

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT

Administrative Office of the Courts
1501 West Washington, Suite 105
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Request for Proposals RFP 15-01 Electronic Document Management Systems and Related Services

AOC RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Questions from ImageSoft, Inc.

- 1. Section 3.1.1 Introduction, paragraph 3, page 14** – You note that your strategy has been to use a standard application for individual court implementations. This application is OnBase. Does the AOC want to continue the use of the OnBase platform? Please explain your current platform strategy. **[Functional]**

AOC Response: OnBase is the Commission on Technology’s standard solution for electronic document management in Arizona courts and has been for more than a decade. Movement to any different solution for courts is not being contemplated at this time, though courts listed in Paragraph 3.1.3.7 have received exceptions to use a non-standard EDMS and other individual courts may petition to do so in the future.

- 2. Section 3.1.1 Introduction, paragraph 7, page 15** – You state that AOC is again crafting a purchasing vehicle that will allow the courts to contract directly with the vendor(s). Please explain your vendor strategy and how many vendors to you wish to contract with for the statewide contract. **[Functional]**

AOC Response: The sentence in paragraph 7 contains a typographical error and should read as follows: “The AOC is again crafting a purchasing vehicle that will allow the courts to contract directly **with a vendor.**”

3. **Section 3.1.1 Introduction, paragraph 8, page 15** – Will AOC entertain remote support services or does the AOC require that support be provided locally in Phoenix and Tucson? Please explain your support strategy. **[Functional]**

AOC Response: While remote support generally proves sufficient for the needs of the courts in Arizona, on occasion, the physical presence of a technician has been required in the past and will very likely be required in the future. Any onsite requirement would be noted in the negotiated statement of work for the individual court, but the travel and per diem costs would have to be included in the price sheet, Appendix A associated with the statewide contract.

4. **General**, Are you expecting vendors to take over just the support and maintenance of current systems, and are you expecting the vendor to provide new implementation services, licenses, and maintenance support for new implementation? Please explain your intentions? **[Functional]**

AOC Response: The focus of the RFP on maintenance of current OnBase systems does not rule out implementation of any new OnBase systems during the term of the contract. Please refer to Paragraph 3.2.2.2 for details of the base components in any single-court, standalone system implementation.

5. **General**, Please provide a list of OnBase modules (with quantities), and other equipment (scanners, scanner software) that you expect to be in scope components. **[Functional]**

AOC Response: Section 3.2.2 of the RFP details the various components that are in scope for purchase by courts. Because individual courts use individual scopes of work to purchase off the statewide contract, the AOC has no complete listing of quantities of various OnBase components in use throughout the state. Section 3.1.3 provides descriptions of the various categories of courts using OnBase today. The approximate counts are as follows: Paragraph 3.1.3.2 – 13 superior courts; Paragraph 3.1.3.3 – 15 sending systems; Paragraph 3.1.3.4 – 5; Paragraph 3.1.3.5 – 1; Paragraph 3.1.3.6 – 54; and Paragraph 3.1.3.7 – included in the other counts.

6. **General**, Same as the question above for OBOL instances. **[Functional]**

AOC Response: Since OBOL is operated by Hyland Software, Inc., the AOC is not aware of the detailed modules and quantities employed. If Hyland requires authorization from the court to release detailed information to a potential bidder, the AOC will facilitate obtaining the consent of the single court that is using OBOL at present.

7. **Section 7.1.1 Proposal Submittal Checklist, page 34** – Does your checklist denote the order of items (as listed) that you want to see in the proposal response, or is the Checklist just a guide to what the proposal should contain? Example: 4. Proposal References, should this be listed as Section 4 of the proposal, or placed as page 2 of the proposal as

noted on RFP Section 4.3 on page 31? Please explain. We want to structure our proposal in the order that will best help you evaluate it. **[Administrative]**

AOC Response: The checklist, Section 7: Submission Requirements, on page 34 of the RFP is a list of items that must be included in the proposal response. With the exception of the Proposal Submittal Letter – Section 7.2, page 35 which should be the first page to the proposal, and Proposal References – Section 4.3, page 31 which should be the second page to the proposal; the submission requirements do not need to be in any specific order. However, typically, the proposal response sections follow the same pattern of sections in the RFP.

Questions from DataBank

- 1. Question:** I'm following the Proposal Submittal Checklist (under section 7.1) and I notice that number four calls out for Proposal References, but yet on the actual page 31 of the proposal the heading says "use as page 2". Shall I format the response as per the order of items on the Checklist?

AOC Response: Refer to AOC response to ImageSoft, Inc. #7 above.

- 2. 3.3.2 Description of vendor's OnBase integration experience:** Is the AOC asking for examples where the vendor has integrated OnBase as an ECMS solution within a customer's environment or the vendor's experience integrating OnBase with other Line of Business Applications?

AOC Response: The intent of the deliverable requested in Paragraph 3.3.2 is to gauge the bidder's experience with enabling and supporting system integration between OnBase and other enterprise-level business applications. Responses should also take into account the specific integration-related requirements described in Paragraph 3.2.3.2.