

**Michigan State Court Administrative Office  
Statewide e-Filing System and Integrated EDMS RFP  
RFP Addendum #1**

Date of Addendum: September 28, 2016

**NOTICE TO ALL POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS**

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

**PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL DEADLINE**

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

**1.0 – RFP**

Item	Section	Title	Description of Change
1.1	2.2	Proposal Format	Add the following language after the first sentence of the second paragraph: <u>“and all required attachments with the exception of the Cost Proposal, which must be provided in a separate, sealed envelope.”</u>
1.2	2.2.3	Cost Proposal Workbook	Add the following language after the last sentence of the first paragraph: <u>“The Cost Proposal must be provided in a separate sealed envelope.”</u>
1.3	6.3	Support Services	Replace the last sentence of the first paragraph with the following language: <u>“Please note that Support Services <b>described in this section must be conducted within the Continental US</b> and will be required subsequent to full deployment of the statewide e-Filing system and integrated EDMS as courts are “on-boarded.””</u>

## 2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

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

Item	Questions and Answers	
2.1	Q:	Are EFSP vendors intending to pursue participation in the statewide system exclusively as an EFSP required to respond to the RFP?
	A:	EFSP vendors intending to pursue participation in the statewide system exclusively as an EFSP are not required to respond to the RFP.
2.2	Q:	Will there be a certification process for external EFSPs?
	A:	It is anticipated that there will be a process for ensuring that external EFSPs meet technical and functionality requirements. At a minimum, external EFSPs will need to show evidence of complying with ECF 4.0.1 standards.
2.3	Q:	Concerning project scope, are the Court of Claims, Appellate Courts, and Supreme Court to be included in this project?
	A:	Our initial focus will be on the trial courts. Court of Claims, Appellate Courts, and the Supreme Court are not in scope for this project.
2.4	Q:	Concerning system volumes estimation, will Michigan make eFiling mandatory? If yes, how will this be phased in?
	A:	The intention is that courts that implement e-Filing make it mandatory for filers. It is anticipated that courts will implement different case types in a phased approach.
2.5	Q:	RFP – 5.2 Overview of Existing IT Environment; In accordance with the last sentence in Sub Section 5.2, ImageSoft requests the documentation related to the network supporting the Michigan judiciary.
	A:	The diagram of the current network will be provided via email to the requester. Note: Alternatives are under review for the replacement of services currently providing network connectivity between trial courts and JIS (as stated in Section 5.2.2).
2.6	Q:	RFP - 6.2.7 Document Conversion and Migration – What is the scope of the number of counties that should be included in the initial EDMS conversion?

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>	
	<p>A: The decision to convert from a local EDMS to the statewide system is at the court level, therefore we do not have an answer at this time. For the purpose of this proposal, the assumption should be made that all courts currently using an EDMS will switch.</p>
2.7	<p>Q: Attachment A - A.4.7 Can you provide more details on the “local courthouse self-help informational kiosk”? For instance; are these standard PC’s or hardened kiosk stations with touch screens.</p>
	<p>A: The type of informational kiosk has not been determined. For the purpose of this proposal, please offer your recommendation.</p>
2.8	<p>Q: Attachment A - A.4.7.4 Can you provide metrics by location of the various courts’ network bandwidth and any upgrade plans?</p>
	<p>A: No metrics are available at this time as network bandwidth varies from county to county throughout the state. Please identify what is required for the successful operation of the proposed solution.</p>
2.9	<p>Q: NIEM/ECF Standards -                      a. Are there any known/documented extensions to the ECF 4.01 standard and/or IEPD that the eFiling solution needs to support in Michigan?</p>
	<p>A: To our knowledge, there are not known/documented extensions to the ECF 4.01 standard and/or IEPD that the eFiling solution needs to support in Michigan.</p>
2.10	<p>Q: NIEM/ECF Standards -                      b. Do the current electronic filing implementations in Michigan support the ECF 4.01 Standard?</p>
	<p>A: As a part of the discovery phase with the current electronic filing courts, the selected vendor may ascertain whether the implementation supports the ECF 4.01 Standard. It is not expected that this information have any bearing on the proposal or implementation as the statewide solution will replace existing systems.</p>
2.11	<p>Q: Models – Pricing/Hosting                      a. Do the Michigan Courts have any preference with respect to the pricing model (per transaction vs. licensing model)?</p>

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>	
	<p>A: The preferred pricing model is licensing. The Cost Proposal Workbook expects licensing costs (along with annual software maintenance and support) to be provided. Vendors may alternatively take a transaction-based pricing model approach that bundles software licensing, maintenance and support costs along with Operations and Support costs. The structure of the Operations and Support Worksheet allows vendors to propose using either a licensing or a transaction-based pricing model.</p>
2.12	<p>Q: Models – Pricing/Hosting                      b. Do the Michigan Courts have any preference with respect to the deployment model (hosted vs. on premise)?</p>
	<p>A: As noted in Section 1.1.1, "The e-Filing system and integrated EDMS will be multi-tenant, hosted systems managed by the Provider, and integrate with existing court case management and document management systems." In addition, the Technical Specifications in Attachment B state that the solution shall be browser-based and not require the deployment of end-user workstation / client-side components.</p>
2.13	<p>Q: RFP Responses                      b. Is partnering among solution providers/vendors acceptable to the Michigan Courts for this RFP or is the expectation that the complete solution be provided by a single vendor?</p>
	<p>A: Yes, partnering among solution providers is acceptable as long as one of the venture partners is designated as the "prime contractor." Please refer to Section 1.2.13 (Multi-Vendor Solutions) for additional details.</p>
2.14	<p>Q: Filing Volumes                      a. Could annual case load statistics for 2015 be provided?</p>
	<p>A: Annual case load statistics for 2015 can be found in Section 5.1.5 (Michigan Court Case and Document Volume Estimates).</p>
2.15	<p>Q: Filing Volumes                      b. What percentage of the case/document volume/load is coming from the existing electronic filing system implementations?</p>
	<p>A: Approximately 1.5% of the case/document volume/load is coming from the existing electronic filing system implementations. Note: Limited case types are available electronically in the pilot courts and the volume in Circuit Courts is much less than District Courts.</p>

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
2.16	Q:	Filing Volumes c. Can you provide a list of entities that are exempt from filing, usage fees and your estimate as to what percentage of the case/documents are coming from such exempt entities?
	A:	As per Attachment A Section 5, entities expected to be exempt from fees include persons receiving public assistance in Michigan and "Internal" users of the system, such as court officials, clerks and associated departments (e.g., Friend of the Court). Governmental agencies may also be exempt from filing fees under certain circumstances. Percentages of submissions filed by "Internal" users are not available for all pilot courts at this time, but one did report a rate of 7% for 2015.
2.17	Q:	For the EDMS solution, the State of Michigan Executive Branch has 2 EDMS solutions. Would you consider looking into those or is that something you would not consider because obviously you would not have control how that would go along and neither would the vendor. Follow up: So in that case the vendor would not be responsible obviously, right? You'd be looking for a single vendor if you chose the state solution then you'd have to work with the State Executive Branch in terms of pricing and all those things.
	A:	A proposal submitted utilizing a State of Michigan EDMS solution would be considered. However, the expectation would be that the vendor partner with the State's EDMS vendor to complete the proposal. Any modifications required (e.g., cost) as a result of the existing State contract with the EDMS vendor would be addressed during contract negotiations.
2.18	Q:	Outside of the document management system, how many other integration points are there? Like CMS systems, financial systems, etc. Follow up: RFP doesn't give an exact number so you can gage the effort. Follow up: So that could be 100+ or 50+ integration points for one court?
	A:	The total number of integration points varies from court to court, but it is expected to be 30 or less. Please refer to Section A.4.7 of the Proposal Response Template for a list of potential integration points.
2.19	Q:	On the EDMS side, is it the courts intention to address the number of business process that take place within the court once the filing has been received for review and approval? Follow up: So, for the each of the 83 counties and 200 and some courts, you want the vendor to address all of those internal intra-court, inter-department workflows that relate to court business?

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>	
	<p>A: We understand that configuring all requested workflows for 242 courts would be a substantial effort and one that may slow the rate at which we are able to implement e-Filing. We are looking for your recommendations as to how we may be able to set limits on the scope of work associated with establishing the workflows (hours, etc.) so that implementations may continue at an acceptable pace.</p>
2.20	<p>Q: Are all the court forms that are filed standard across all counties all case types?                      Follow up: So for example, in landlord tenant forms the elements / what's required to be filed may be different from court A to court B?</p>
	<p>A: There are some standard required forms, but there are many pleadings that do not require a standard form. The litigant has to submit certain information to the court, but the form in which it is done in not standardized in all cases. We again, will be looking for your ideas on how to best accomplish this.</p>
2.21	<p>Q: In regards to integration, is there an integration infrastructure already in place that we could hook in to? Or are we looking at creating a brand new integration environment with the EDMS and all those things.                      Follow up: Would you use the states if they have one?</p>
	<p>A: There is no existing integration infrastructure. If the State of Michigan has an infrastructure that would meet the requirements for the proposed solution, we would consider it if the vendor had obtained prior agreement from the State that it could be utilized for the purpose outlined in the proposal.</p>
2.22	<p>Q: From a pricing perspective, if you roll out one court and then there is a gap in time between courts, then you let the team go and hire and train a new team when another court needs to roll out. How do you want us to talk about roll out when it is less expensive for us to keep one team on board that would proceed to roll courts out without a break in between?</p>
	<p>A: For the purpose of this proposal, please offer your recommendation for the implementation approach you feel would be most cost efficient while still resulting in a high success rate in the courts. Please note that development of the selected approach will be highly collaborative - combining your experience with technology projects with our knowledge about the courts.</p>
2.23	<p>Q: Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this?</p>
	<p>A: Companies responding to this RFP should be based in the US.</p>
2.24	<p>Q: Whether we need to come over there for meetings?</p>

<b>2.0 – CLARIFYING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>	
	A: Yes, there is an expectation that there will be many onsite meetings with both SCAO and Trial Court staff following contract award.
2.25	Q: Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)
	A: Via this addendum, the Support Services outlined in Section 6.3 of the RFP must be housed within the Continental US. This includes Hosting Services and Help Desk.

<b>3.0 – INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>	
The following item(s) are provided as a matter of information only to all respondents and do not modify or become part of the Contract Documents.	
Item	Question and Answers
3.1	Q: Attachment A - A.5 Application Functionality: Are we to provide a comment for each item of the Attachment B, Tab A. Functional Specification, Tab B. General and Technical Spec; or just a high level response for each category in those spreadsheets? Please clarify the response requirement.
	A: Proposers are expected to use the response codes in Attachment B to indicate how each functional specification will be provided in the proposed solution. Additional comments need not be provided in this attachment. However, all items for which a response code of 'C' (Customization) or 'I' (Integration) is provided must be described and priced in the Cost Proposal.
3.2	Q: RFP Responses a. Will the Michigan Courts consider responses that only address the e-Filing System (and not the EDMS aspects)?
	A: Though proposals that only address the e-Filing system will be accepted, they would be severely deficient in overall functionality and not do well in scoring.
3.3	Q: October 4th is the final day for questions. When will answers to those questions be posted given responses are due by the 25th? The concern is that there is not enough time between Oct 4th and the submission date and it may affect the response.

<b>3.0 – INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
	A:	We will turnaround responses as soon as they are available, however; until we know the volume / complexity of questions received on October 4th, we cannot commit to a specific date they will be provided. If the time to respond is expected to be more than one week, we will send a notification via email.
3.4	Q:	In Attachment B, can we add a comments field in order to provide clarification or additional info on the functional requirements? Follow up: A lot of times in RFPs, a stated specification can be accomplished in different ways, providing the "this is how we're envisioning doing it" can help determine whether we are aligned or it's something that we should talk about during the demonstration.
	A:	As per the response provided in Question 9: Proposers are expected to use the response codes in Attachment B to indicate how each functional specification will be provided in the proposed solution. Additional comments need not be provided in this attachment. However, all items for which a response code of 'C' (Customization) or 'I' (Integration) is provided must be described and priced in the Cost Proposal.  If it is necessary to augment other coded responses, comments can be included in Section A.8.3 (General Assumptions and Dependencies) of the Proposal Response Template. The expectation is that the number of additional comments included in this section is limited.
3.5	Q:	Can we pull the information from Attachment A into our own template?
	A:	To ensure consistency in responses for the evaluation team, all proposers must use the structure and numbering provided in the Proposal Response Template.
3.6	Q:	Will questions be submitted prior to the October 4th deadline be answered prior to that round being published?
	A:	We will turnaround responses to questions received prior to the October 4th deadline as soon as we are able based on availability of staff (no more than once a week).

<b>3.0 – INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>																							
3.7	Q:	Are you able to provide names of the vendors and their representatives that attended the Vendor Conference on Sept 15?																					
	A:	Participating vendors are listed in alphabetical order below: <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px; width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Organization</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Representative(s)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bluewolf, an IBM company</td> <td>Amy D. McDevitt</td> </tr> <tr> <td>General Code</td> <td>Michael Leidlein</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IBM</td> <td>Yogesh Saxena</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ImageSoft</td> <td>Tim Zarzycki, John Maynard, Dan Mayernik</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kim Technologies</td> <td>Andy Daws, Tyrone Harvey</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Laserfiche</td> <td>Will Talbot, Ana Gaytan, Jereb Cheatham</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lochbridge</td> <td>Jeffrey Sanscrainte</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Salesforce</td> <td>Nick Palazzolo</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tybera Development Group</td> <td>Norm Anderson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tyler Technologies</td> <td>Robert Schott</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Organization	Representative(s)	Bluewolf, an IBM company	Amy D. McDevitt	General Code	Michael Leidlein	IBM	Yogesh Saxena	ImageSoft	Tim Zarzycki, John Maynard, Dan Mayernik	Kim Technologies	Andy Daws, Tyrone Harvey	Laserfiche	Will Talbot, Ana Gaytan, Jereb Cheatham	Lochbridge	Jeffrey Sanscrainte	Salesforce	Nick Palazzolo	Tybera Development Group	Norm Anderson	Tyler Technologies
Organization	Representative(s)																						
Bluewolf, an IBM company	Amy D. McDevitt																						
General Code	Michael Leidlein																						
IBM	Yogesh Saxena																						
ImageSoft	Tim Zarzycki, John Maynard, Dan Mayernik																						
Kim Technologies	Andy Daws, Tyrone Harvey																						
Laserfiche	Will Talbot, Ana Gaytan, Jereb Cheatham																						
Lochbridge	Jeffrey Sanscrainte																						
Salesforce	Nick Palazzolo																						
Tybera Development Group	Norm Anderson																						
Tyler Technologies	Robert Schott																						
3.8	Q:	Does the posting of the RFP on the Buy4Michigan site have any impact on the defined process?																					
	A:	No, the posting of the RFP on the Buy4Michigan site has no bearing on the process defined. It has been posted there as way to inform other prospective vendors of the RFP's release.																					
3.9	Q:	Can we submit the proposals via email?																					
	A:	Per the RFP, Section 2.2 (Proposal Format) “one (1) hard copy signed original, and ten (10) printed copies of the proposal” must be submitted in addition to an electronic copy. Please review that section for specific details.																					
3.10	Q:	That all (or any) changes to the RFP/addenda will be posted at the following site <a href="https://www.buy4michigan.com/bs0/external/bidDetail.sdo">https://www.buy4michigan.com/bs0/external/bidDetail.sdo</a>																					
	A:	All addendums to the RFP will be posted to the Buy4Michigan site in addition to the State Court Administrative Office website.																					
3.11	Q:	That no addenda has been published post the pre-proposal conference.																					
	A:	At this time (9/21), no RFP addenda have been published.																					
3.12	Q:	Whether there exists any recording of the pre-proposal conference that I can review.																					

<b>3.0 – INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS</b>		
	A:	There is no recording of the conference available for review.
3.13	Q:	Whether there exists a consolidated set of questions that came through from the other vendors.
	A:	An addendum will be posted in the near future containing questions asked to date as well as during the vendor conference.
3.14	Q:	Whether there exists a list of vendors who attended the pre-proposal conference.
	A:	Yes, this information was requested during the conference and will also be included in the upcoming addendum. Please refer to item 3.7 above.

**END OF ADDENDUM**