



**District of Columbia Courts
Administrative Services Division
Procurement and Contracts Branch**



AMENDMENT NO. 1

TO: ALL PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS

AMENDMENT

ISSUE DATE: March 15, 2023

**SUBJECT: Request for Proposal (“RFP”) No. DCSC-23-RFP-30
*Court Case Management System (CMS)***

**PROPOSAL
SUBMISSION**

**DATE: April 10, 2023, by 2:00 p.m., Eastern Standard Time (“EST”)
*By Email Only, See Sections L.1.2 & L.1.4***

This Amendment (“Amendment”) No. 1 is issued and hereby published on the Courts’ website and effective as of the date shown above. Except as modified hereby, the RFP remains unmodified.

Item No. 1: The Questions & Answers Spreadsheet is hereby issued and attached as Exhibit 1.

Item No. 2: The proposals due date is hereby extended from March 27, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST to April 10, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST.

Item No. 3: Delete Section B.3 of the RFP (RFP Schedule) in its entirety and replace it with the following:

Below is the anticipated schedule for this solicitation.

Solicitation Activity	Date
RFP Release	February 14, 2023
Pre-Proposal Conference	March 1, 2023
Offeror Inquiries Due	March 8, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST
Responses to Inquiries	On/Before March 15, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST
Proposals Due	April 10, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST
Selected Vendors Invited for Demonstrations	TBD

Item No. 4: Delete Section L.1.2 of the RFP in its entirety and replace it with the following:

“Proposals shall be submitted **BY EMAIL ONLY**. The RFP number, title and proposal due date are as follows:

*Solicitation Number: **DCSC-23-RFP-30***

*Caption: **“District of Columbia Court of Appeals Case Management System (CMS)”***

*Proposal Due Date & Time: **April 10, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST**”*

Item No. 5: All Other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Note: One (1) copy of this Amendment is being sent to only those Offerors who received a copy the solicitation. Offerors shall sign below and attach a signed copy of this Amendment to each offer to be submitted to the Courts in response to the subject RFP. Proposals shall be delivered in accordance with the instructions provided in the original RFP documents and this Amendment No. 1. Offerors shall submit their proposals in accordance the instructions provided in the original RFP documents and this Amendment No. 1. This Amendment, together with your proposal must be received by the District of Columbia Courts no later than the date and time specified for proposal submission. Revisions or price changes occasioned by this Amendment must be received by the Courts no later than the date and time set for proposal submission. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this Amendment may be cause for rejection of any proposals submitted in response to the subject RFP.

Darlene D. Reynolds

Darlene D. Reynolds
Contracting Officer

This Amendment is acknowledged and is considered a part of the subject RFP.

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

Title of Authorized Representative

Name of Firm

Exhibit 1
Questions & Answers Spreadsheet

(See following page)

D.C. Courts
Case Management System

RFP No. DCSC-23-RFP-30
Court Case Management System (CMS)

Questions & Answers Spreadsheet

Deadline for Questions: March 8, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST

No.	OFFEROR QUESTION	RFP SECTION & PAGE	D.C. COURTS RESPONSE														
1	Is it possible to extend the deadline for Proposals by an additional 3-4 weeks to allow all Vendors the time to prepare a comprehensive bid?	Part 1. Section B.3 RFP Schedule	<p>Yes, we will extend the deadline by two weeks to April 10, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST. RFP Section B.3 RFP Schedule is hereby amended to state:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Solicitation Activity</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>RFP Release</td> <td>February 14, 2023</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pre-Proposal Conference</td> <td>March 1, 2023</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Offeror Inquiries Due</td> <td>March 8, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Responses to Inquiries</td> <td>On/Before March 15, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proposals Due</td> <td>March 27 April 10, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Selected Vendors Invited for Demonstrations</td> <td>TBD</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Solicitation Activity	Date	RFP Release	February 14, 2023	Pre-Proposal Conference	March 1, 2023	Offeror Inquiries Due	March 8, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST	Responses to Inquiries	On/Before March 15, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST	Proposals Due	March 27 April 10, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST	Selected Vendors Invited for Demonstrations	TBD
Solicitation Activity	Date																
RFP Release	February 14, 2023																
Pre-Proposal Conference	March 1, 2023																
Offeror Inquiries Due	March 8, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST																
Responses to Inquiries	On/Before March 15, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST																
Proposals Due	March 27 April 10, 2023 at 2:00 P.M., EST																
Selected Vendors Invited for Demonstrations	TBD																
2	Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (Like, from India or Canada)	General Question	No, all companies should be based within the United States. As stated in RFP Section C.5.2 Hosting, the Offeror must propose a data center located within the United States and a secondary data center (backup site) located within the United States. Please also note that the successful Offeror (“Offeror”) must be registered with the District of Columbia and System for Award Management (SAM) prior to Award of a Contract.														
3	Whether Offerors based outside the USA need to come over to USA for meetings?	General Question	Not applicable, based on the response to question 2.														

D.C. Courts
Case Management System

No.	OFFEROR QUESTION	RFP SECTION & PAGE	D.C. COURTS RESPONSE
4	Can an Offeror perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)	General Question	All work must be performed from within the United States. This includes but is not limited to configuration, development, and access to any information or data from D.C. Courts from outside the United States.
5	Can the Offerors submit the proposals via email?	Section L.1.4 of the RFP.	See Section L.1.4.
6	Can you define "offeror"? For instance, can the offeror acting as prime combine reference/case studies with those of the chosen subcontractors?	Page 71, Section L.2.2.1.1 #11 - 11) References and Client Base.	<p>The Prime Contractor may include information that demonstrates the qualifications of the Prime Contractor and any proposed subcontractors. If the Prime Contractor is proposing to use subcontractors, the proposal shall clearly state whether qualifications, references, and supporting materials pertain directly to the Prime Contractor (Offeror) or to specific subcontractors.</p> <p>Please note that RFP Section L.2.2.1.1, 10) Subcontractors requires two references from the subcontractor. Please note that RFP Section L.2.2.1.1, 11) References and Client Base requires five references from the Offeror.</p>
7	In the portal where the documents are stored, we are getting a 404 error when we try to open attachments J11, J12 & J14. What are the other options to access these files?	Attachments J.11, J.12 & J.14	The Attachments J.11, J.12 & J.14 were provided to the Offerors via email.

D.C. Courts
Case Management System

No.	OFFEROR QUESTION	RFP SECTION & PAGE	D.C. COURTS RESPONSE
8	Are comments in column F required within Attachment J.11 if the requirement is marked as “Available out-of-box (with or without configuration)”?	Attachment J.11	<p>No, comments are not required in Attachment J.11 column F if requirements are marked as “Available out-of-the-box (with or without configuration)” Offerors may add comments if helpful to clarify how the requirement will be satisfied.</p> <p>Per the Instructions tab on Appendix J.11, comments are required in Attachment J.11 column F if requirements that are marked as requiring customization or in development.</p>
9	In requirement #1 of the Technical tab of Attachment J.11, can the Courts clarify what is meant by “system transactions”?	Attachment J.11	This refers to any change made to the system such as the creation, editing, and deletion of docket entries, addition or removal of parties from a case, acceptance/rejection of an eFiling, etc. In general, the more granular the logging, the better.
10	The requirement paragraph ends: “Include, at minimum:” but there is nothing after it. Is there missing text there, or just no details?	Page 79, subsection j) Integration	<p>RFP Section L.2.2.1.2, Section B Technical Approach and Statement of Work, Subsection 9j) Integration is amended as follows:</p> <p>“Include a detailed plan for integrating the required functionality within the solution as described in this RFP. The Offeror shall install, test, and make production-ready all required integrations in order for the CMS to go live. See Sections C.5.7 – C.5.9, and C.5.22. Include, at minimum:”</p>

D.C. Courts
Case Management System

No.	OFFEROR QUESTION	RFP SECTION & PAGE	D.C. COURTS RESPONSE
11	Does D.C. Court of Appeals expect any ancillary sources (homegrown databases, archived data, excel files, access databases) to be in scope in addition to C-Track and the specified document and image sources?	Page 81, C.5.17	No. The Courts require only the data and documents described in RFP Section C.5.17 to be converted. In addition, OnBase is not part of this environment. RFP Section L.2.2.1.2 Section 9e is amended as follows: Data and Document Conversion. Describe the proposed conversion plan to include data, documents, and images. See Section C.5.17.
12	Will the DCCA provide system documentation (data dictionary, file layouts, diagrams) to help with data conversion estimation, or provide these to the selected vendor?	Page 81, C.5.17	We will provide these to the selected vendor.
13	How many tables exist in the current system?	Page 81, C.5.17	There are 187 tables used in the CMS database and 44 tables used in the eFiling database.
14	How are documents and images linked to cases or parties in the current CMS?	Page 81, C.5.17	They are linked using the C-Track data model.
15	In requirement #3 of the Technical tab of Attachment J.11, can the Courts further explain and clarify this requirement?	Attachment J.11	Courts withdraw Technical Requirement #3 from Attachment J.11, which stated "Support hashing for data mapping and retrieval".
16	Is the vendor expected to convert case or person financial data as part of this project?	Page 81, C.5.17	No. There is no financial data stored in the current CMS.
17	To ensure that vendors receive back their Past Performance Forms from their clients in time to include in their proposal submissions (there are a high number of public procurements occurring currently), and as noted in question #3 above and as well in the pre-proposal conference call that there may be missing requirements, we request that the Court provide the vendor community an extension to the proposal due date of at least two weeks.	Page 1	Please see response to Question #1.

D.C. Courts
Case Management System

No.	OFFEROR QUESTION	RFP SECTION & PAGE	D.C. COURTS RESPONSE
18	Can the DCCA provide a list of the current CMS lack of capabilities and efficiencies as described in section C.3.1 "Current Technology Environment"?	C.3.1 "Current Technology Environment"	The two limitations described, not having the judicial voting native within the CMS and limited reporting capabilities, are the best examples. Our hope is that newer case management systems will have evolved significantly since the current one went live in 2011 and have new capabilities and efficiencies.
19	Would the DCCA be interested in vendors providing a virtual court platform as part of their CMS response?	General Question	Offerors may include functionality that is available “out of the box” without additional development for the Courts consideration.
20	How many people visit the Courts main website per month?	General Question	In February 2023, the dccourts.gov website received 37,000 unique visitors.
21	How many people access the current CMS public portal per month?	General Question	We do not have that information.
22	Would the DCCA prefer auto indexing capabilities be included in pricing and each vendors response? If so - what fields does the court want to be included in indexing?	General Question	The DCCA does not index documents using particular fields; this is not a required pricing element. We do require optical character recognition (OCR) per Functional Requirements 171 and 172 so that a user is able to search and find keywords in documents. Offerors shall include pricing as relevant for these requirements.
23	Would the DCCA prefer auto redaction capabilities be included in pricing and each vendors response? If so - what fields does the court want to be redacted?	General Question	Please see Functional Requirement 305 related to automated redaction. Offerors may assume that all personally identifiable information (PII) must be redacted. Offerors shall include pricing as relevant for this requirement.
24	Would the Court prefer evidence management be included as part of the CMS functionality?	General Question	The DCCA does not manage evidence. However, the new DCCA CMS should house exhibits (e.g., documents, video and audio files) that are provided by the Superior Court and administrative agencies.
25	What is the current payment number of transactions per office?	General Question	There are fewer than 10 payments per month on average. The only payments are \$100 for petitions for review and occasional copy fees.

D.C. Courts
Case Management System

No.	OFFEROR QUESTION	RFP SECTION & PAGE	D.C. COURTS RESPONSE
26	What is the average transaction amount?	General Question	Petitions for Review are \$100; copying usually costs \$10 or less.
27	Can the court provide these numbers broken down by payment method (credit, debit, eCheck, etc.)?	General Question	Most payments for petitions are made by check. Most payments for copying are made by cash. The DCCA does not currently accept credit cards but may in the future (see Functional Requirement 273).
28	Would the courts like the option for customers to be able to pay at the counter?	General Question	Yes.
29	If the court would like the ability to pay at the counter, we are happy to provide the Courts with point of sale (POS) devices. Please list how many POS devices are needed per location.	General Question	Two at the counter in the public office (one is a back-up). If Offerors propose POS capabilities, Offerors must itemize the cost of ancillary hardware/equipment in the Price Proposal.
30	How many cases are currently being e-filed annually on average?	General Question	Currently cases are not originated through the eFiling system. They are entered manually into the CMS or “harvested” through the current interface 1 listed in Attachment J.16 - Interface Descriptions. The DCCA originates roughly 2000 cases per year.
31	What is the estimated go-live timeframe for the system?	General Question	The court will expect the selected vendor to implement the new system promptly. A proposed timeline is among the deliverables, see Sec. C.5.23.
32	Does the Court prefer vendors to include travel costs in their total base price or list it as a separate line total?	General Question	Please include the cost of travel in the relevant deliverables. Note that while most work may occur remotely/virtually, the RFP includes requirements for onsite presence during key milestones that will be mutually agreed upon with the Court, such as go-live and the period immediately after go-live.
33	Would the court prefer the vendor to include integration costs for the vendor to build the integrations listed or does the court prefer their IT team be responsible for building each integration?	General Question	As stated in the RFP (Section C.5.7 and elsewhere), “The Offeror shall implement all integrations and interfaces listed in this RFP. The Offeror is required to provide all costs associated with the required interfaces/integrations in Offeror’s price proposal.”

D.C. Courts
Case Management System

No.	OFFEROR QUESTION	RFP SECTION & PAGE	D.C. COURTS RESPONSE
34	Does the Court require vendors to include any current pending or active lawsuits as a part of their RFP response?	General Question	Yes, please include. Please see RFP Section L.2.2.1.1, Section A Firm Qualifications and Disclosures, Subsection 4) Pending Litigation.
35	In the Offeror Response Column of Attachment J.11, is the DC SC amenable to adding an option for “Configuration”? There are products on the market that might not meet DC SC’s requirements out of the box but can through simple configuration updates (modifications without direct changes to the underlying code).	Attachment J.11	In Attachment J.11, the “Offeror Response” column includes an option for “Available out-of-box (with or without configuration)”.
36	Has the Court (Including Crowe on behalf of the Court) received product demonstrations for Appellate Court Case Management Systems specifically? (I.e. not Trial Court Case Management Systems).	General Question	Yes.
37	Referencing C.5.25, will the Court assist in the setup of a phone-based helpdesk hotline or is it expected that vendors establish their own phone-based helpdesk? Does the DC SC have a number to use for this helpdesk service?	Section C.5.25	The Offeror is responsible for setting up the phone-based helpdesk/technical support hotline to meet the requirements of the RFP.
38	Referencing section L.2.2.1.2, does DC SC have a target implementation timeline or go-live date for all must have requirements?	Section L.2.2.1.2	The court will expect the selected vendor to implement the new system promptly. A proposed timeline is among the deliverables, see Sec. C.5.23.
39	Can the vendor bring their own payment vendor solution (credit card processor) for this CMS implementation, or do they have to integrate with the DC Courts payment vendor?	General Question	The selected Offeror will need to integrate with the DCCA’s selected payment vendor.
40	To have a better understanding of the complexity of the reports, will the courts provide sample blank templates for the reports that are in scope for this implementation?	General Question	The courts will provide sample reports for this implementation.

D.C. Courts
Case Management System

No.	OFFEROR QUESTION	RFP SECTION & PAGE	D.C. COURTS RESPONSE
41	Does the court have a particular deadline for this project implementation?	General Question	The court will expect the selected vendor to implement the new system promptly. A proposed timeline is among the deliverables, see Sec. C.5.23.
42	If a vendor has CMS implementations in Trial Courts but not Appellate Courts, would they be unfavorable for the Courts from an evaluation process even though their solution meets the technical and functional requirements of this RFP? In other words, if a vendor does not have an Appellate Court implementation, should they not bid?	General Question	As described in RFP Section L.2.2.1.1, section 7) Experience, Offerors must Include a listing of a minimum of five projects of a similar scope, size, and complexity to this project delivered within the last five years. Note that the Courts prefer Offerors with demonstrated experience with appellate courts.
43	What is the BI/Data Warehouse platform (Oracle, PowerBI, etc.) that the courts will be using for integration for the new CMS.	General Question	The courts currently utilizes Oracle Data Integrator for Extraction, Loading and Transforming (ELT) data into the warehouse; Microsoft PowerBI for data modeling & Data Visualizations, Dashboard reporting.