



STATE OF IDAHO

Idaho Supreme Court
Administrative Office of the Court

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

Statewide Judicial Court Case Management Solution

May 6, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. RFP ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION	1
2. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING QUESTIONS.....	10
3. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS	10
4. MANDATORY COVER LETTER	12
5. BUSINESS PROPOSAL.....	14
6. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.....	17
7. PROPOSED SOLUTION – CORE FUNCTIONALITY	19
8. PROPOSED SOLUTION – ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONALITY	20
9. VALUE ADDS	21
10. DETAILED FUNCTIONAL SPECIFICATIONS.....	22
11. PROJECT STRATEGY AND APPROACH REQUIREMENTS	23
12. DATA CONVERSION, SYSTEM INTEGRATION AND INTERFACE PLAN.....	25
13. SYSTEM ANALYSIS, DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.....	29
14. SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS, SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE.....	31
15. FUTURE PRODUCT AND SERVICE ROADMAP	32
16. TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS	33
17. RISKS AND CONSTRAINTS.....	36
18. COST SPECIFICATIONS	37
19. STANDARD AGREEMENTS	39
20. PROPOSAL REVIEW AND EVALUATION	40
21. GENERAL CONDITIONS	42
22. PRE-CONTRACT AWARD DISCUSSIONS	44
ATTACHMENT 1: OFFEROR QUESTIONS	45
ATTACHMENT 2: MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS ATTESTATION FORM.....	47
ATTACHMENT 3: REFERENCES.....	49
ATTACHMENT 4: COST PROPOSAL	54

ATTACHMENT 5: FUNCTIONAL SPECIFICATION RESPONSE - EXPLANATION	55
ATTACHMENT 6: LETTER OF CREDIT	56
ATTACHMENT 7: DEFINITIONS, TERMS AND ACRONYMS.....	57

1. RFP ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

RFP Title:	State of Idaho – Statewide Judicial Court Case Management Solution
RFP Project Description:	Implement a comprehensive, fully integrated statewide judicial court case management solution, to include e-filing, enabling the Idaho Judiciary to improve access to information by both internal and external stakeholders, improve integration of information with judicial business partners, and maximize efficiency of the court's business processes.
RFP Lead:	Kevin Iwersen Chief Information Officer PO Box 83720 Boise, Idaho 83720-0101 RFP@idcourts.net Fax: (208) 334-2416
Submit sealed proposal via US Mail:	Idaho Supreme Court CONTRACT PROPOSAL – CMS RFP PO Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720-0101
Submit sealed proposal via courier:	Idaho Supreme Court CONTRACT PROPOSAL – CMS RFP 451 W. State St. Boise, ID 83702
Submit electronically via email:	RFP@idcourts.net
RFP Opening Date:	May 6, 2013
Deadline To Receive Questions:	May 13, 2013
RFP Closing Date / Time:	May 28, 2013, 5:00pm (Mountain DST) <i>Offerors are encouraged to plan accordingly in order to complete their proposals by this date. Due to a firm timeline, the Idaho Judiciary does not anticipate extending the RFP closing date and/or time.</i>
Oral Presentations/Demonstrations	The top two (2) proposals may be invited to give oral presentations in Boise, ID. The RFP Evaluation Committee reserves the right to invite additional proposals, if desired. Oral presentations are tentatively scheduled for June 17-21, 2013. It is expected oral presentations will last

	two (2) full days for each invited offeror.
Initial Term of Contract and Renewals:	Initial term of the Agreement will be for five (5) full production years after final system acceptance. At the end of the fifth year of production use, and upon mutual agreement, the Idaho Judiciary may renew the contract on an annual basis, or a mutually agreed upon, fiscally responsible renewal term. If an annual renewal term is used, the annual renewal pricing will not exceed 3.5% over the previous year's renewal term.

1.1 Purpose: The Idaho Judiciary seeks to implement a new comprehensive, integrated statewide court management solution to replace the current trial and appellate court case management systems. The Judiciary seeks to leverage this transition not only to replace the existing case management systems with a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) solution, but also to adopt the necessary applications and technologies to enable the Judiciary to achieve its strategic business goals: improve access to information by both internal and external stakeholders; improve integration of information with business partners; and maximize efficiency of business processes in Idaho's courts.

1.1.1 The Idaho Judiciary is focused on “provide[ing] access to justice through the timely, fair, and impartial resolution of cases.”[1] To more efficiently carry out the Idaho Courts’ mission, Chief Justice Roger S. Burdick stated that the Court’s “vision for the future” included advancements in the technology the Courts currently use. Chief Justice Burdick’s vision included that “Idahoans will be able to file court cases online 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. They will be able to pay traffic tickets, learn when a particular case is scheduled for hearing and access and view all documents filed in every case, all online, without visiting the courthouse. As the Judiciary continues to move toward ‘e-everything’ in the area of court technology, Idahoans can expect better access, greater convenience, and more complete transparency.”[2] To meet the Courts’ vision, the Court created the Court Technology Committee. This committee was charged with planning and implementing a new court case management solution, developing a comprehensive e-filing business model, improving the statewide telecommunications network to facilitate the Court’s work, and creating a statewide business model for deploying court functions in the information technology field.

1.1.2 Based on this charge, the Idaho Judiciary seeks to partner with a vendor experienced in implementing statewide comprehensive solutions, including case management; content/document management; financial management; public access (including secure access for judicial partners); electronic filing (e-filing); electronic service (e-service); supervision of persons under court order; electronic payments; and user-friendly data extraction and reporting. The solution should provide for robust workflow to facilitate efficient case and financial processing. The Idaho Judiciary also desires the solution to have an intuitive, efficient user interface as well as strong integration capabilities to facilitate data exchange with Idaho’s judicial partners. The solution should also provide an appropriate level of configurability to minimize the need to customize and/or modify the solution as the Idaho Judiciary adjusts or streamlines its business practices. The expectation is the vendor solution will allow the Idaho Judiciary to improve its current business practices resulting in significant productivity gains.

1.1.3 Additional components will be considered as part of this statewide solution to facilitate a comprehensive solution to include, but not limited to, judicial workbench/interface, appellate case management, child protection and jury management. The Judiciary desires that potential offerors propose all-inclusive solutions to include all of the components listed above, where possible; preference will be given to those proposals.

1.1.4 As a value-add, optional component of the RFP, the Idaho Judiciary also seeks to specifically identify case management solutions for prosecutor and public defender

[1] Mission Statement of the Idaho Courts
[2] Idaho State Judiciary’s 2012 Annual Report.
Statewide Court Case Management Request for Proposal
May 6, 2013

offices. Offerors are encouraged to provide information regarding case management applications for such entities to enable a complete and unified court case management environment. The purchase of licenses and implementation services for this option is out-of-scope for this RFP and will be negotiated between the offeror and the specific prosecutor and/or public defender offices that may choose to leverage this option. Offerors will also be permitted, as desired and available, to provide additional information regarding any other value-add products and/or services for the Idaho Judiciary's (or other judicial partner stakeholders') consideration (such as jail management, etc.).

- 1.1.5 Qualified offerors should be able to demonstrate a full complement of existing applications and capabilities currently deployed in statewide and/or large multi-jurisdictional production environments. The Idaho Judicial Branch includes trial courts in 44 counties; the court case management solution must support not only the most efficient operation of each individual court, but their complete integration into a single state court case management system with consistent data entry processes and standards, common management reports, the capability to access data from any point within the system, the capability to provide a single interface with the public and with stakeholders, which includes the capability for users to access all Judicial Branch data through that interface. As part of this contractual partnership, the Judiciary is seeking to enter into a long-term affiliation with a court case management offeror who can and will support and maintain the applications indefinitely. Therefore, qualified offerors should verify their long-term business health and technical strength through their response to this RFP.

1.2 RFP Operative Purpose and Obligations. This RFP is issued to provide a comparative evaluation of similar solutions provided by various offerors and to facilitate a competitive procurement process. This RFP is not issued pursuant to any procurement statutes or rules, including but not limited to, title 67, Idaho Code, nor is it governed by the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act.

- 1.2.1 Upon completion of the RFP evaluation process, the Idaho Supreme Court's Administrative Office of the Court and the apparent successful offeror will enter into pre-contract award discussions (as outlined in section 21 of the RFP). The Administrative Office of the Court will submit to the selected offeror agreements, including, inter alia, a professional services agreement with an attached Statement of Work that incorporates the RFP specifications. Standard agreements provided by the apparent successful offeror (as outlined in section 19 of the RFP) will be considered.
- 1.2.2 No binding contractual obligations are created by the RFP or the act of the Idaho Judiciary reviewing the response thereto. All actual work to implement the RFP will be governed by separate, later agreements in a form acceptable to the Idaho Judiciary and its attorneys that integrate and contemplate the RFP specifications.

1.3 Scope. The scope of this RFP includes the procurement of a COTS court case management solution (as described in section 1.1) as well as the services to plan, design, implement and support the solution. Offerors should provide the appropriate software application licensing for all court users within Idaho, to include the Idaho Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, district courts, magistrate courts, and appropriate county personnel. The Idaho Judiciary prefers proposed solutions that are installed and proven in jurisdictions comparable to Idaho. The professional and technical services scope of this RFP includes all phases of the implementation lifecycle, including but not limited to project management, gap analysis, design, software and hardware installation, data conversion, internal and external interface development, system customization and configuration, testing, technical and user training, user and system documentation, implementation support, and post implementation support and maintenance.

1.3.1 The project is expected to be implemented in two major phases; however, the Idaho Judiciary will consider other options proposed by offerors. The two major phases include: 1.) replace the existing case management solutions for both the trial and appellate courts to a robust, state-of-the-art, comprehensive court management system; and 2.) implement a fully electronic court records system that includes e-filing, e-service, digital document management (including the implementation of “smart documents” which deliver to the court data elements necessary for effective case management as well as representations of the data in the form of a document), electronic court record management workflow, and judicial bench/interface for access to electronic court records by the justices and judges.

1.4 Objectives. The objectives of this RFP are to obtain a comprehensive solution that will accomplish the following:

- 1.4.1 Replace the Idaho Judiciary’s aging case management application with a state-of-the-art application that meets the functional case management needs of the Judiciary and is supported by a provider that has the long-term capacity to support and upgrade the application for the foreseeable future;
- 1.4.2 Enable the Idaho Judiciary to fully transition to electronic court records, to include digital document management;
- 1.4.3 Provide secure, accurate, timely, and reliable judicial information to justice decision makers;
- 1.4.4 Support customer-facing services such as e-filing, access to case information, and access to court documents;
- 1.4.5 Provide access to court calendars;
- 1.4.6 Improve communications, workflow and interaction with judges and court personnel;
- 1.4.7 Improve the efficiency of court business processes and allow for court business process reengineering;
- 1.4.8 Provide Idaho’s courts and judges with the tools and information to provide just, prompt and safe resolution of cases;
- 1.4.9 Enable a fully integrated financial module to manage court fees, fines, restitution and any other court costs;

- 1.4.10 Allow for the efficient production of accurate management reports and on-line or printed forms using court information from the application's database;
- 1.4.11 Allow for the expeditious but phased retirement of the Judiciary's existing case management applications; and,
- 1.4.12 Provide a durable case management application that supports the conservation of financial and staff resources while facilitating the phased integration of ongoing system improvements and new technologies.

1.5 Background Information.

- 1.5.1 **The Idaho Court System.** The Idaho Judiciary is comprised of the Idaho Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, district courts and magistrate courts. The Supreme Court, the state's top appellate court, includes the chief justice and four other justices. The Supreme Court hears appeals from Magistrate and District Courts and from the Idaho Public Utilities Commission and the Industrial Commission. It has original jurisdiction to hear claims against the state, and to issue writs of review, mandamus, prohibition and habeas corpus, and all writs necessary for complete exercise of its appellate jurisdiction. Because the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction for appeals, the Idaho Court of Appeals hears cases on assignment from the Supreme Court. This appellate assignment system is rare in the United States and increases the unique functional requirements needed for Idaho's court management solution. In fiscal year 2011, 1,016 cases were filed, and 160 cases were retained by the Supreme Court; in fiscal year 2012, 1,047 cases were filed, and 168 cases were retained by the Supreme Court.
 - 1.5.1.1 The Court of Appeals currently has four judges, and cases are heard by three-judge panels. The Court of Appeals has jurisdiction to hear all cases assigned to it by the Supreme Court. However, the Supreme Court may not assign cases involving claims against any state, extraordinary writs, appeals from the imposition of capital punishment or appeals from the Industrial Commission or Public Utilities Commission. While an appellant may petition the Supreme Court to rehear a Court of Appeals decision, the Supreme Court is not required to grant such a petition. In fiscal year 2011, 561 cases were assigned to the Court of Appeals; 554 cases were assigned to the Court of Appeals in fiscal year 2012.
 - 1.5.1.2 Idaho is divided into seven judicial districts, each with an administrative district judge chosen by the other district judges in the district. Each judicial district employs a trial court administrator, supervised by the administrative district judge and the administrative director of the courts.

- 1.5.1.3 Idaho has 44 counties, and each county has a District Court which includes a Magistrate Division. There are 45 district court judges and 89 magistrate judges in the state. District Court judges have jurisdiction over civil and criminal cases. They decide cases involving the most serious criminal cases (felonies), and typically hear civil cases where the amount of money in dispute exceeds \$10,000. Civil damage actions usually involve personal injury such as automobile negligence cases and contractual disputes between parties. District judges hear post-conviction relief actions in which a defendant is challenging his or her conviction or incarceration. District judges also hear agency appeals and appeals of decisions made by magistrate judges. Each district judge employs a court reporter who is responsible for capturing the record of proceedings in that judge's court. In addition to these District Courts, the Snake River Basin Adjudication is a special District Court that focuses solely on water issues. The water adjudication currently operates a separate case management system and desires to utilize the new, statewide system for this purpose. In fiscal year 2011, 22,606 cases were filed with the District Courts; in fiscal year 2012, 21,597 cases were filed.
- 1.5.1.4 The Magistrate Division includes at least one judge resident within each county. These judges hear probate matters, divorce proceedings, domestic violence restraining orders, juvenile proceedings, initial felony proceedings through the preliminary hearing, criminal misdemeanors, infractions, civil cases when the amount in dispute does not exceed \$10,000 and cases in Small Claims Court that is established for disputes of \$5,000 or less. In fiscal year 2011, 432,966 cases were filed with the Magistrate Division; in fiscal year 2012, 414,818 cases were filed.
- 1.5.1.5 Idaho has implemented a robust problem-solving court structure to divert non-violent offenders from prison and jail into treatment. By increasing direct supervision of offenders, coordinating public resources, and expediting case processing, these courts strive to break the cycle of criminal behavior, alcohol and drug use, and incarceration. As of February 2013, Idaho has 24 Felony Drug Courts, 11 Adult Mental Health Courts, 1 Juvenile Mental Health Court, 9 Misdemeanor/DUI Courts, 4 DUI Courts, 8 Juvenile Drug Courts, 4 Child Protection Drug Courts, and 3 Veterans Courts. Idaho also has 6 Domestic Violence Courts.
- 1.5.1.6 In addition to district and magistrate judges, Idaho leverages senior judges who have retired from full-time work. They provide an important service to the state's judicial branch by continuing to make themselves available to hear cases on an as needed basis. By employing senior judges, the state court system has had additional flexibility in managing caseload increases in a cost-effective manner.
- 1.5.1.7 Due to the rural nature of the State of Idaho, many of Idaho's judges are required to travel to other courts within (or between) their districts for court proceedings. In fiscal year 2012, district and magistrate judges drove 377,450 miles, or the equivalent of 858 judge's days, for court purposes. In fiscal year 2011, judges drove 361,488 miles.
- 1.5.1.8 The elected clerk of the District Court (the "county clerk") is an important link in Idaho between the judiciary and county government. District Court clerks and their deputies provide crucial services to judges.

1.5.1.9 Further information regarding Idaho's judicial system and processes can be found on the Idaho Supreme Court web site at: <http://isc.idaho.gov/> or in "The Media Guide to the Idaho Courts" located at: http://isc.idaho.gov/files/Media_Guide_06-22-12.pdf

1.5.2 **Idaho's Current Case Management Systems.** The Idaho Statewide Trial Court Automated Records System (ISTARS) is a comprehensive trial court automation system deployed in each of Idaho's 44 counties – designed and maintained by Justice Systems, Inc. of Albuquerque, New Mexico. The system was designed to streamline the operation of Idaho's trial courts. This system is used for complete case management for every case type filed (to include civil, criminal and juvenile cases). This solution was originally deployed in the 1980s as an AS-400 based application and subsequently upgraded to the current Microsoft Windows-based client-server architecture in the late 1990s. ISTARS uses separate servers in each county. Each user connects to a local county server using a client application installed on the user's computer. Each county-based server is backed up to a central database which in turn populates a data repository. The Idaho Judiciary uses ISTARS to provide judicial data to a number of outside entities including the Idaho State Police, Department of Juvenile Corrections, Department of Transportation, and the State Tax Commission. Data exchanges link the Ada County District Court, Ada County Jail, and the 44 county ISTARS databases for financial transactions completed through an on-line, Internet payment service provided by CitePay.

1.5.2.1 In January 2008, the Idaho Supreme Court created a statewide, consolidated database and opened the Data Repository web site to the public, to provide information on the status of trial court cases in all 44 counties in the State of Idaho. Electronic records are available from 1995 forward, although some information for older cases may be available. This information is displayed according to Idaho Administrative Rule 32. The status of both pending and closed cases is available to the public. Extended access is also provided to specific judicial users (e.g. government entities, prosecutors, public defenders, etc.) who require more detailed access to specific court records for the purposes of their positions.

1.5.2.2 Additionally, in partnership with Justice Systems Inc., the Idaho Supreme Court implemented a web-based appellate case management application. This application is separate from the existing ISTARS client-server application used by the 44 counties. This appellate system is used by the Idaho Supreme Court and Court of Appeals to manage all cases on appeal, to include digital briefs and records for each case. The system also enables all notices to be sent to appropriate parties via electronic mail rather than the U.S. Postal Service. The Clerk's Office also uses this system to track and issue notices regarding the timeliness of transcripts for appellate cases.

1.5.2.3 ISTARS supports approximately 1,000 court users, including clerks, judges and administrative staff.

1.5.3 **Idaho's Judicial Network.** In regards to physical size, Idaho is the 13th largest state in the union covering over 83,557 square miles, approximately 823 of which are water. According to the latest census, there are 1,567,582 people living in Idaho's 44 counties. The residents of Idaho live in a wide-variety of landscapes: from the near sea level port city of Lewiston, to the high mountains of Challis and Hailey, and everything in between. Idaho is a very large state, but only one city is over 100,000 people. Thus, the majority of Idahoans and the courts servicing these citizens are located in rural areas which pose many challenges when delivering technology resources. The current network infrastructure to Idaho's rural courthouses is typically equivalent to a T-1 connection with a maximum data transmission rate of 1.544 megabits per second. The network infrastructure supporting the Idaho Judiciary will be undergoing a modernization in the next twelve (12) months to provide the appropriate bandwidth and reliability for the new statewide case management system. The intent is to provide a dedicated connection to each courthouse, enabling at least 2 megabits per second with a backup, redundant link.

2. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMITTING QUESTIONS

- 2.1 Questions regarding the RFP requirements must be submitted via email and via the form provided with this RFP. An electronic question form, titled "Offeror Question Template" is included as Attachment 1 to this RFP. Questions will only be received and considered via this form. Offerors must submit questions to RFP@idcourts.net, using the email subject line of "CMS RFP Questions". Questions must be received no later than the date stated in Section 1, or as amended.
- 2.2 Official answers to all written questions will be posted as an amendment to this RFP on the Idaho Supreme Court's web site.

3. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

- 3.1 **Proposal Format.** A consolidated proposal to be submitted by an offeror must consist of four (4) distinct parts. The Business Proposal and Scope of Work Proposal should include a table of contents identifying the contents of each section, including page numbers of major subsections.
- 3.1.1 A Cover Letter and Business Proposal. The Cover Letter must address the responses to Section 4 of the RFP. The Business Proposal must include responses to Section 5 of the RFP. This portion of the proposal will be used by the Evaluation Committee to evaluate the offeror's response to the business requirements.
- 3.1.2 A Minimum Requirements Attestation Form. The Minimum Requirements Attestation Form (Attachment 2) must be fully completed, annotating if the offeror meets the minimum requirements to be considered for evaluation as outlined in Section 6 of the RFP.
- 3.1.3 A Scope of Work Proposal. The Scope of Work Proposal must include responses to Sections 7 through 17 of the RFP. This portion of the proposal will be used by the Evaluation Committee to evaluate the offeror's response to many aspects to include, but not limited to, the project strategy, approach, functional and technology requirements.
- 3.1.4 A Cost Proposal. The Cost Proposal must be separate from the Business and Scope of Work Proposals. The Business and Scope of Work Proposals must not contain any pricing information.
- 3.2. **Proposal Submission Methods.** Proposals may be submitted in either of the following two methods:
- 3.2.1 Electronically submitted proposals must be submitted to RFP@idcourts.net. PROVIDE THE COST PROPOSAL AND ALL OTHER REQUIRED DOCUMENTS. The Cost Proposal must be provided as a separate file from the other proposal documents. Electronically submitted proposals must also have a scanned actual signature submitted.
- 3.2.2 Manually submitted proposals must be submitted with an ORIGINAL HANDWRITTEN signature executed in INK and be returned with the relevant

solicitation documents. PHOTOCOPIED SIGNATURES or FACSIMILE SIGNATURES are NOT ACCEPTABLE (and may result in a finding that your proposal is non-responsive). For Manually Submitted Proposals:

3.2.2.1 The proposals must be addressed to the RFP Lead and clearly marked "CONTRACT PROPOSAL – CMS RFP."

3.2.2.2 Each proposal must include one (1) complete proposal when submitted.

3.2.2.3 Offerors submitting manually must also submit one (1) digital copy of the proposal on CD or USB device. PDF, Word or Excel formats are required (the only exception is for printed brochures not available in these formats). The format and content must be the same as the manually submitted proposal. The digital version must NOT be password protected or locked in any way.

3.2.2.4 The manually submitted Business Proposal and Scope of Work Proposal must be sealed, identified as the "Business and Scope of Work Portion of Proposal – CMS RFP."

3.2.2.5 The manually submitted Cost Proposal must be separately sealed, identified "Cost Portion of Proposal – CMS RFP."

3.2.3 Where possible, the Business and Scope of Work Proposals and the Cost Proposal should be shipped in a single shipping container, if submitting manually.

3.2.4 If your manually or digitally submitted proposal contains trade secret information which you have identified, also submit a redacted copy (if in digital format, with the word "redacted" in the file name) of the Business Proposal and/or Scope of Work Proposal with all trade secret information removed or blacked out; as well as a separate document containing a complete list of all trade secret information which was removed/blacked out in the redacted copy.

Use Section 4 of this RFP as the outline for the Cover Letter to the RFP.

4. MANDATORY COVER LETTER

- 4.1 Mandatory Cover Letter:** The offeror's proposal must include a cover letter on official letterhead of the offeror with the offeror's name, mailing address, telephone number, facsimile number, e-mail address, and name of offeror's authorized signer. The cover letter must identify the RFP Title, and must be signed, in ink, by an individual authorized to commit the offeror to the work proposed. In addition, the cover letter must include:
- 4.2.1 An executive summary providing a condensed overview of the contents of the Business and Scope of Work Proposals demonstrating an understanding of the services to be performed.
 - 4.2.2 Identification of the offeror's corporate or other legal entity status. Offerors must include their tax identification number. The offeror must be a legal entity with the legal right to contract.
 - 4.2.3 A statement indicating the offeror's acceptance of General Conditions included in Section 20 of the RFP.
 - 4.2.4 A statement of the offeror's compliance with federal and state employment laws.
 - 4.2.5 A statement that offeror has not employed any company or person other than a bona fide employee working solely for the offeror or a company regularly employed as its marketing agent, to solicit or secure this contract, and that it has not paid or agreed to pay any company or person, other than a bona fide employee working solely for the contractor or a company regularly employed by the contractor as its marketing agent, any fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gifts or any other consideration contingent upon or resulting from the award of this contract. The offeror must affirm its understanding and agreement that for breach or violation of this term, the State has the right to annul the contract without liability or, in its discretion, to deduct from the contract price the amount of any such fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gifts or contingencies.
 - 4.2.6 A statement naming the firms and/or staff responsible for writing the proposal.
 - 4.2.7 A statement that offeror is not currently suspended, debarred or otherwise excluded from federal or state procurement and nonprocurement programs.
 - 4.2.8 A statement that the offeror certifies that they have disclosed in writing any issues (including litigation and growing concerns) that could adversely affect the offeror's and/or subcontractor's ability to operate and/or deliver on the products/services outlined within the response.
 - 4.2.9 A statement affirming the proposal will be firm and binding for ninety (90) days from the proposal opening date.

4.2.10 The offeror must include a statement recognizing that the offeror, if chosen as the RFP's apparent successful offeror, will provide a Letter of Credit, in the form of Appendix 6, which shall secure the performance of the offeror, including without limitation performance of the services in accordance with the Scope of Work and subsequent project management plan, and providing deliverables in accordance with the requirements and specifications outlined within this RFP, and shall secure any damages, cost or expenses resulting from the offeror's default in performance hereunder or liability caused by the offeror. The Letter of Credit must be in the amount of 30% of total project costs and must be delivered to the Idaho Supreme Court's Administrative Office of the Court prior to final contract approval. The offeror may satisfy the obligation to provide a Letter of Credit through provision of one or more Letters of Credit on behalf of the offeror or from various sources. In addition, in the event of termination for default, the Letter of Credit shall become payable to the Idaho Supreme Court for any outstanding damage assessments made by the Idaho Supreme Court against the offeror. An amount up to the full amounts of the Letter of Credit may also be applied to offeror's liability for any administrative costs and/or excess costs incurred by the Idaho Supreme Court in obtaining similar software, deliverables, other products and services to replace those terminated as a result of offeror's default. The Idaho Supreme Court may seek other remedies in addition to this stated liability.

4.3 Acknowledgement of Amendments: If the RFP is amended, the offeror must acknowledge each amendment with a signature on the acknowledgement form provided with each amendment. The acknowledgement form should be emailed to the RFP Lead prior to submission of an RFP response. Failure to return a signed copy of each amendment acknowledgement form may result in the proposal being found non-responsive.

Use Section 5 of this RFP as the outline for response to the Business Proposal requirements of the RFP, and identify it as Business Proposal.

The evaluators will be scoring the proposal based on the completeness of the response to each item listed below.

5. BUSINESS PROPOSAL

5.1 This section of the RFP discusses the required business specifications. Offerors should respond to each section and provide all available documentation.

5.2 Experience and Expertise: Clearly describe, in the form of a narrative, your experience and expertise in delivering the products or services proposed on this project, as well as for any proposed subcontractors. Additionally, provide information on the following:

5.2.1 Describe the number and scope of successful court system implementation projects costing greater than \$2 million during the last five years, to include the proposed solution and/or any other court system projects.

5.2.2 Identify the number of successful court system implementations with demonstrated support for at least 500 concurrent end users during the last three years, using the proposed solution and/or any other court system projects. Provide a description outlining the scope of work for each of these implementations.

5.3 Organizational Depth and Stability: The Idaho Judiciary requires that offerors have the capabilities to successfully execute a project of the size and complexity of a statewide court case management application conversion and implementation. Moreover, the Idaho Judiciary expects that the successful offeror will remain in business long after any implementation for the State of Idaho and will fully support the Idaho Judiciary with its court case management environment for the foreseeable future. All offerors must demonstrate organizational stability as well as the expertise and experience needed to successfully deliver and support Idaho's court management solution.

5.3.1 Describe the size, in terms of individuals employed, of the department of your organization that is devoted to your court case management solution. If possible, please include an organizational chart.

5.3.2 Identify how many specific staff directly employed as members of the offeror's company are dedicated to the areas listed below (specify by Full-Time Equivalency (FTE)). Include the location of these staff members. (Do not include subcontractors.)

5.3.2.1 New system/functionality development (architects and designers, programmers, DBAs, web programmers, etc.)

5.3.2.2 Help desk/customer support

5.3.2.3 Implementation support/rollout

5.3.2.4 Training

5.3.2.5 Sales and marketing

5.3.3 Describe your organization's personnel growth or reduction within the previous three years. If reductions have occurred, provide an explanation.

5.4 Financial Stability: The Idaho Judiciary requires its long-term business partners to be financially stable and positioned to provide support for the foreseeable future. At a minimum, independent evidence of financial stability is required. **Offerors are required to submit audited financial statements or comprehensive Dun and Bradstreet reports.** Offerors are also expected to provide clear answers to all listed items below; misleading or inaccurate information could result in disqualification. In addition to demonstrating financial stability, offerors must address each of the following areas:

5.4.1 Number of new clients acquired within the past five years and nature of relationship.

5.4.2 Percentage of income derived from software licensing (software), system implementation (implementation services), and post-implementation support and maintenance (support services).

5.4.3 Full disclosure of any current litigation involving the offeror, whether related to the offeror's court case management application or not.

5.4.4 Provide a complete list of any litigation/adversarial proceeding for the last five years the offeror was involved in as either a plaintiff or defendant and what the outcome of the incident was.

5.4.5 Disclose any growing concerns and/or issues that are not public that would affect negatively the offeror's ability to deliver upon the proposed products and/or services.

5.4.6 Identify annual revenue per year for each of the last five years.

5.5 Existing Clients and References: The Idaho Judiciary seeks a partner with proven, successful experience with the proposed solution.

5.5.1 Provide a complete customer list for the court management solution being offered. The complete customer list must include the following: first and last name of customer, phone number, email address, organization/company name, city, state, products implemented, software versions, project dates, and total project costs. Specifically identify those clients that have implemented the proposed solution in either a statewide or multi-jurisdictional environment.

5.5.2 In addition to section 5.5.1, offerors are further encouraged to provide a brief profile of each current case management client, including the product version provided and supported, in order to help the Evaluation Committee understand the scope of the projects completed for each client.

- 5.5.3 At a minimum, offerors are to provide at least three (3) verifiable references of clients. Failure to provide three (3) verifiable references may, at the Idaho Judiciary's discretion, render the offeror's proposal non-responsive and no further consideration given. At least one of the reference clients must have used the proposed COTS solution in a statewide or multi-jurisdictional/multi-site court environment in a verifiable (non-test or training) production environment for no less than one hundred and twenty (120) production days. Use Attachment 3, "References", for reference responses. The Judiciary reserves the right to identify, contact and evaluate other offeror clients in addition to those provided as reference clients.

5.6 Previous Clients and Implementation Issues: The Idaho Judiciary seeks to understand any experiences with previous clients that have either resulted in failed implementations and/or discontinuances of the offeror's products.

- 5.6.1 Identify the number of customers who have discontinued use of your proposed or previous court case management products within the past five years. Please provide the organizational name of these clients.
- 5.6.2 Identify any incomplete and/or failed implementations of your proposed or previous court case management products.

Use Section 6 of this RFP to understand, review and attest to your compliance with the Idaho Judiciary's Minimum Requirements.

6. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

- 6.1** This section describes the minimum requirements related to the business requirements and scope of work that must be included as part of the offeror's proposed solution. Offerors must attest that they meet each of these minimum requirements by completing the Minimum Requirements document contained in Attachment 2. Proposals that fail to meet these minimum requirements will be found non-responsive. Proposals that meet the requirements, or are otherwise approved by the Evaluation Committee, will continue in the evaluation process.
- 6.2 Proposed Solution Minimum Product Requirements.** The following components and/or capabilities must presently exist and be fully operating as part of the offeror's COTS, "out-of-the-box" solution. The minimum components are:
- 6.2.1 Party-centric case management to include case processing, calendaring, docketing, financial management, workflow, warrants, party management (to include the ability to change attorney and party contact information and to link parties to cases), and time standards measurements.
 - 6.2.2 Integrated document/content management to facilitate comprehensive case information.
 - 6.2.3 Electronic filing (e-filing) to permit the filing of legal documents/information by electronic means and to facilitate a fully integrated filing process from the filer into the court case management solution environment, from the filer to other parties, and from the court case management solution to filers. E-filing also includes the filing of court-created documents and notices and their electronic communication to parties.
 - 6.2.4 Web-based repository to facilitate public access as well as secure access for specific judicial partners to case information and documents.
 - 6.2.5 Reporting capabilities with standardized (out-of-the-box) reports and the ability to create custom reports, to include the measurement of time standards.
 - 6.2.6 Problem-solving court and supervision capabilities to support Idaho's problem-solving court efforts; such capabilities should include tracking and measuring client progress through the problem-solving court process.
 - 6.2.7 Multiple court architecture in a centralized system to serve numerous courts, counties, and communities of interest, providing security controls to limit access to the appropriate users while supporting a statewide view of all courts.
 - 6.2.8 Data/information exchange architecture to facilitate standards based integration and/or data exchanges including support of National Information Exchange Model/Electronic Court Filing 2.0 or later and Electronic Court Filing 4.0 or later (NIEM/ECF) based data exchanges with other entities.

- 6.2.9 Configurable application features to minimize and/or relieve the Idaho Judiciary of the need to modify the solution in the future as we modify or streamline business practices.
- 6.2.10 Electronic payments to facilitate statewide on-line, integrated payment processing, to include a payment mechanism for document access, public web portal access, and other fees that the Idaho Judiciary may elect to and/or need to collect.

6.3 Proposed Solution Minimum Technical Requirements. All offeror proposals must meet the following technical requirements:

- 6.3.1 The proposed solution must operate within Microsoft Windows Server, UNIX, or Linux server operating system environments.
- 6.3.2 The proposed solution must operate on a Microsoft SQL or Oracle database environment.
- 6.3.3 The proposed solution must be a browser-based solution (which can include a web-client plug-in, wrapper, and/or rich Internet application to facilitate an enhanced user experience or functionality).
- 6.3.4 The proposed solution must be able to operate on Microsoft Windows XP (32-bit version) and Windows 7 (32-bit and 64-bit versions).

6.4 Proposed Solution Minimum Production Experience Requirements. The proposed solution (to include any proposed integrations with a sub-contractor module and/or application) must currently be operating, for no less than one hundred and twenty (120) production days prior to the release date of this solicitation, in a statewide or large multi-jurisdictional/multi-site court environment with demonstrated support for at least 500 concurrent users. (Note: Production days do not include training or testing.)

Use Sections 7 through 17 of this RFP as the outline for response to the RFP, and identify it as Scope of Work Proposal

The evaluators will be scoring your proposal for functionality, technology requirements, project strategy, approach and other factors based on the completeness of the response to each item listed below.

7. PROPOSED SOLUTION – CORE FUNCTIONALITY

- 7.1 Proposed Solution Core Requirements.** The offeror should provide an overview of the following components and/or capabilities included as part of the offeror's COTS, "out-of-the-box" solution. As set forth in section 6, the Idaho Judiciary expects these components to be the minimum components proposed by the offeror and must be included as part of the COTS proposal. Each offeror will respond to a detailed list of desired functional specifications in Section 10. This section is intended for the offeror to provide a high-level description of the primary capabilities included in the solution and to provide an opportunity for the offeror to highlight and/or explain the advantages, differentiators and benefits of the proposed solution for the following areas. These components may be integrated as a single application or separated by a public interface that could be used to provide the capability by the offeror or a 3rd party module. Offeror's should clearly identify the public interface integration options available to the Idaho Judiciary for these modules (if available), providing flexibility for the Idaho Judiciary to potentially replace the specified module in the future with an alternative. The Idaho Judiciary strongly desires certain modules noted below to support a public interface option; preference will be given as part of the evaluative process to proposals that provide these options.
- 7.1.1 Party-centric case/court management to include case processing, calendaring, docketing, financial management, workflow, warrants, party management and time standards measurements.
 - 7.1.2 Integrated document/content management to facilitate comprehensive case information. A public interface option for the document/content management component is preferred and should be highlighted by the offeror, if available.
 - 7.1.3 Electronic filing (e-filing) to permit the filing of legal documents/information by electronic means and to facilitate a fully integrated filing process from the filer into the case management solution environment, from the filer to other parties, and from the case management solution to filers. E-filing also includes the filing of court-created documents and notices and their electronic communication to parties. (Note: The Idaho Judiciary is considering an on-premise, licensed solution as the preferred model; however, SaaS-based models – to include transactional fees – will also be considered. Please describe both approaches, if available.) A public interface option for the e-filing component is preferred and should be highlighted by the offeror, if available.
 - 7.1.4 Web-based repository to facilitate public access as well as to secure access for specific judicial partners to case information and documents.
 - 7.1.5 Reporting capabilities to include standardized (out-of-the-box reports) and the ability to create custom reports.

- 7.1.6 Problem-solving court and supervision capabilities to support Idaho's problem-solving court efforts; such capabilities should include tracking and measuring client progress through the problem-solving court process.
- 7.1.7 Multiple court architecture in a centralized system to serve numerous courts, counties, and communities of interest, providing security controls to limit access to the appropriate users while supporting a statewide view of all courts.
- 7.1.8 Data/information exchange architecture to facilitate standards based integration and/or data exchanges including support of National Information Exchange Model/Electronic Court Filing 2.0 or later and Electronic Court Filing 4.0 or later (NIEM/ECF) based data exchanges with other entities.
- 7.1.9 Configurable application features to minimize and/or relieve the Idaho Judiciary of the need to modify the solution in the future as we modify or streamline our business practices.
- 7.1.10 Electronic payments to facilitate statewide on-line, integrated payment processing, to include a payment mechanism for document access, public web portal access, and other fees that the Idaho Judiciary may elect to and/or need to collect. A public interface option for the electronic payments component is preferred and should be highlighted by the offeror, if available.

8. PROPOSED SOLUTION – ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONALITY

- 8.1** In addition to the product requirements outlined in section 7.1, the following capabilities are additional components for the scope of work of this project and must be fully integrated and/or included as separate modules that can be integrated into the proposed solution. *These components may not exist with the offeror solution at this time; however, they must be available no later than within fifteen (15) months from contract approval. Preference will be given to offerors that are currently and fully operating such components in a statewide or large multi-jurisdictional/multi-site court environment.* Please explain if the capability is currently developed, in development (if in development please also give the estimated completion date), or whether the offeror proposes to utilize a third-party to meet the requirement. Additionally, these components may be integrated as a single application or separated by a public interface that could be used to provide the capability by the offeror or a 3rd party module. Offeror's should clearly identify the public interface integration options available to the Idaho Judiciary for these modules (if available), providing flexibility for the Idaho Judiciary to potentially replace the specified module in the future with an alternative. The Idaho Judiciary strongly desires certain modules noted below to support a public interface option; preference will be given as part of the evaluative process to proposals that provide these options.

(Note: Proposed solutions will be evaluated on the total capabilities offered; however, the Idaho Judiciary may determine to not implement or include specific components, functionality and/or modules listed below in the final contract.)

- 8.1.1 Judicial work bench/interface to facilitate improved case access for judges and clerks and to enhance courtroom processing.

- 8.1.2 Jury management to assist with jury selection and management processes. A public interface option for the jury management component is preferred and should be highlighted by the offeror, if available.
- 8.1.3 Appellate court functionality to support case management process from the trial courts through the appellate courts. This functionality can be provided by the offeror as part of the proposed solution or integrated with a proposed third-party solution (as a subcontractor to the offeror). (Note: If proposals offered are not favorable to the Idaho Judiciary's appellate needs, the Idaho Judiciary reserves the right to exclude the appellate case management functionality of the RFP from the final contract and keep the existing appellate case management system. If this occurs, integration between the selected offeror's proposed trial court case management solution and the existing appellate case management system would be expected as part of the final scope of services.)
- 8.1.4 Child protection/welfare court management capabilities to ensure timely oversight of cases to protect children from harm, to make timely decisions about their futures, and to address parents' due process rights.

9. VALUE ADDS

- 9.1** As a supplement to the minimum and additional product requirements outlined in Sections 7 and 8, the following value-added capabilities are optional components to the scope of work. If the offeror has a current product, service and/or 3rd party provided solution, the offeror should respond to and provide information regarding these options as the Idaho Judiciary is interested in understanding potential comprehensive solutions. When responding to these options, please indicate if the optional functionality would be provided directly by the offeror or whether the offeror proposes to utilize a third-party vendor to deliver the functionality. The Idaho Judiciary is not obligated to procure these options as part of the final solution; however, it may elect to include specific components, modules and/or services listed below as optional components in the final contract. If included in the final contract, these capabilities could be considered for procurement and implementation by either the Idaho Judiciary or by other state, county, or city entities.
 - 9.1.1 Prosecuting Attorney and/or Public Defender applications and/or modules to manage criminal and non-criminal cases with the ability to fully integrate and share information with the statewide court case management solution.
 - 9.1.2 Jail/Prison Management applications and/or modules to assist with the management of correctional staff and inmate population. This solution should have the ability to fully integrate and share information with the statewide court case management solution.

- 9.1.3 Other value added products and/or services available from the offeror if the offeror believes these products and/or services offer additional value to the Idaho Judiciary. Examples of value add might be products and/or services related to cost savings, technology/application options the RFP does not address or has not considered, or any other options that could provide benefit to the Idaho Judiciary. These Value Add options will be considered and could be selected to be a part of any contract let, and the Idaho Judiciary reserves the right exercise these options. (Note: If Software as a Service (SaaS) is an option for the proposed solution in Sections 7 and 8, offerors are not to list SaaS as a Value Add. Instead, SaaS should be described in the relevant section of the RFP related to that capability. Offerors should include the SaaS option and related costs on Attachment 4.

10. DETAILED FUNCTIONAL SPECIFICATIONS

- 10.1** This section of the RFP presents an overview of the Judiciary's existing and desired functionality for the new solution. Case management is the most critical information technology function of the judiciary and includes the traditional activities such as case initiation, event docketing, scheduling and calendaring of events, financial record-keeping, and management and statistical reporting. Additional functionality is also requested to provide a comprehensive court management solution. However, with the exception of the appellate courts, Idaho's courts are similar to other state judiciaries in that its case management needs and general policies, processes, and procedures are not unique to Idaho. It is for this reason that the Idaho Judiciary is confident that purchasing a proven, commercial off-the-shelf application will meet most of the Judiciary's needs.

- 10.2** The functional specifications identify the features and functions desired by the Idaho Judiciary for the proposed court case management solution. The Functional Specification Response Form (included as Attachment 5) outlines the desired features and functions for the new solution for the Idaho Judiciary.

- 10.2.1 Proper completion of the Functional Specification Response Forms is critical. Offerors are to respond to each functional specification listed on the form in each tab. Each response must be based on the proposed solution. Each response will be one of five possible answers as follows:

S = Supported currently (fully or configurable) in proposed solution
U = Upgrade supported in future scheduled release. Provide a scheduled release date in the explanation column.
3 = 3rd Party supported - List the vendor and version/release number
C = Customization required to provide this functionality
N = Not proposed

If the "Comment" field is marked with an "asterisk," (*) use the "Offeror Explanation" field to explain "how" your solution supports the described functionality.

- 10.2.2 As stated earlier in the RFP, the Idaho Judiciary is seeking a COTS solution that provides configurable options to achieve the majority of the desired functionality listed on the Functional Specification Response Form. Preference will be given

to those offerors who are able to meet the functional specification as part of the proposed solution (as identified with “S” or “U” on the Functional Specification Response Form). If an offeror responds to a functional specification with an “S”, “U” or “3”, the offeror must be able to provide this functionality as part of the proposed solution. However, the Judiciary understands that some of this requested functionality may require customization. The Judiciary seeks to minimize the amount of customization as part of this implementation and will review each of the functional specifications that require customization to determine if the specification is essential to Idaho’s implementation. A final determination of which customization elements will be requested and/or implemented will be determined as part of the contract negotiation and/or gap/fit analysis process of the project.

- 10.2.3 The Functional Specification Response Form includes a section for Prosecuting Attorney / Public Defender case management functionality. This is a Value Add functionality desired by the State of Idaho, related to Section 9.1.1 above. Offerors that are proposing this specific Value Add should complete this section of the Functional Response Form. If not offering this Value Add capability, offerors should annotate “N” (Not proposed) for the applicable requirements.

11. PROJECT STRATEGY AND APPROACH REQUIREMENTS

- 11.1 This section of the RFP defines the required components of any offeror’s response to the RFP regarding project strategy, approach and training. The offeror must discuss its structure and approach to managing projects of this scale. The offeror’s proposal must also include the following:
- 11.2 **Overall Project Strategy:** Describe your overall strategy for achieving the Idaho Judiciary’s objectives. Detail how your strategy will add value to the Idaho Judiciary’s environment as well as how the proposed strategy has been proven successful in previous implementations.
 - 11.2.1 **Project Approach:** Provide your detailed project approach to fully implement your case management application in Idaho and fully describe the phases, tasks, and activities that will be followed to complete the entire project. The offeror’s proposal should include a proposed pilot implementation strategy.
 - 11.2.2 **Project Plan:** The Idaho Judiciary seeks to complete this project within 30 to 36 months of contract award. Offerors should propose and include a project plan and timeframe that is realistic and achievable, and ideally within this timeframe. The project plan must provide a time-based representation of the proposed approach and strategy. The Idaho Judiciary will request a more detailed project plan from the selected offeror during contract negotiations. The Idaho Judiciary recognizes that 30 to 36 months is an aggressive timeline; therefore, please explain and provide further detail regarding how long similar projects have taken in other jurisdictions.

11.2.3 Project Team: Describe your proposed project team, its structure, and individual responsibilities, to include the number of personnel that will be assigned to the project full-time or part-time. Project Management and Technical Lead(s) must be clearly identified and their experience noted. For the duration of this project, identified Project Management and Technical Lead(s) cannot be reassigned, replaced or removed from the project unless specifically requested and/or approved by the Idaho Judiciary.

11.2.3.1 Qualifications of Personnel: Provide resumes for employees who will be managing and/or directly providing services under the contract. For positions that are not filled, a position description (including requisite qualifications/experience) should be provided.

11.2.3.2 Subcontractors: Describe the extent to which subcontractors, if any, will be used to comply with contract requirements. Describe the sub-contractor entity, relationship to the offeror, services and/or products. Include each sub-contractor position providing service, and provide a detailed description of how the subcontractors are anticipated to be involved under the contract. Include a description of how the offeror will ensure that all subcontractors and their employees will meet all Business and Scope of Work requirements. Describe the offeror's relationship with all proposed subcontractors, including previous working relationships and projects. Offerors must disclose the location of the subcontractor's business office and the location(s) where the actual work will be performed. (Note: If the offeror utilizes any entity other than the entity submitting the proposal to provide any of the services required by this RFP, the relationship between the two entities is considered that of a contractor-subcontractor for the purpose of this section, regardless of whether a relationship is based on an actual written contract between the two.) If the offeror's solution incorporates the use of a software product, such as Microsoft Windows or Oracle, and the offeror is going to directly provide this software license and/or support as part of the proposed solution, describe this as part of the subcontractor relationship.

11.2.4 Idaho Judiciary Personnel Resource Needs: In addition to the definition of the offeror's proposed project team, identify the recommended Idaho Judiciary personnel needed to assist the offeror with this project to include quantity of personnel (by role), skill sets requested and any other special requests or recommendations. The Judiciary understands these are recommended estimates and subject to change as the offeror becomes familiar with the Judiciary's organizational structure.

11.2.5 Knowledge Transfer: Describe how the project team will interact with Idaho Judiciary personnel to ensure knowledge transfer and to achieve a smooth transition from implementation to daily operations.

11.3 Project Management Approach: Describe your methodology and approach to managing the project. Within your response, address the following:

11.3.1 Project Management Experience: Describe the scope of your project management services and experience in managing a project of similar scale.

- 11.3.2 **Communication Plan:** Describe how project status will be tracked, communicated and managed.
 - 11.3.3 **Change Management:** Describe your approach to change management, not only regarding software product(s) but also as regards to the entire project implementation.
 - 11.3.4 **Risk/Issue Management:** Describe your process for managing and resolving project issues and risks. It should be noted that the Idaho Judiciary may additionally employ independent verification and validation (IV&V) services.
 - 11.3.5 **Budget Management:** Describe your process for managing the project budget, expenditures and costs.
 - 11.3.6 **Project Documentation:** Describe your project documentation approach to ensure project tasks, decisions and issues are appropriately documented.
 - 11.3.7 **Project Management Tools and Procedures:** Describe any proposed project management tools and procedures that you prefer to manage a project of this scale.
- 11.4 Training Plan:** The offeror's proposal should discuss and explore both a comprehensive training approach as well as a "train-the-trainer" approach. The offeror must include a detailed training plan covering all training needs and must include sample training and on-line materials for training proposed for the offeror's solution. The proposal must also include the following:
- 11.4.1 Method(s) of training, to include computer-based training, videos, etc.
 - 11.4.2 Length of training
 - 11.4.3 Scope of training
 - 11.4.4 A list of training materials and samples
 - 11.4.5 Help desk/end-user support training
 - 11.4.6 Offeror's ability to integrate Idaho-specific court/business rules training
 - 11.4.7 Custom help capabilities integrated into the solution that can be populated by the Idaho Judiciary and/or other entity
 - 11.4.8 Certification and other capabilities for testing user comprehension
 - 11.4.9 Specific training regarding report creation and generation using proposed reporting tools (e.g. integrated reporting, Crystal Reports, SQL Server Report Services, etc.)

12. DATA CONVERSION, SYSTEM INTEGRATION AND INTERFACE PLAN

- 12.1** This section of the RFP defines the components of any offeror's response to the RFP regarding data conversion, system integration and interfaces.

- 12.2 Data Conversion:** Describe your strategy and approach for converting and integrating legacy data into the new court management environment. In responding to this section of the RFP, please be aware that Idaho courts have had the capability and the authority to create their own data entry codes since the introduction of the client-server application in the late 1990s. Consequently, data conversion routines will have to be customized for the district and magistrate courts in each of Idaho's 44 counties. At a minimum, please cover the following points:
- 12.2.1 Describe your approach toward migration of existing data from legacy systems to your case management application.
 - 12.2.2 Describe your approach regarding definition of data mapping rules.
 - 12.2.3 Describe your approach to addressing data extraction, transformation, staging, cleansing, and validation.
 - 12.2.4 Describe your tools, either internal or third party, to facilitate the data conversion process.
 - 12.2.5 Describe your strategies to conduct the final conversion process.
 - 12.2.6 Identify what Idaho Judiciary resources you would require to execute your data conversion strategies.
 - 12.2.7 Based on your experience with similar projects, describe the critical success factors that you associate with successful data conversion.
 - 12.2.8 Describe your experience with transformation and migration of case management data from an existing Oracle relational database environment to your case management application.
 - 12.2.9 As described in the scope of work, this project will require the offeror to upgrade and/or replace both trial court and appellate case management systems which operate on different systems with different data dictionaries. Describe your experience and proposed approach to converting data from multiple environments to the proposed solution.
 - 12.2.10 Describe your approach and experience in converting existing images/documents from either an existing case management system or from multiple external data stores into the proposed solution.

12.3 Existing Data Exchanges, System Integration and Interface Development: The Judiciary's existing case management environment currently exchanges information with other ancillary systems. The basic purpose and method for each of these ancillary system data exchanges is described below. It is the Judiciary's intention to maintain these exchanges to existing ancillary systems, either using a similar exchange method or implementing a direct integration/interface with the ancillary system. Please describe your approach to optimizing the data exchanges with the following ancillary systems. While it is the court's intention not to lose any of its current functionality with current data exchanges, it is open to ideas of meeting that functionality in means other than what is currently in place today. Within responses, offerors are to address the strategy and tools that they would employ to maintain and/or improve the integration environment within the courts.

12.3.1 Idaho State Police (ISP). The proposed solution should include, at a minimum, a data extract to provide to ISP data concerning warrants, no contact orders, protection orders, fingerprint cards, convictions, firearm restrictions and firearm relief from restriction. As part of the new solution, the Idaho Judiciary prefers this information be exchanged via a system-to-system interface versus a data extract.

12.3.2 Idaho Transportation Department (ITD). The proposed solution should include, at a minimum, a data extract to provide to ITD data concerning infractions, convictions, license suspensions, and receipt/compliance of paid infraction citations. As part of the new solution, the Idaho Judiciary prefers this information be exchanged via a system-to-system interface versus a data extract.

12.3.3 Idaho Fish and Game (IDFG). The proposed solution should include, at a minimum, a data extract to provide to IDFG data concerning infractions, convictions and financial penalties related to IDFG defined statutes. As part of the new solution, the Idaho Judiciary prefers this information be exchanged via a system-to-system interface versus a data extract.

12.3.4 Idaho State Tax Commission. The proposed solution should include, at a minimum, a data extract to provide the Tax Commission with tax intercept information related to adult criminal fines, fees and restitution. As part of the new solution, the Idaho Judiciary prefers this information be exchanged via a system-to-system interface versus a data extract.

12.3.5 Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections (IDJC). The proposed solution should provide a full data extract to IDJC of all records and actions related to juvenile offenders. As part of the new solution, the Idaho Judiciary prefers this information be exchanged via a system-to-system interface versus a data extract.

12.3.6 Idaho Department of Health and Welfare (IDHW). The proposed solution should include, at a minimum, the ability to import data from IDHW regarding adoptions, child welfare/protection cases and other information. As part of the new solution, the Idaho Judiciary prefers this information be exchanged bi-directionally via a system-to-system interface.

12.3.7 VINELink (provided by Appriss Inc.). The proposed solution should include, at a minimum, a data extract to provide to VINE hearing notifications and other victim notification information. As part of the new solution, the Idaho Judiciary prefers this information be exchanged via a system-to-system interface versus a data extract.

- 12.3.8 eCitation providers (to include, but not limited to, APS, Fatpot, Saltus Technologies, Spillman, and internally-developed systems). The proposed solution should include, at a minimum, the ability to import a data file from various eCitation providers. As part of the new solution, the Idaho Judiciary prefers this information be exchanged via a system-to-system interface versus a data extract.
- 12.3.9 Collections Services Vendor(s). The proposed solution should include, at a minimum, a data extract to provide various collections service vendors with information related to the party/defendant, the amount owed, the payment due date and other related information for the timely collection of overdue fines, fees, restitution, and other courts costs. As part of the new solution, the Idaho Judiciary prefers this information be exchanged via a system-to-system interface versus a data extract.
- 12.3.10 Prosecutor / Public Defender Case Management Systems (to include New Dawn Technologies JustWare, Justice Systems Inc. FullCase and an internally-developed system by Ada County, Idaho). The proposed solution should include integration to existing prosecutor case management systems as part of the proposed solution. (Note: The Idaho Judiciary and applicable prosecutor offices may elect to transition existing prosecutor case management system(s) and associated interface(s) to the offeror's value-added prosecutor case management product, if offered in Section 9. Products and services associated with this transition would be considered separately from this proposal.)
- 12.3.11 Jail Management (internally-developed system by Ada County, Idaho). The proposed solution should include integration to the existing jail management system within Ada County, Idaho. (Note: The Idaho Judiciary and Ada County may elect to transition the existing jail management system and associated interface to the offeror's value-added jail management product, if offered in Section 9. Products and services associated with this transition to the value add product would be considered separately from this proposal.)

12.4 Potential System Integration and Interface Development: The Judiciary also desires to interface and/or integrate other ancillary systems into the new case management solution for specific functionality. It is the Judiciary's intention to investigate these options with the selected offeror to improve the data exchange between the Idaho Judiciary and the ancillary system(s) and/or to attain operational efficiencies. Please describe your approach to either interfacing ancillary systems to your application or to incorporating the functionality provided by ancillary systems within your application for the following (identify existing clients that are currently using your proposed solution for such integrations, as applicable):

- 12.4.1 Court Audio Recordings. Describe your ability to support integration opportunities with ForTheRecord products into the case management solution.
- 12.4.2 Web Infrastructure for Treatment Services (WITS). Describe your experience, if any, to support integration opportunities with WITS (reference <http://www.witsweb.org/home.asp>) for client coordination and financial management of individuals in problem solving courts.

- 12.4.3 Idaho Department of Corrections (IDOC). Describe your ability to support a system-to-system integration and/or interface with IDOC's internally developed corrections management system to provide hearing, conviction, probation, license suspension, financial (e.g. fines, fees and restitution), and other applicable information.
- 12.4.4 Third Party Jail Management Systems. Describe your ability to support additional third-party integration with other vendor-provided or internally-developed jail management systems that may already or will exist within state and/or local jails. Describe the technical integration method and challenges.
- 12.4.5 Third Party Probation Management Systems. Describe your ability to support additional third-party integration with other vendor-provided or internally-developed probation management systems that may already or will exist within state and/or local jurisdictions. Additionally, describe your ability to support integration opportunities with vendors that provide services to probation departments for drug testing, electronic monitoring, interlock compliance and other supervision services. Describe the technical integration method and challenges.
- 12.4.6 Third Party Jury Management Systems. Describe your ability to support third-party integration with other vendors for jury management. Describe the technical integration method and challenges. (Note: The intent of the Idaho Judiciary is to provide a statewide jury management capability; however, specific counties may elect to not immediately use this statewide solution, thereby driving the potential need for the proposed solution to integrate with other third party jury management systems.)
- 12.4.7 Third Party Electronic Payments. Describe your ability to support third-party integration to your proposed solution for electronic payment processing. Describe the technical integration method and challenges.
- 12.4.8 Third Party Accounting and Finance Systems. Describe your ability to support third-party integration to your proposed solution for accounting and finance information (e.g. statewide accounting system, local county finance systems, etc.). Describe the technical integration method and challenges.
- 12.4.9 Other. Identify your ability and experience integrating any other third party vendor supplied products.
- 12.5** Cloud-Based Data Exchange: The Judiciary desires the ability to understand how the proposed solution could be used to share specific data with other states such as offender, conviction and warrant information. Please describe your proposed solution's capabilities to exchange information with other entities, and provide examples of how your solution is currently being used by other customers in this manner.

13. SYSTEM ANALYSIS, DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

- 13.1** This section of the RFP defines the required components of any offeror's response to the RFP regarding the system analysis, design and implementation.

13.2 System Analysis and Design: Describe your approach to analyzing the existing capabilities within Idaho's current case management systems (to include both the trial court and appellate systems) compared to your case management system and how you propose to address any differences. In your response, please address (at a minimum), the following:

13.2.1 Describe your process to understand Idaho's current business processes and practices and how these processes and/or practices could then be either addressed in the proposed solution or how you would facilitate consideration of business process and/or practice changes.

13.2.2 Describe your process to understand and identify Idaho's functional and statutory requirements compared to your proposed case management solution for both Idaho's trial and appellate court needs.

13.2.3 Describe your process to identify, document and address any gaps in capability with your proposed solution compared to Idaho's current systems.

13.2.4 Describe your process to identify, modify and enhance the offeror's product to address unique Idaho requirements.

13.3 System Implementation: Describe your approach toward implementation of your case management application. In responding, please ensure that the following points are addressed:

13.3.1 **Piloting and Sequencing:** Describe the structure and approach that you use to determine an appropriate rollout strategy and pilot installation. Specifically address your preferred rollout strategies based on your experience and success (e.g. court rollout, case type, etc.).

13.3.2 **Rollout Support:** Describe the level of support that you provide for individual courts during the initial days and weeks of the rollout to include technical and functional support resources. Describe any Idaho Judiciary resources that may be required to execute your proposed rollout strategy. As part of this description, specifically identify your plan for deploying both offeror and/or Idaho Judiciary court process experts in courts during rollout period. Describe how this process would be implemented, based on the offeror's experience to include time periods, resources needs, etc.

13.3.3 **Transition to Normal Operations:** Describe the processes, tools, and/or resources you will use to transition an individual court from a rollout phase to an operational phase, including any handoff procedures or checks that will occur during this process.

13.4 Additional System Transitions: Describe your approach toward transitioning the following applications currently employed by the Idaho Judiciary. Provide examples of how you have supported a transition from previous statewide systems to your proposed solution:

13.4.1 **Public Access / Repository:** Describe how you would support a transition for the public and extended access users who leverage the Idaho Judiciary's existing repository web application during the transition to the proposed solution.

13.4.2 **Appellate System:** Describe how you would support a transition of the Idaho Judiciary's existing appellate case management system, used for the Court of Appeals and the Idaho Supreme Court. Provide information regarding when and how this transition would be proposed as part of your implementation.

13.4.3 **Jury Management:** Describe how you would propose a transition of multiple jury management solutions used by various courts to a statewide jury management solution (if included as part of the final solution).

14. SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS, SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE

14.1 This section of the RFP defines the required components of any offeror's response to the RFP regarding maintenance and support of the proposed solution.

14.2 **Service Level Agreements / Support:** Describe your service level agreements and support plans available to the Idaho Judiciary for the proposed solution. Provide a copy of the proposed service level agreements. When responding, provide information to include but not limited to the following:

14.2.1 Describe the levels of support (if multiple levels are offered) and what is included for each level.

14.2.2 Describe the support delivery channels. (e.g., manuals, on-line help, phone, e-mail, etc.).

14.2.3 Describe the support response times, to include break/fix response processes

14.2.4 Describe the method of notice to customers for new features, support issues, etc., such as customer information bulletins. Provide samples if available.

14.2.5 Describe any user groups available that the Idaho Judiciary could be a part of (e.g., frequency of meetings, location of regional groups, etc.).

14.2.6 Describe your process, if any, to assign an account manager to oversee support issues for the account. Describe the activities and services provided by this manager.

14.2.7 Describe your standard warranty terms and period(s).

14.2.8 Describe any support, if any, that the offeror would provide directly to court employees/end-users (e.g., clerks, judges, etc.) for products provided as part of the proposed solution.

14.2.9 Describe the support, if any, that the offeror would provide directly to non-court employees/end-users (e.g., attorneys, pro se litigants, etc.) for products provided as part of the proposed solution.

14.3 **Maintenance:** Describe your maintenance plans and process to the Idaho Judiciary for the proposed solution to include but not limited to the following:

- 14.3.1 Describe the frequency of maintenance releases (e.g., quarterly, semi-annual, annual, etc.) and what is typically included in such releases.
- 14.3.2 Describe your version release cycle to include the frequency of full version upgrades. (e.g., annual, bi-annual, etc.)
- 14.3.3 Describe the terms of your maintenance agreement, specifically regarding what is:
 - 14.3.3.1 Included (e.g. new version upgrades, architectural changes to the solution, etc.)
 - 14.3.3.2 Not included (e.g. new version upgrades, architectural changes to the solution, etc.)
- 14.3.4 Provide a copy of applicable maintenance agreements.
- 14.3.5 Describe inclusion of any maintenance services and/or development/customization services, if any, provided as part of the maintenance agreement to address legislative changes or other mandated requirements.

15. FUTURE PRODUCT AND SERVICE ROADMAP

- 15.1** This section of the RFP defines the components of any offeror's response to the RFP regarding future product development and/or enhancements, as well as services, associated with the scope of this RFP. Specifically, the offeror is asked to provide detailed information, with timelines, regarding such new capabilities or improvements.
- 15.2 Product enhancement /changes:** Describe your plans, if any, to enhance, change and/or improve the proposed solution in the following specific functional areas. Provide targeted timelines as well as differentiate those items that would be included as part of the maintenance agreement versus those items that would require new licensing:
 - 15.2.1 Case management/processing
 - 15.2.2 Document/content management
 - 15.2.3 Electronic filing and electronic service
 - 15.2.4 Judicial workbench/interface
 - 15.2.5 In-court clerk's workbench/interface
 - 15.2.6 Public access/repository
 - 15.2.7 Reporting and analytics
 - 15.2.8 Problem-solving courts/supervision
 - 15.2.9 Child protection/welfare

- 15.2.10 Appellate courts
- 15.2.11 Jury management
- 15.2.12 Collections
- 15.2.13 Electronic payments
- 15.2.14 Public defender/prosecutor modules
- 15.3** Describe future plans for your case management application in terms of the following aspects:
 - 15.3.1 Architecture
 - 15.3.2 Operating system
 - 15.3.3 Database
 - 15.3.4 Client software platform changes
 - 15.3.5 Integration with handheld devices. (e.g., tablets, mobile phones, etc.)
- 15.4** Any other new features and/or enhancements that you anticipate will be incorporated into your case management application within the next 365 days, not previously covered in the RFP.
- 15.5** Describe any other aspects of the long-term vision/strategy for the proposed solution.
- 15.6** Describe your vision for collaborative enhancement design and development among the offeror's clients, including how clients would come together to develop a joint design for a new functionality or capability, and how such enhancements would be priced by the offeror.
- 15.7** Describe your process for creating additional functionality or capability needed by Idaho as a unique feature of Idaho's application, how such enhancements are defined and agreed upon, how they are priced, what ongoing costs are associated with maintenance of those capabilities when new versions of offeror's products are released, and what credit if any will Idaho receive if other clients purchase the same capability.

16. TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

- 16.1 System Architecture:** Any proposed case management application must be "centrally administered" and maintainable by Idaho Judiciary staff without onsite or online remote offeror support. The application architecture must be browser based (which can include a web-client plug-in, wrapper, and/or rich Internet application to facilitate an enhanced user experience and functionality). The offeror should provide the following:
 - 16.1.1 Detailed overview of the standard system architecture required by your solution.

- 16.1.2 Detailed description of any client-side software (to include web-client plug-ins, wrappers and/or rich Internet application platforms) needed to operate the proposed solution.
- 16.1.3 Describe the ability of the proposed solution to support various operating systems (e.g. Windows 8, Mac OS X, etc.) and web browsers (e.g. Microsoft Internet Explorer, Mozilla Firefox, Google Chrome, Apple Safari, etc.). Discuss how the offeror plans for and updates the solution to ensure broad support for new releases/upgrades of operating systems and web browsers.
- 16.1.4 Describe any technical architecture and/or features (either client or server-side) to facilitate improved application performance. Describe any additional architectural or technical features available in your solution to ensure appropriate performance for a centralized architecture in a highly distributed, large geographic area (similar to Idaho's courts). Specifically describe how you've addressed this performance in other customer implementations.
- 16.1.5 Describe the security architecture employed by your application and detail on how it provides server, client, application layer and database security controls. Idaho requires role-based security for both internal and external users.
- 16.1.6 Describe the security testing and remediation process used to identify and fix vulnerabilities within the application code of the proposed solution. Discuss how this process is used in the development and pre-release process, as well as any on-going testing of existing applications to ensure appropriate security levels.
- 16.1.7 Describe the identity management and access management architecture; indicate whether the proposed solution integrates with LDAP.
- 16.1.8 Outline a recommended backup and disaster recovery/business continuity strategy.

16.2 Network Architecture. The application should function within the physical constraints of the Idaho Judiciary's network environment. It should provide an acceptable application response time for common transactions, ensuring the timely and efficient processing of cases and usability. Offerors should provide the following:

- 16.2.1 Describe the required network infrastructure and related performance requirements (e.g. minimum bandwidth, etc.) to ensure optimal application performance for end-users.
- 16.2.2 Describe, if any, wide area network (WAN) optimization or related features that your application has to guarantee or ensure appropriate performance for end-users.
- 16.2.3 Describe the transmission security capabilities employed by your application (e.g. session control, encryption, etc.) to protect sensitive data.

16.3 Database Architecture: Provide a description and diagram of the database model recommended for your case management application while addressing the following:

- 16.3.1 The overall data structure, including table relationships, high-level data flow and/or data structure diagrams. Provide a sample of the database record layout, a sample list of data elements, and/or a sample of the database schema.
- 16.3.2 Description of how the database(s) maintain linkage between participants with a particular emphasis how the database(s) maintain linkages between unique parties.
- 16.3.3 Description of how database events are logged, retained, and maintained as events are modified, added or deleted, with a particular emphasis on financial data.
- 16.3.4 Description of how court business rules/constraints are enforced within the database structure.
- 16.3.5 Description of how distributed instances of the case management application's databases can be synchronized with a central instance, if distributed instances are needed. (Note: The Idaho Judiciary prefers a centralized database approach; however, if a distributed instance is needed at a later time, this information should explain any technical requirements and/or challenges.)
- 16.3.6 Describe the database management software that your application requires. If there are multiple database types available, list all options giving version and release numbers.

16.4 Technical Platform: Offerors must provide responses regarding the technical platform requirements and/or recommendations for the proposed solution, to include the following:

- 16.4.1 Describe and/or identify any recommendations that you make to optimize application performance of your proposed solution.
- 16.4.2 Identify all operating systems that will support your proposed application. In the event that there are multiple operating systems available, list all options, and provide versions and release numbers.
- 16.4.3 Describe if your proposed solution operates within a virtualized environment. Provide examples of customers operating the proposed solution using virtualization. Identify any components of your proposed solution that cannot (or are not recommended to) operate in a virtual environment and explain why.
- 16.4.4 List any software support products required to support your recommended computing environment and describe any additional software products (to include version numbers) required to effectively and efficiently run your proposed application software.
- 16.4.5 Provide detailed recommendations (including minimum and recommended configurations, recommended model numbers, part numbers, storage sizes) for hardware, software and required ancillary licensing (if any) needed by your application that are required for successful deployment. Include detailed specifications, if available.

- 16.4.6 Identify any end-user equipment for court employees that are required to fully use your proposed solution. Provide detailed recommendations, with specifications, for such equipment.
- 16.4.7 Provide a short documentation sample that is representative of your standard application documentation package.

17. RISKS AND CONSTRAINTS

17.1 Identification of Risks and Constraints. Based on the scope of work detailed in this RFP, identify any risks or constraints that you will need to address prior to or during the performance of the work, as well as a description of how you will address each one. Identify any further risks and/or issues that you anticipate may need to be addressed to ensure a successful implementation. Provide your response to this section on no more than two, double-spaced typewritten pages.

Use Section 18 of this RFP as the outline for your response to the Cost Proposal requirements of the RFP.

18. COST SPECIFICATIONS

- 18.1** The Cost Proposal is a combination of the offeror's written response to items listed below as well as the completion of the Cost Response Form found in Attachment 4. Offerors must complete the Cost Response Form and submit it with their written responses to the cost proposal information requested below. Offerors are encouraged to provide any supplemental information beyond the Cost Response Form, if needed, to fully explain their licensing, maintenance and services offerings.
- 18.2** For services-based work, costs are requested to reflect two separate options for the body of work: Time & Materials and Fixed Cost. Upon contract negotiation with the selected offeror, Idaho will determine which option to exercise as part of the final contract negotiation for services-based work efforts.
- 18.3** The proposed costs must directly relate to the project work plan, address the services outlined through this RFP, and clearly identify the following components:
- 18.3.1 Software Licensing and Costs – Identify software licensing included in your proposal. Provide an itemized list of the costs of all software being proposed. (Note: Do not include the estimated cost of customization proposed to meet the functional requirements as part of Software Licensing and Costs; these costs, if any, shall be outlined separately in section 18.3.6 and 18.3.7).
- 18.3.1.1 The offeror should provide the Idaho Judiciary with pricing models that provides flexibility to the Judiciary. The Idaho Judiciary prefers a “site license” model versus a per-user license model; however, any model proposed must provide the flexibility for the Idaho Judiciary to move within the licensing (and associated) pricing model when new courts are added or as the needs of the Judiciary change. Offerors must provide a statement of agreement with this requirement and include a full description of their proposed licensing structure and a copy of the terms and conditions of the licensing agreement with their proposals.
- 18.3.1.2 If an offeror can provide a component as a choice between a.) On-premise, licensed component of software or b.) Software as a Service (SaaS) (replacing or reducing the licensed component of software), the offeror should identify the licensed component option as part of the proposed software licensing that would be eliminated or reduced. On the Cost Response Form, clearly annotate in the SaaS section if this software license (and associated costs) would be eliminated or reduced if the Idaho Judiciary were to select a SaaS option.
- 18.3.2 Software Maintenance and Support Costs – Identify all software maintenance and support costs included to maintain and support the proposed solution. Clearly identify when maintenance and support costs will commence as part of the

project (e.g., at end of full implementation, etc.). Distinctly describe how software maintenance and support costs are determined (e.g., percent of software licenses, etc.). Provide detailed information on what is included in the maintenance and support agreement. Preference will be given to offeror's that include development and/or support for annual legislative changes or other mandated requirements as part of the maintenance and support agreement.

18.3.2.1 If an offeror has elected to provide a choice between a.) On-premise, licensed component of software or b.) Software as a Service (SaaS) (replacing or reducing the licensed component of software), the offeror should clearly identify the amount of maintenance that would be eliminated and/or reduced if the Idaho Judiciary were to select the SaaS option.

18.3.2.2. As discussed in Section 1, the initial term of the Agreement will be for five (5) full production years after final system acceptance. At the end of the fifth year of production use, and upon mutual agreement, the Idaho Judiciary may renew the contract on an annual basis, or a mutually agreed upon, fiscally responsible renewal term. If an annual renewal term is used, the annual renewal pricing will not exceed 3.5% over the previous year's renewal term. The offeror should acknowledge this requirement. Furthermore, describe how future year maintenance increases are determined by the offeror and provide examples (e.g. percent) of typical maintenance increases with other customers.

18.3.3 Software as a Service (SaaS) Option Costs (if any) – If the offeror proposes a SaaS option, clearly identify the costs to the Idaho Judiciary as well as any costs (e.g., transactional, subscription, etc.) to users or any other entity. Provide as much detail as possible regarding these costs so that the Evaluation Committee can fully understand the cost structure for the service. Additionally, if the SaaS option replaces and/or reduces the licensing costs identified in section 18.3.1, the offeror should clearly identify which line item and amount was reduced.

18.3.4 Hardware Costs – Provide an itemized list of all hardware, if any, required for this proposal and the price of this equipment if procured from the offeror. It is important to note that the Idaho Judiciary reserves the right to purchase specified hardware from its own hardware vendor(s) and may not include hardware in the final contract.

18.3.5 Implementation Costs – Describe and list all costs that would be associated with the implementation of the systems. These costs may include, but are not limited to, design, gap analysis, business process review, installation, configuration, integration, interfacing, project management, training, data conversion, and implementation services. Offerors are requested to provide two separate options for the body of work: Time & Materials and Fixed Cost.

18.3.6 Customization Costs – Describe and list all estimated costs associated with any customization where column "C" was marked in the Functional Specification Response Form in Attachment 5. For purposes of evaluation and comparison, offerors are requested to provide Customization Costs in two aspects: a.) a

cumulative cost estimate for all customizations reflected in all sections of the Functional Specification Response Form; and, b.) a cost estimate for each section on the Functional Specification Response Form. (Note: The section cost estimate should reflect the costs for the scope of work of all customizations required for that specific functional set of specifications. Do not provide a line item cost for each customization item listed in the section.) This breakout will be used by the evaluation team to understand the amount and scope of customization required for each set of functionality. The Idaho Judiciary reserves the right to contract for all, any, or none of the customizations identified in the Functional Specification.

18.3.7 Idaho specific customizations other than conformance with functional requirements – Assuming that the initial phases of the implementation strategy identify customizations necessary or desired for Idaho that were not included within the functional requirements and are not provided in the offeror’s solution, provide the offeror’s cost structure for providing these customizations. Provide both Time & Materials and Fixed Cost approaches to providing these services.

18.3.8 Other Costs – Provide an itemized list of any costs not identified elsewhere in this RFP (e.g. travel, software not included, transactional fees, etc.).

18.3.9 Cost Summary – Carry forward detailed costs from preceding pages to summarize the one-time and five-year ongoing costs for the proposed solution.

18.4 The offeror must provide a fully-burdened rate which must include, but not be limited to, all operating and personnel expenses, such as: overhead, salaries, administrative expenses, profit, supplies, software licensing, per diem, etc. unless otherwise specified in the Other Costs section.

19. STANDARD AGREEMENTS

19.1 The offeror must submit a form of the standard agreements for the following items, as applicable:

19.1.1 Standard software license

19.1.2 Software as a Service (cloud) subscription agreement

19.1.3 Maintenance agreement (previously requested in section 14.3.4 of the RFP)

19.1.4 Professional services agreement

19.1.5 Any other agreement(s) the offeror may wish to propose or use if selected as the apparent successful offeror

19.2 The Idaho Judiciary will not be bound to these submitted agreements. Final agreements will be established as outlined in sections 1.2 and 22 of the RFP.

20. PROPOSAL REVIEW AND EVALUATION

- 20.1** The objective of the Idaho Judiciary in soliciting and evaluating proposals is to ensure the selection of a firm or individual that will produce the best possible results for the funds expended. As stated in Section 1.2, this RFP is issued to provide a comparative evaluation of similar solutions provided by various offerors and to facilitate a competitive procurement process. This RFP is not issued pursuant to, including but not limited to, title 67, Idaho Code, nor governed by the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act.
- 20.2** All proposals will be reviewed first to ensure that they meet the Minimum Requirements of the RFP listed in Section 6 and Attachment 2. Any proposal(s) not meeting these requirements will be found non-responsive. Proposals that meet the requirements will continue in the evaluation process outlined in this section.
- 20.3** The proposals will be evaluated and scored by the Evaluation Committee and/or other authorized designee(s).
- 20.4** The top offerors (2 or more offerors) with the highest scores after the evaluation of the proposals may be asked to make oral presentations and provide detailed demonstrations of the proposed solution to the Evaluation Committee (or other authorized designees). This is an optional phase of the evaluation process and may not be exercised if deemed unnecessary by the Evaluation Committee. If deemed necessary, the invited offerors should expect to give an overview of their proposals and respond to questions, which may include hypothetical scenarios, quality assurance issues, software issues, hardware issues, technology issues and project implementation services. Offerors should plan for two (2) days of oral presentation and detailed demonstrations. Responses become an official part of the proposal and will be evaluated (any costs incurred by the offerors associated with oral presentations are the responsibility of the offeror.)
- 20.5** The Evaluation Committee may elect to conduct customer site visit(s) for a specific offeror(s). This is an optional phase of the evaluation process and may not be exercised if deemed unnecessary by the Evaluation Committee. If deemed necessary, the selected offeror(s) will be notified of the desire by the Evaluation Committee and arrangements will be made to ensure a timely visit to identified customer(s). The site visits, if exercised, will be conducted by a subset of the Evaluation Committee at the expense of the Idaho Judicial Branch.
- 20.6** The RFP evaluation scoring criteria will be distributed across two (2) phases of evaluation, as follows:
- 20.6.1 Phase 1: An initial maximum allocation of 1,000 points may be awarded based upon the offeror's responses to each evaluation factor as follows:
- 20.6.1.1 Business Proposal: Up to 200 points may be awarded based on the offeror's ability to meet the Idaho Judiciary's business requirements.

20.6.1.2 Scope of Work Proposal: Up to 600 points may be awarded based on the offeror's Scope of Work Proposal based on the following:

- Functionality and Functional Specifications: Up to 240 points may be awarded based on the functional capabilities of the proposed solutions.
- Project Approach, Implementation, Services and Capabilities: Up to 210 points may be awarded based on the offeror's overall project strategy and approach to meeting the objectives of the court, to include the following:
 - Project Strategy and Approach
 - Data Conversion, System Integration and Interfaces
 - Systems Analysis, Design and Implementation Plan
 - Service Level Agreements, Support and Maintenance
 - Future Product and Services Roadmap
 - Risks and Constraints
- Technology Requirements: Up to 150 points may be awarded based on the offeror's responses to the technical requirements.

20.6.1.3 Cost Proposal: The cost proposal will be awarded 200 points. A total of 150 points will be awarded to the offeror with the lowest total costs reflected on the Cost Response Form (comprised of the following: licensing, software maintenance and support, fixed bid, time and materials, customization and other costs); remaining offerors will be awarded a proportional amount of the 150 points based on their cost versus the lowest cost solution. The remaining 50 points may be awarded based on the offeror's response to the cost requirements and requests.

20.6.2 Phase 2: An additional allocation of 700 points may be awarded based upon the results of the following, optional evaluation steps:

20.6.2.1 Oral Presentation and Demonstration: Up to 500 points may be awarded based upon an evaluation of finalist offeror's oral demonstrations.

20.6.2.2 Customer Site Visits: Up to 200 points may be awarded based upon an evaluation of the proposed solution in an existing customer's environment.

20.7 The evaluation process will include the following:

20.7.1 The RFP Lead or his designee(s) may contact the offeror for clarification of the offeror's response.

20.7.2 Responsive proposals will be evaluated by the Evaluation Committee and/or specified designees for those aspects of the Proposals that have been assigned a point value.

20.7.3 Upon completion of the evaluation (Phase 1), the Evaluation Committee will make a determination on which (if any) steps in Phase 2 will be conducted to further evaluate the offerors. The Evaluation Committee reserves the right to select none, one, or more offerors for this phase.

20.8 The responsive offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the Idaho Judiciary, taking into consideration the evaluation factors, will be recommended for contract award.

21. GENERAL CONDITIONS

21.1 No Obligation. This procurement in no manner obligates the State of Idaho, the Idaho Judiciary, or any of its agencies to the use of any proposed professional services until a valid written contract is awarded and approved by the appropriate authorities.

21.2 Termination. This RFP may be canceled at any time and any and all proposals may be rejected in whole or in part when the Idaho Judiciary determines such action to be in the best interest of the Idaho Judiciary.

21.3 Sufficient Appropriation. Any contract awarded as a result of this RFP process may be terminated if sufficient appropriations or authorizations do not exist. Such termination will be effected by sending written notice to the contractor. The Idaho Judiciary's decision as to whether sufficient appropriations and authorizations are available will be accepted by the contractor as final.

21.4 Legal Review. The Idaho Judiciary requires that all offerors agree to be bound by the general requirements contained in this RFP. Any offeror concerns must be promptly brought to the attention of the RFP Lead.

21.5 Governing Law. This procurement and any resulting agreements with offerors shall be governed by the laws of the State of Idaho.

21.6 Basis for Proposal. Only information supplied by the Idaho Judiciary in writing through the RFP Lead or in this RFP should be used as the basis for the preparation of offeror proposals.

21.7 Offeror Qualifications. The Evaluation Committee and/or RFP Lead (or his/her designee) may make such investigations as necessary to determine the qualifications of an offeror and to determine the validity of answers provided by said offeror.

21.8 Right to Waive Minor Irregularities. The Evaluation Committee reserves the right to waive minor irregularities. This right is at the sole discretion of the Evaluation Committee.

21.9 Idaho Judiciary Rights. The Idaho Judiciary reserves the right to accept all or a portion of an offeror's proposal.

21.10 Ownership of Proposals. All documents submitted in response to this Request for Proposal(s) shall become the property of the Idaho Judiciary and the Supreme Court of Idaho. Materials will not be returned to the offeror. The Idaho Judiciary is under no obligation whatsoever with respect to submitted information and that the offeror releases the Idaho Judiciary from liability arising out of or related to the Idaho Judiciary's use of any submitted information.

- 21.11 Electronic Mail Address Required.** A large part of the communication regarding this procurement will be conducted by electronic mail (email). Offeror must have a valid email address to receive this correspondence
- 21.12 Project Team Prohibited Activities.** Court employees or Evaluation Committee members or observers or volunteers are prohibited from participating directly or indirectly in the preparation of this procurement when the employee knows that the individual or any member of the individual's family has a financial interest in the business seeking or obtaining a contract. Once the RFP is issued, potential offerors, their employees, partners, and family members may only communicate with the RFP Lead or his designee relative to any aspect of this RFP.
- 21.13 Incurring Cost.** Any cost incurred by the offeror in preparation, transmittal, presentation of any proposal or material submitted in response to this RFP shall be borne solely by the offeror.
- 21.14 Prime Contractor Responsibility.** Any contract that may result from this RFP shall specify that the prime contractor is solely responsible for fulfillment of the contract with the Idaho Judiciary. The Idaho Judiciary will make contract payments to only the prime contractor.
- 21.15 Subcontractors.** Use of subcontractors must be clearly explained in the proposal, and major subcontractors must be identified by name. The prime contractor shall be wholly responsible for the entire performance whether or not subcontractors are used.
- 21.16 Amended Proposals.** An offeror may submit an amended proposal before the deadline for receipt of proposals. Such amended proposals must be complete replacements for a previously submitted proposal and must be clearly identified as such in the transmittal letter. The Idaho Judiciary personnel will not merge, collate, or assemble proposal materials.
- 21.17 Offeror's Rights to Withdraw Proposal.** Offerors will be allowed to withdraw their proposals at any time prior to the deadline for receipt of proposals. The offeror must submit a written withdrawal request signed by the offeror's duly authorized representative addressed to the RFP Lead.
- 21.18 Proposal Offer Firm Responses.** Offeror responses to this RFP, including proposal prices, will be considered firm for ninety (90) days after the due date for receipt of proposals.
- 21.19 Initial Term of Contract and Renewals:** Initial term of the Agreement will be for five (5) full production years after final system acceptance. At the end of the fifth year of production use, and upon mutual agreement, the Idaho Judiciary may renew the contract on an annual basis, or a mutually agreed upon, fiscally responsible renewal term. If an annual renewal term is used, the annual renewal pricing will not exceed 3.5% over the previous year's renewal term.

22. PRE-CONTRACT AWARD DISCUSSIONS

- 22.1** Prior to contract award, the Idaho Supreme Court's Administrative Office of the Court and the apparent successful offeror will clarify expectations, agree to any special terms and conditions, agree on the services cost model (fixed price and/or time and materials), and finalize contractual agreements. As part of the final contractual agreement, the Administrative Office of the Court may require that the venue for the adjudication or disposition of any claim, action or dispute arising out of the agreement be in the courts of Ada County, Idaho. Additionally, the Office may impose a mandatory arbitration provision in any final agreement, which will be handled in the State of Idaho.
- 22.2** Prior to contract award, the apparent successful offeror must develop, in partnership with the Administrative Office of the Court, a project management plan for the implementation of the deliverables and services. The project management plan will contain all points of clarification, and an agreed upon schedule for the implementation of the services, identifying a critical path timeline, critical path tasks, and major deliverables. Payments will be based upon major deliverable testing and acceptance by the Administrative Office of the Court as agreed upon in the project management plan. Once completed, the project management plan will be signed by the offeror and the Administrative Office of the Court and will become an artifact of the contract. Once the contract is in place, all modifications to the project management plan must be reviewed and approved by the Administrative Office of the Court and an amended artifact released via a change order to the contract.
- 22.3** Should after twenty (20) Idaho state government working days from the start of pre-contract award discussions, the Administrative Office of the Court and the apparent successful offeror are not able to finalize a project management plan and contract, the Administrative Office of the Court may terminate discussions, find the apparent successful offeror non-responsive, and deem the second highest ranked offeror as the apparent successful offeror. The Administrative Office of the Court may then enter into pre-contract award discussions with them. The Idaho Supreme Court and/or Idaho Judiciary will not be liable for any offeror costs associated with pre-contract award discussions.
- 22.4** During pre-contract award discussions, the offeror will ensure that all required documentation such as letters of credit, are in the offeror's possession and ready for inclusion in the contract. The Administrative Office of the Court will not issue a contract to the offeror until all contract document requirements are in the Administrative Office of the Court's possession. It is expected that any delay in issuing the contract will impact project management plan schedules, and place the offeror in danger of missing delivery of the first major deliverable.
- 22.5** Creation and modifications to the project management plan are the responsibility of the offeror. Modifications are not effective until agreed to between the Administrative Office of the Court and the offeror, and memorialized via a change order to the contract. All modifications to the project management plan and/or contract will carry the signatures of the Administrative Office of the Court and the offeror.

ATTACHMENT 1: OFFEROR QUESTIONS

PLEASE DO NOT IDENTIFY YOUR NAME OR YOUR COMPANY'S NAME OR PRODUCT NAMES OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN YOUR QUESTIONS.

ADD ROWS BY HITTING THE TAB KEY WHILE WITHIN THE TABLE AND WITHIN THE FINAL ROW.

The following instructions must be followed when submitting questions using the question format on the following page.

1. DO NOT CHANGE THE FORMAT OR FONT. Do not bold your questions or change the color of the font.
2. Enter the RFP section number that the question relates to in the "RFP Section" field (column 2). If the question is a general question not related to a specific RFP section, enter "General" in column 2. If the question is in regards to a General Condition, state the number in column 2. If the question is in regard to an attachment, enter the attachment identifier (example "Attachment 1") in the "RFP Section" (column 2), and the attachment page number in the "RFP page" field (column 3).
3. Do not enter text in column 5 (Response). This is for the State's use only.
4. Once completed, this form is to be e-mailed per the instructions in the RFP. The e-mail subject line is to state the RFP number followed by "Questions."

Offeror Question Template

RFP # [] (Title of Service)

Question	RFP Section	RFP Page	Question	Response
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				

ATTACHMENT 2: MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS ATTESTATION FORM

Annotate in column Y/N (Yes = Y; No = N) stating whether you can comply with each minimum requirement. If you feel there are extenuating circumstances requiring an explanation, use the Comment column to clarify. **Complete both pages of the attestation form.**

Minimum Requirement	Y/N	Comment
Minimum Product Requirements: Does your proposed solution include the following components and/or capabilities as part of the COTS, "out-of-the-box" solution?		
Party-centric case/court management to include case processing, calendaring, docketing, financial management, workflow, warrants, (to include the ability to change attorney and party contact information and to link parties to cases), and time standards measurements		
Integrated document/content management to facilitate comprehensive case information		
Electronic filing (e-filing) to permit the filing of legal documents/information by electronic means and to facilitate a fully integrated filing process from the filer into the case management solution environment, from the filer to other parties, and from the court case management solution to filers. E-filing also includes the filing of court-created documents and notices and their electronic communication to parties.		
Web-based repository to facilitate public access as well as secure access for specific judicial partners to case information and documents		
Reporting capabilities to include standardized (out-of-the-box reports) and the ability to create custom reports, to include the measurement of time standards		
Problem-solving court and supervision capabilities to support Idaho's problem-solving court efforts; such capabilities should include tracking and measuring client progress through the problem-solving court process		
Multiple court architecture in a centralized system to serve numerous courts, counties, and communities of interest, providing security controls to limit access to the appropriate users while supporting a statewide view of all courts		
Data/information exchange architecture to facilitate standards based integration and/or data exchanges including support of National Information Exchange Model/Electronic Court Filing 2.0 or later and Electronic Court Filing 4.0 or later (NIEM/ECF) based data exchanges with other entities.		
Configurable application features to minimize and/or relieve the Idaho Judiciary of the need to modify the solution in the future as we modify or streamline our		

Minimum Requirement	Y/N	Comment
business practices		
Electronic payments to facilitate statewide on-line, integrated payment processing, to include a payment mechanism for document access, public web portal access, and other fees that the Idaho Judiciary may elect to and/or need to collect.		
Minimum Technical Requirements: Does your proposed solution meet the following technical requirements?		
Does the proposed solution operate within Microsoft Windows Server, Unix, or Linux server operating system environments?		
Does the proposed solution operate on a Microsoft SQL or Oracle database environment?		
Is the proposed offering a browser-based solution (which can include a web-client plug-in, wrapper and/or rich Internet application to facilitate an enhanced user experience and functionality)?		
Is the proposed solution able to operate on Microsoft Windows XP (32-bit version) and Windows 7 (32-bit and 64-bit versions)?		
Minimum Production Experience Requirements: Does your proposed solution meet the following production experience requirements?		
Is the proposed solution currently operating, for no less than one hundred and twenty (120) production days prior to the release date of this solicitation, in a statewide or large multi-jurisdictional/multi-site court environment with demonstrated support for at least 500 concurrent users? (Note: Production days does not include training or testing.)		

ATTACHMENT 3: REFERENCES

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE OFFEROR:

Offerors will be scored on at least three (3) completed reference questionnaires (if more than three are received, reference scores will be averaged). The completed reference questionnaires must be from individuals, companies, or agencies with knowledge of the offeror's experience that is similar in nature and scope to the products or services being requested by this RFP, and are within the last seven (7) years from the date this RFP was issued.

References not received prior to the RFP Closing Date and Time will receive a score of "0" for that reference. References outside the requisite number of years (see paragraph above), and references determined to not be of a similar nature and scope to the products or services requested by this RFP will also receive a score of "0" points. **Determination of similar will be made by using the information provided by the reference in Section II of the Reference Questionnaire, General Information and any additional information provided by the reference.**

REFERENCES MUST BE RECEIVED BY THE IDAHO SUPREME COURT, DIRECTLY FROM THE REFERENCE CLIENT IN ORDER TO BE CONSIDERED.

1. Offers must complete the following information on page 2 of the "Reference's Response To" document before sending it to the Reference for response.
 - a. Print the name of your reference (company/organization) on the "REFERENCE NAME" line.
 - b. Print the name of your company/organization on the "OFFEROR NAME" line.
 - c. Be certain that the RFP Closing date and time in Instruction 5, on the following page, is correct.
2. Send the "Reference's Response To" document to your references to complete.

NOTE: It is the offeror's responsibility to follow up with its references to ensure timely receipt of all questionnaires. Offerors may e-mail the RFP Lead prior to the RFP closing date to verify receipt of references.

**REFERENCE'S RESPONSE TO:
Idaho Statewide Judicial Case Management Request for Proposal**

REFERENCE NAME (Company/Organization): _____

OFFEROR (Vendor) NAME (Company/Organization): _____ has submitted a proposal to the State of Idaho Supreme Court to provide the Idaho Judiciary with a statewide case management system. We have chosen you as one of our references.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Complete **Section I. RATING** using the Rating Scale provided.
2. Complete **Section II. GENERAL INFORMATION**
3. Complete **Section III. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT** by manually signing and dating the document. (*Reference documents must include an actual signature.*)
4. E-mail or fax **THIS PAGE** and your completed reference document, **SECTIONS I through III** to:

RFP Lead: Kevin Iwersen

E-mail: RFP@idcourts.net

Fax: (208) 334-2146
5. This completed document **MUST** be received no later than May 28, 2013 at 5:00 p.m. (Mountain Time). Reference documents received after this time will not be considered. **References received without an actual signature will not be accepted.**
6. DO **NOT** return this document to the Offeror (Vendor).
7. In addition to this document, the State may contact references by phone for further clarification if necessary.

Section I. RATING

Using the Rating Scale provided below, rate the following numbered items by circling the appropriate number for each item:

Rating Scale	
Category	Score
Poor or Inadequate Performance	0
Below Average	1 – 3
Average	4 – 6
Above Average	7 - 9
Excellent	10

Circle **ONE** number for each of the following numbered items:

1. Rate the overall quality of the vendor's services:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

2. Rate the overall quality and completeness of the vendor's product:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

3. Rate how well the agreed upon, planned schedule was consistently met and deliverables provided on time. *(This pertains to delays under the control of the vendor):*

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

4. Rate the overall customer service and timeliness in responding to customer service inquiries, issues and resolutions:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

5. Rate the knowledge of the vendor's assigned staff and their ability to accomplish duties as contracted:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

6. Rate the accuracy and timeliness of the vendor's billing and/or invoices:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

7. Rate the vendor's capability to provide you with an accurate cost estimate for the products and/or services procured: *(This pertains to the original scope of the project):*

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

8. Rate the vendor's ability to quickly and thoroughly resolve a problem related to the services provided:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

9. Rate the vendor's flexibility in meeting business requirements:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

10 Rate the likelihood of your company/organization recommending this vendor to others in the future:

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Section II. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Please include a brief description of the services provided by this vendor:

2. During what time period did the vendor provide these services for your business?

Month:_____ Year:_____ to Month:_____ Year:_____

Section III. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I affirm to the best of my knowledge that the information I have provided is true, correct, and factual:

Signature of Reference

Date

Print Name

Title

Phone Number

E-mail address

ATTACHMENT 4: COST PROPOSAL

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE OFFEROR:

Offerors will be scored on both the “Cost Response Form” and the offeror’s written responses to the items listed in Section 18. When returning the responses to the Cost Proposal, provide both the completed “Cost Response Form” as well as the written responses as the Cost Proposal. Do not combine answers or forms with any other portions of the RFP to include, but not limited to, Business Proposal or the Scope of Work Proposal.

USE THE MICROSOFT EXCEL FILE TITLED, “COST RESPONSE FORM” TO PROVIDE SPECIFIC COST AMOUNTS TO THIS SECTION OF THE RFP.

ATTACHMENT 5: FUNCTIONAL SPECIFICATION RESPONSE - EXPLANATION

The Functional Specification Response Form is provided to offeror's as a separate attachment in the form of a Microsoft Word document. This Word form outlines the desired features and functions for the new solution for the Idaho Judiciary. Proper completion of the Functional Specification Response Forms is critical. Offerors are to respond to each functional specification section listed on the form. Each response must be based on the proposed solution. Each response will be one of five possible answers as follows:

S = Supported fully or configurable in proposed solution

U = Upgrade supported in future scheduled release. Provide a scheduled release date in the explanation column.

3 = 3rd Party supported - List the vendor and version/release number

C = Customization required to provide this functionality

N =Not proposed

If the "Comment" field is marked with an "asterisk," (*) use the "Offeror Explanation" field to explain "how" your solution supports the described functionality.

USE THE MICROSOFT WORD FILE TITLED, "FUNCTIONAL SPECIFICATION RESPONSE FORM" TO RESPOND TO THIS SECTION OF THE RFP

ATTACHMENT 6: LETTER OF CREDIT

LETTER OF CREDIT

Bank _____

_____, 200_

Irrevocable Letter of Credit

Number: _____

Amount: [US\$ _____]

To whom it may concern:

At the request and for the account of the Idaho Supreme Court we hereby establish our Irrevocable Letter of Credit Number _____ in your favor, available by draft(s) at sight on Bank _____, up to the aggregate sum of \$ _____ (_____ United States Dollars), inclusive of any banking charges effective as of today's date and expiring on Acceptance of the System as defined in contract # _____ dated as of _____, __, 200_.

Partial drawings are permitted. Drafts drawn under this Letter of Credit must be accompanied by the following document:

A Certificate signed by the Idaho Supreme Court's Administrative Office of the Court to the effect that the amount drawn represents funds due and payable to you because of the following reason:

Nonperformance of the Offeror (_____) pursuant to contract # _____ dated as of _____, 200_ for designing, developing, implementing, and maintaining the new Statewide Judicial Court Case Management Solution.

We hereby agree with the drawers, endorsers and holders in due course of any draft under this Letter of Credit that such drafts shall be duly honored on presentation provided that all terms and conditions of the Letter of Credit have been complied with.

This Letter of Credit is subject to the Uniform Customs and Practices for Documentary Credits (1993 Revision) International Chamber of Commerce Publication Number 500, as modified from time to time.

Yours faithfully,

For and on behalf of

Bank _____

By: _____

Title: _____

ATTACHMENT 7: Definitions, Terms and Acronyms

This section contains definitions and abbreviations that are used throughout this procurement document.

Administrative Office of the Court (AOC) - The Administrative Office of the Idaho Supreme Court is the organizational entity responsible for administrative oversight of the Courts in the State of Idaho.

Case Management System (CMS) - A computerized system that enables more efficient management of court administration processes. Also allows a court to, among other things, initiate and manage cases, manage data, create documents, create reports, manage financial information, and manage other important court functions.

Court or courts- Any (or all) organization(s) of government belonging to the judicial branch of government whose function is the application of laws to controversies brought before it and the public administration of justice.

Court Technology Committee- A committee created by the Idaho Supreme Court to make operational decisions concerning Idaho Judiciary's information technology program.

Contract- A written agreement for the procurement of items of tangible personal property or services.

Contractor- A successful offeror who enters into a binding contract.

Determination- Written documentation of a decision by the RFP Lead, procurement manager or other official Idaho Supreme Court designee including findings of fact supporting a decision. A determination becomes part of the procurement file.

Evaluation Committee- The body appointed by the Idaho Judiciary or its designees to perform the evaluation of offeror proposals and provide numeric scoring of all proposals.

Offeror- Any person, corporation, or partnership that chooses to submit a proposal to this RFP.

Request for Proposals (RFP)- All documents, including those attached or incorporated by reference, used for soliciting proposals.

RFP Lead- The person assigned by the Idaho Judiciary to manage or administer a procurement requiring the evaluation of competitive sealed proposals.

Responsible Offeror- An offeror who submits a responsive proposal and who has furnished, when required, information and data to prove that its financial resources, production or service facilities, personnel, service reputation and experience are adequate to make satisfactory delivery of the services or items of tangible personal property described in the proposal.

Responsive Offer or Responsive Proposal- An offer or proposal that conforms in all material respects to the requirements set forth in the request for proposals. Material respects of a request for proposals include, but are not limited to, price, quality, quantity or delivery requirements.

Trade Secret- Trade secrets include a formula, pattern, compilation, program, computer program, device, method, technique or process from which an offeror derives economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to its competitors, and not being readily ascertainable by proper means by other persons and which is subject to efforts by the offeror that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy.