



**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS OF
GEORGIA**

TECHNOLOGY AND OPERATIONS DIVISION

Request for Information (RFI)

August 30, 2010

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS OF GEORGIA
244 WASHINGTON STREET, S.W., SUITE 300
ATLANTA, GA 30334**

Introduction

The Administrative Office of the Courts of Georgia (“AOC”) wishes to implement a standard, modern, full-featured Court Case Management System (“CMS”) for use in all levels of the courts of Georgia and an appropriate and stable funding model to acquire and maintain a statewide system.

This RFI is issued as a means of technical discovery and information gathering. This RFI is for planning purposes only and should not be construed as a solicitation nor should it be construed as an obligation on the part of the AOC to make any purchases. This RFI should not be construed as a means to pre-qualify vendors.

From the information provided by the respondents to the RFI, a determination will be made regarding any actual contracting through a procurement process. Any future contract that may be awarded must comply with AOC procurement requirements. The AOC may utilize the results of this RFI in drafting a competitive solicitation (RFP) for the subject services/products/equipment.

Participation in this RFI is voluntary and the AOC will not pay for the preparation of any information submitted by a respondent or for the AOC’s use of that information.

Project Overview

Business background of the project:

Currently a number of disparate court case management systems are used by courts in Georgia. The Georgia Judicial System is unified in name only, therefore the over 1,100 local courts have considerable autonomy and many have developed or acquired separate court systems. Most of the trial courts in the state use some level of basic automated docketing system or case management systems. However, these limited functionality systems were designed primarily to meet local needs, and were developed or acquired independent of a common framework. As a result there are no statewide data standards in place, there is limited ability to share information, and the information that is available is often incomplete, inaccurate or not usable from a statewide perspective.

The fundamental issues remain those of organizational boundaries and areas of responsibility. As technology has grown to meet the demands for interoperability, court organizations have often not taken advantage of the benefits of economies of scale, shared infrastructure, and shared vision. Too often, they continue to operate with a high degree of

technological independence, often based on arguments of the need for independence of the individual courts and of the uniqueness of individual courts and their automation needs. In today's technology environment, it is possible and desirable for courts to plan and use common technologies, infrastructure, and applications without jeopardizing independence. Experience over the years has shown that the "uniqueness" of every court's automation needs is an expensive and debilitating myth for the judiciary. While court automated applications must be scalable to support large and small court operations in our non-unified court environment, the basic functionality, structure, and capabilities needed within applications are the same from court to court across the state of Georgia and can be met with the one appropriately designed system we have provided.

The courts of Georgia, with other participants actors in the justice system, have the duty to obtain the greatest benefit for every tax dollar spent. There must not be one system of justice for well-funded jurisdictions and a lesser one for those less fortunate. Efficiency is obviously an important value and has bearing on other values as well—a more efficient system could increase access to justice, which assists parties belonging to disadvantaged social groups in bringing their case to court and therefore promotes equality. An efficient system is one in which parties can actually enforce their rights and therefore legitimacy is enhanced. One important by-product of adopting electronic filing of cases or e-filing is the strengthening of the legitimacy of the justice system—a central value that is often promoted by an emphasis on efficiency.

The technology currently available makes possible highly integrated, inter-connected, and inter-reliant systems. The efficient operation of individual courts, and of a statewide court system requires the justice system to participate in such systems. But such systems cannot be put in place without common planning, system design, and system operation.

Non-automated courts and those using the low-level, docketing applications prevalent in courts around the state do not provide a sufficiently robust platform for electronic filing. They do not use standard tables or codes for the various categories of case types, events, documents, or party types. The judiciary must encourage those local courts to move to full-featured case management systems and standard code tables, based on those already developed, and meeting national standards, that will serve as the appropriate foundation for an e-filing court.

Georgia's judiciary has been slowly building an infrastructure to enable e-filing by encouraging the use of more complex automated Case Management Systems in its courts. Non-automated courts and those using the low-level, docketing applications prevalent in courts around the state do not provide a sufficiently robust platform for electronic filing. They do not use standard tables or codes for the various categories of case types, events, documents, or party types. The judiciary must encourage those local courts to move to full-featured case management systems and standard code tables, based on those already developed, and meeting national standards, that will serve as the appropriate foundation for an e-filing court and moving into the future.

Online Court Case Management System

This project involves the building, hosting, processing and maintenance of an On-line Court CMS. The project will include the following capabilities to chronologically track how a case moves through the court system:

1. Case initiation and indexing,
2. Docketing and related recordkeeping,
3. Scheduling,
4. Document generation and processing,
5. Calendaring,
6. Hearings,
7. Disposition,
8. Execution,
9. Case close,
10. Accounting (including front counter, cashier, back office and general ledger functions),
11. Security, and
12. Management and statistical reports.

All as defined by the National Center for State Courts' Functional Standards (see below)

The AOC is seeking a solution for hosted court Case Management System software, including disaster recovery capability with minimal business interruption.

Additionally, AOC is seeking a working model for funding the expenses connected with licensing the CMS and associated maintenance and support costs. Alternate self-funded revenue models should be evaluated, including but not limited to:

- State General Funds
- Filing fees
- Subscriptions
- Dedicated technology fee

Implementation and testing will be completed by the vendor in collaboration with the AOC staff.

Implementation of the pilot of the new product and associated processes will likely begin by July 1, 2012.

Specific objectives of the project include:

- A full-featured, robust Court Case Management System based on the National Center for State Courts' (NCSC) published Functional Standards for Case Management, located at http://www.ncsconline.org/d_tech/standards/default.asp
- The system must be fully compliant with all of the following:
 - Official Code of Georgia (<http://www.lexis-nexis.com/hottopics/gacode/default.asp>)
 - Uniform Rules for Georgia Courts

http://www.georgiacourts.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=122&Itemid=82)

- Georgia Traffic Court Manual
http://www.dds.ga.gov/business/2007_TrafficCourtRM.pdf
- Revised Handbook for Probate Judges of Georgia
- SAAS or cloud-based, securely accessible via any web browser by validated users.
- AOC personnel will be the first tier of support for court users.
- The system shall utilize an enterprise-level Relational Database Management System (RDBMS) e.g. Oracle, MS-SQL, or MySQL.
- The system shall provide a data dictionary that describes all aspects of the data model. ERD provided ODBC for flexible local or state reporting, accessible through SAP-Crystal Reports or similar reporting tools. The system shall feature robust reporting tools utilizing industry standard reporting engines (e.g. SQL Server Reporting Services, Crystal Reports). Basic reporting capability shall be integral to the application.
- Included in the reporting capability, the system shall include the data elements and facility to produce reports satisfying the National Center for State Courts CourTools Trial Court Performance Measures
http://www.ncsconline.org/D_Research/CourTools/tcmp_courttools.htm.
- The systems must maintain the financial parts of case files, account for fines and fees, and other court funds, with ledger, journals, reports, and a full audit trail in adherence to Generally Accepted Accounting Practices as referenced by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board.
- Forms and Notices shall be documents created as merge files with MS-Word (current version) from data contained in the system.
- The system shall prevent incomplete, invalid, or corrupt data from being processed as well as data being processed out of sequence through a series of edit checks, declarative data integrity rules, or procedure-based business rules.

Requirements

AOC core requirements for replacing the current CMS are:

1. The minimum acceptable capability of any replacement software is that it must be better than the current functionality.
2. The new application must have the same reports and forms generation capabilities (especially Calendars) and the same or better Import/Export capability.
3. Uses the same data elements.
4. Uses the same codes and code tables (provided by AOC).

5. All existing current data must be converted or migrated to the new software - including financial data.
6. New software must run on a relational DBMS platform; Oracle, MS-SQL, MySQL
7. Web-Based, centrally located, accessed through any browser from anywhere.
8. The elements of implementation will include the ability to integrate and/or interface with other governmental agencies, entities, governmental and private, in and outside the local jurisdiction. These interactions shall be compliant with current ECF/NIEM/XML standards.
9. State Customizable; Locally Configurable.
10. May be branded to existing users as a new version of the state-supplied CMS or an update, and to new users as a completely new application.

The bulk of the courts in Georgia have licensed software from companies that provide software packages that are not true case management systems. They are essentially general small business systems modified to provide docketing capability and the bare minimum required by statute and tolerated by judges, based on desktop level programming tools. Their strength is that they will “customize” their packages to fit the existing business processes in each court and whether or not they comply with Georgia law and rules of court.

Larger counties can afford to license software from some of the major national players in court case management. However, it is still a county-by-county transaction, and the vendors still “customize” their software for each individual county, exponentially driving up the cost for the assessment, configuration, training, modification, and reports. We seek to avoid the inefficiencies inherent in such a system and benefit the citizens of the 9th most populous state by the economies of scale that the purchasing power of the State of Georgia can bring.

This document will be posted and made available to potential vendors on September 3, 2010.

Responses to this document must be received by December 15, 2010.

Based on responses to the RFI, a Request for Proposal (RFP) may be issued which will contain more detailed requirements for the product, contractual details, and key criteria for successful bidders.

From the replies to the RFP document, possible vendors may be asked to present demonstrations of their offerings.

Instructions for Vendors

This documentation should be delivered to AOC no later than December 15, 2010.

Send completed RFI documentation to Michael S. Neuren and any marketing brochures or web link describing your organization and your product offerings in the areas of Court Case Management System at:

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS OF GEORGIA
244 WASHINGTON STREET, S.W., SUITE 300
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30334**

Feel free to contact Michael S. Neuren by telephone at (404) 657-4218 or michael.neuren@gao.us, should you have any questions.

**Answer the following questions to the best of your ability and return to AOC
by the date specified above.**

Requested Information	Response
General	
Company name	
Company address	
Parent company	
Describe ownership and/or strategic partnerships of your company	
Name and signature of the person responsible for the information contained in this RFI	
Phone number	
Fax number	
E-mail address	
Web site URL	

<p>Company location (corporate office; other offices)</p>	
<p>Total number of employees (include breakdown per department, if possible)</p> <p>Key employees names and employment contracts</p>	
<p>When was your company's initial year of operation?</p> <p>How long have you been providing this type of product?</p>	
<p>What are the details of your business continuity arrangements?</p>	
<p>What is the total number of installations of the version of software being proposed? (If applicable)</p> <p>Have you supplied this product to customers in a similar industry, with a similar profile that would act as a reference site for your product? If so, provide a summary of the services you provided and contact information for these references.</p>	
<p>Does your organization have any third-party relationships/alliances, association memberships, sponsorships? Describe these.</p>	
<p>Is there any outstanding legal action against your company or partnering company(s)? If so, provide</p>	

details.	
Are there any acquisitions or mergers anticipated or pending?	
What documentation is provided for the product?	
Please provide any return on investment (ROI) information for your product.	
Was your software written and acquired from a third party, or was it written by your organization? Does any of your software use open source code? Are there earlier versions of your product that are no longer supported?	
What warranty do you provide for the services that would be provided?	
Technical Requirements	
Describe the environment required for your product work effectively. What operating system (OS)? Describe the underlying software and the approach used to develop and maintain the system. Describe the real time inquiry capabilities of your system. What browsers are compatible with this product? Describe the maintenance measures involved with a production system of your product. How are updates or versioning handled in your product?	
<i>Are there any special hardware requirements to run your system?</i> <i>Are there any special network requirements?</i>	

How secure is this software?	
Describe your backup / recovery plan.	
Please describe your migration plan. How did you handle any previous upgrades; How do you plan to handle upgrades in the future?	
Training & Support	
Please provide information on your implementation methodology.	
<p>What level of training do you recommend?</p> <p>Do you offer formal user training?</p> <p>What type of courses do you offer and what is their duration?</p> <p>Do you provide training materials? Describe them. Are training materials available at no cost?</p>	
<p>Where are your support services located?</p> <p>What are the hours of operation and response times of support services?</p> <p>What levels of support are available? Define each level.</p> <p>Is there an extra charge associated with product support?</p> <p>Does support include product updates, as well as bug fixes?</p> <p>How often are major software upgrades available?</p> <p>How are software and/or database updates implemented?</p> <p>What is the helpdesk escalation procedure?</p>	

Total Cost of Ownership (TCO)

<p>How is your product priced?</p> <p>Please provide a detailed breakdown of the cost of your product.</p> <p>Please provide examples of pricing structures used by other jurisdictions.</p>	
<p>What are the licensing costs of the product, if any?</p> <p>Do you offer discounts for volume?</p>	
<p>What are your consulting rates to help with implementation?</p> <p>What is the charge for training?</p> <p>Are there maintenance and support costs? Please give a breakdown.</p>	
<p>What do you charge for customization?</p> <p>Describe some customization work that you have completed.</p>	
<p>Do you charge for product or services during the evaluation period?</p> <p>Are there any other costs that would contribute to the total cost of ownership of your product?</p>	