.61	Q:	In the addendum, you answered a question regarding work being done outside of the US (2.25) where you mentioned that Support Services must be housed within the US. Are there any restrictions on location for other work being done outside the US (e.g. software development, QA testing, etc.)? If there are restrictions, would this apply top both our employees and any contractors we work with?
	A:	Though there are no location restrictions for services other than Support, any Provider that plans to utilize offshore resources on the e-Filing project must provide at least one corporate reference where this delivery model was successfully utilized. This requirement applies to the Provider and any subcontractors.

### 3.0 – INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following item(s) are provided as a matter of information only to all respondents and do not modify or become part of the Contract Documents.

Item	Question and Answers	
3.1	Q:	What came of the Self-Represented E-Filing Interface portion of the e-Filing effort? Who did you contract with and what the approximate date/contract value? How were they selected? If not acquired, how/when will you select this vendor?
	A:	No contract has yet been awarded for the e-Filing System and EDMS procurement. Based on the current timeline, award is expected to occur in January 2017.
3.2	Q:	What procurements or internal efforts are left to complete the statewide e-filing effort?
	A:	This RFP is for procurement and deployment of the statewide system and is currently the only planned procurement.
3.3	Q:	Can you tell me when the proposals are due? Also when is the expected award date?
	A:	As per the Section 1.1.3 in the RFP (Schedule), the Proposal Submission Deadline is October 25, 2016 at 2pm; the Contract Negotiations Initiated date is January 9, 2017.
3.4	Q:	We came upon this RFP late, and are wondering where we might find the details related to the information shared and questions asked at the pre-bid on 9/15?
	A:	Addendum #1 to the Statewide Electronic Filing System and Integrated Document Management RFP was posted to Buy4Michigan and <a href="http://www.courts.mi.gov/efiling">www.courts.mi.gov/efiling</a> on 9/28. The addendum includes responses to questions asked prior to 9/22, including those that came up during the Vendor Conference on 9/15.
3.5	Q:	Please confirm the date for final questions are due and that work is targeted to begin January 2017.
	A:	The final date for questions to be submitted is October 4, 2016. Work is targeted to begin after the completion of contract negotiations in January 2017.

<b>3.0 – INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
3.6	Q:	Attachment B  Certain requirements may need multiple code values. For example, one part of a requirement can be coded as E, while the other part a requirement is G. Since only one code is allowed and SCAO does not desire written answers within Attachment B, how are vendors to indicate and describe multiple codes for a single requirement?
	A:	Though most specifications are written as single functions, for any item which a Proposer believes could be answered with multiple codes, please use the more conservative code (e.g., G and not E for the item referred to) and provide an explanation in Section A.8.3 (General Assumptions and Dependencies) of the Proposal Response Template.
3.7	Q:	Only one answer is allowed for each item in attachment B. For an answer requiring the use of 2 methods, for instance both Customization and Integration, is only marking "I" for Integration sufficient? Attachment B, All
	A:	Though most specifications are written as single functions, for any item which a Proposer believes could be answered with multiple codes, please use the more conservative code and provide an explanation in Section A.8.3 (General Assumptions and Dependencies) of the Proposal Response Template.  In regards to the example provided: If providing the functionality involves the integration of an external product, it would be an 'I'. If it involves the customization of the base product and no external integration, it would be a 'C'. If it is both, either could be used since each code requires explanation and may have a cost implication.
3.8	Q:	Will SCAO extend the submission deadline of the RFP Response to November 8, 2016?
	A:	No, the submission deadline of the RFP Response cannot be extended to November 8, 2016.
3.9	Q:	Can SCAO provide the current network diagram to all bidders? Addendum #1, Q2.5
	A:	The diagram of the current network will be provided via email to the requester. As stated in Addendum #1, Item 2.5: Alternatives are under review for the replacement of services currently providing network connectivity between trial courts and JIS.
3.10	Q:	Does SCAO currently use any Training Vendors that an be leveraged to provide training for the eFiling solution? Attachment A, A.6.1

<b>3.0 – INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
	A:	No, SCAO does not currently use any Training Vendors that could be leveraged for the e-Filing solution.
3.11	Q:	The document states “Proposal must be organized according to the template presented in this Section”  Do we need to provide the response within ‘Attachment A - Proposal Response Template - RFP 2016-01’ or Can we provide the response in another document in the order mentioned?
	A:	As stated in Addendum 1, Item 3.5, To ensure consistency in responses for the evaluation team, all proposers must use the structure and numbering provided in the Proposal Response Template.  As long as structure and numbering requirements are adhered to, another document may be used.

**END OF ADDENDUM**