

The Supreme Court of Ohio

Addendum No. 1: RFP # 2016-08

Replacement Case Management System (CMS) for
Hocking and Union Common Pleas Court

Date of Issuance: April 25, 2016

Response Date and Time: April 29, 2:00 p.m. EST

Contents of Addendum:

1. Responses to all questions received
2. Pre-Proposal Meeting Attendance Sheet

The Supreme Court of Ohio

1. *Can we obtain a Word/Excel Copy of this RFP?*

Yes. The copies are now posted on the project website at <http://www.ohiocourts.gov/HockingUnionCMS/HockingUnionCMS.aspx>

2. *Section 1 “Overview” - Can you explain what is meant by the phrase “single CMS for both Courts”? Are you looking for a single CMS instance for either courts to utilize or the same CMS being installed in both locations?*

The intent of the courts is to have the same CMS (i.e. common configurations, code standards, etc.) installed on premise at each location.

3. *Section 2 “Current Environment” - Does this proposal need to include Probation? The Current Environment section lists Domestic, Criminal and Civil Case load, but does not list Probation. In Appendix E Section 4 Sentencing Related Code Structures and Section 5 Other Miscellaneous Code Structure both reference probation data.*

No, the RFP does not include implementation of a probation system/module. However, if the vendors have an integrated probation system please feel free to include information about the probation system in the response. The individual courts may have an interest in procuring a probation system as an add-on to this project.

4. *Section 3 “Supreme Court of Ohio Standards*

Appendix E lists potential areas for standardization. The SCO and the Courts have extensively worked over the years on Standards; however, various State agencies within Ohio and even departments within an agency do not agree on simple standards i.e. as Eye Color or Hair Color as well as field lengths for certain values. Is the SCO going to provide guidelines on what standardizations is to be used that have already been established?

The SCO’s Commission on Technology and the Courts has created a cross-functional workgroup to explore the development of CMS based standards with the primary goal of improving data exchange and reporting, and standardized process flows where appropriate among courts and partner agencies. The initial objective of this workgroup will be to **establish a list of prioritized** target areas for standards development and developing a process for standards creation and adoption. The workgroup will be

The Supreme Court of Ohio

engaging the CMS vendor community for input, expertise and assistance in developing and implementing standards overtime.

As a small, but related step towards the development of standards the SCO and the Hocking and Union County courts wish to partner with the selected vendor to explore opportunities for establishing configurations and processes that will facilitate the implementation of standards over time. At a minimum, our goal is to establish common values for the code structures listed as target areas for standards as part of the Hocking and Union County implementations.

5. *Section 4 “General Requirements” (4.1) - Who are the vendors that meet this requirement?*

As of the time the RFP was posted the vendors are, in alphabetical order: CourtView Justice Solutions, Henschen & Assoc., Pioneer Technology Group, Rockware Corp., Sadler-NeCamp Financial Services, Inc. (PROWARE), and The Amicus Group.

6. *Since there are only a few vendors that qualify, will all vendors have an opportunity to do a presentation?*

In accordance with Section 11 “Oral Presentations and Demonstrations”, the SCO and the local courts will determine which vendor solutions to schedule for demonstration as part of the evaluation process.

7. *Since this CMS is to be installed in two Courts, will each Court be present during the presentation should specific questions arise?*

Yes

8. *Section 4 “General Requirements” (4.5) - To what extent does “configurable as required by the local court” mean? Will the Vendors be given the list of items that the Court wants to have as configurable so that we can make sure they are included in the package?*

As stated above, our goal is to establish as close to a common CMS as possible as part of the Hocking and Union County implementations. We are looking to the vendors and their proposals to help answer this question by describing the best practice or optimal configuration(s) of the CMS. However, we understand there will be specific needs that

The Supreme Court of Ohio

differ for each of the two courts such as the distribution of funds formulas, and local data integration needs.

9. Section 8.4 “Electronic Document Management” (8.4.4) - Does this include data and images and in what format (Tif, PDF, etc.)?

We are assuming this question is referring to section 8.4.4 Automated Creation of Trial Court Record. The proposal should describe whether the CMS includes the ability to upload complete digitally indexed case records for cases that are being reviewed by a higher court including what options are/are not available for that functionality.

10. Section 8.10 “Data Integration OAG Interface - Are you referring to Collections, e-Lien or both? What if a Court already has a contract with someone other than the AG for collections, is the AG collection interface still need to be included/configured?”

At a minimum, the system must include an electronic interface to the OAG Collections. Currently, neither Court is using OAG for collections, but would like the ability to do so.

Union County currently does use the AG system for Certificate of Judgment lien filings and releases, however this is a 2 step process and is not integrated into their current system. The obtain the case number from their CMS and then go out to the AG webpage and assign the number & print, then go back to the CMS and fill in the information.

11. Section 8.13.7 “Project Implementation” - Sorry, but we do not understand this run on sentence. Can you please clarify?

The intent of this question is for the vendor to describe how your subject matter expertise and demonstrated best practices inherent in your CMS solution will help the courts to become more efficient using the automation and processes of the CMS.

12. Since this is to be an implementation of a commercial-off-the-shelf CMS, we would assume that all implementations, training, subject matter, etc. would be standard for all Courts.

That is the assumption of the project team as well.

13. Is there specific questions for the Judge’s side vs. the Clerk of Court side of the Court?

The Supreme Court of Ohio

No.

14. There are no details about either of these Courts having an imaging solution. Are there images to be migrated?

Hocking County does not currently have a documents management and imaging solution. Union County does have an existing imaging solution and migration of those images is part of the scope of the implementation for Union County. Currently, Union County has approximately 500,000 documents. The native format of the documents in the current system is DjVu, but all images have been converted to PDF.

15. What type of database is being used for Union County's scanned image meta data. Will we be given conversion files from Vendor or have access to meta data?

Union County's scanned document imaging application uses a SQL server backend database for the court document attributes. The images themselves are saved outside of the SQL database.

16. How many desktop scanners are anticipated at each location respectively?

The RFP does not assume that desktop scanners are the appropriate solution for scanning vs. a batch scanning process. However, if the vendor solution proposes a desktop scanning solution pricing should be provided on a per user basis up to the total number of users stated in the RFP.

17. Are there any public terminal computers/users or other computer/users that may require software licenses other than the 17 users in Union County and the 8 users in Hocking County?

Both courts will have public use computers to allow for limited lookup/access of court records by the public. If the proposed solution requires additional licenses for public access purposes the proposal should state the price per public access station.

18. What is the maximum number of concurrent users viewing scanned images anticipated at each location?

The Supreme Court of Ohio

The maximum number of concurrent users for Hocking County is 15, while the maximum number of concurrent users is 22.

19. Do both courts currently use a collection agency? If so who is/are the company(s)?

Neither Court is currently using a collection agency.

20. Would they be willing to change to a different company to lower integration costs if necessary?

No.

21. Do both courts currently use a company to handle electronic payments?

Electronic payments are not currently being accepted by either court, although this option is desired in the new CMS.

22. If so who is/are the company(s)? Would they be willing to change to a different company to lower integration costs if necessary?

NA – Please see Question 21.

23. Are all users on the same Domain at both locations respectively?

Yes.

24. Will we have remote access to Servers during the conversion process?

Yes. The successful contractor shall have access to the servers as required.

The Supreme Court of Ohio

Pre-Proposal Meeting
 RFP 2016-08: Replacement Case Management System for Hocking and Union Common Pleas Court

April 19, 2016

Name	Entity	E-Mail
Wade Branstetter	Union County	wbranstetter@co.union.oh.us
Teresa Nickle	Union Co.	tnickle@co.union.oh.us
Julia Smith	Union Co.	jsmith@co.union.oh.us
Dave Kelch	Hocking Co	dkelch@Co.Hocking.oh.us
Tommy Kenzie	The Supreme Court of Ohio	kenzie@SC.ohio.gov
Michael Triplett	Court View Justice Solutions	michael.triplett@CourtView.com
Kevin Colwell	AXIA Consulting	Kevin.Colwell@AXIAConsulting.net
Andrew Park	AXIA Consulting	andrew.park@axiaconsulting.net
HARRY KIEFABER	AXIA CONSULTING	harry.kiefaber@axiaconsulting.net
RANDALL DEUM	The Supreme Court of Ohio	drum@sc.ohio.gov

The Supreme Court of Ohio

Pre-Proposal Meeting
 RFP 2016-08: Replacement Case Management System for Hocking and Union Common Pleas Court

April 19, 2016

Name	Entity	E-Mail
Alic Ciavolino	Pioneer Technology Group	nciavolino@ptghome.com
FRANK CARLSON	ORACLE	frank.carson@oracle.com
DON FLISCHER	PROWARE	D.FLISCHER@PROWARE.COM
DAVE HUNTER	HENSCHEN ASSOCIATES	DAVE@henschen.com
PETE ZACKAROFF	THE AMILUS GROUP, INC.	PETER.ZACKAROFF@AMILUSIJS.COM
Shawn Hopper	Ascendum	Shawn.Hopper@Ascendum.com
Milt Nuzum	SCO	MILT.NUZUM@SC.ohio.gov
Ryan Ray	Team Ray Tech / Rockware Corp	rray@teamraytech.com
Jacob Frisch	Team Ray Tech / Rockware Corp	jfrisch@rockwarecorp.com