

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
1	General, no section or page number	1/17/2007	What are each of the courts using for payroll? Does AOC plan to have all of the courts migrate to SAP payroll eventually?	1/23/2008	The Courts are using SAP, county systems and third-party systems. The AOC plans to have all of the trial courts migrate to SAP.
2	Section 1.8, page 9 RFP Key Action Dates Table 1.7	1/17/2007	Respectfully, we would like to request a two week extension of the proposal due date.	1/23/2008	No extension to the Proposal Due Date will be granted. <i>This response has been updated, please refer to Question #30 below.</i>
3	Section V2.1 paragraph 3, page V-2, and Section, V.3.1, Administrative Requirements, page V-3, paragraph 2	1/17/2007	Does 20% for subs include the DVBE requirement? Or is the DVBE in addition?	1/23/2008	The DVBE is considered a sub-contractor and therefore included in the requirement. Also see the AOC Response to Question #4.
4	Section V2.1 paragraph 3, page V-2, and Section, V.3.1, Administrative Requirements, page V-3, paragraph 2	1/17/2007	Would you consider a greater sub participation per project e.g. Upgrade (a project), Additional functionality (another project) etc.	1/23/2008	Administrative Requirement 1 shall be changed to the following: Bidder must agree to accept full Prime Contractor responsibility for coordinating and controlling all aspects of the contract and any Subcontractors. The Bidder must certify that Subcontractor(s) shall not exceed 40% of the fees paid on a project basis, as stated in the Agreement (see Appendix H, Master Services Agreement (MSA) for specific requirements). The MSA will also be updated to reflect the change of sub-contractor participation to 40%.
5	Appendix C, pages C-16, and C-17	1/17/2007	Form 6.1 and 6.2 state the mandatory requirement/qualifications differently from section VI. 3.1 - please advise.	1/23/2008	The forms are incorrect and will be updated through Addendum 1 to the RFP.
6	Section 4, Page 17, Figure IV-2.	1/17/2007	In Section 4, Figure IV-2, Proposed Implementation Schedule for the Phoenix Program, indicates Wave 1 includes Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, Procurement, and Training and Events. By contrast, in Section 4, Figure IV-3, Functionality Waves for the Proposed Implementation Schedule indicates Wave 1 includes Asset Accounting, Treasury, and Inventory Management. Can you confirm the correct scope?	1/23/2008	Figure IV-2 is the correct scope.
7	Section 4, Page 18, Figure IV-3.	1/17/2007	In Section 4, Figure IV-2, Proposed Implementation Schedule for the Phoenix Program, indicates Wave 2 includes Asset Accounting Budget Preparation and Planning, Inventory Management, Project Systems, Recruitment, Travel Management, and Treasury. However, in Section 4, Figure IV-3, Functionality Waves for the Proposed Implementation Schedule indicates Wave 2 includes Grants Management, Budget Control System, Integrated Planning, and Position Budget Controlling. Can you verify the correct scope?	1/23/2008	Figure IV-2 is the correct scope.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
8	Section 4, Page 17, Figure IV-2.	1/17/2007	In Section 4, Figure IV-2, Proposed Implementation Schedule for the Phoenix Program, indicates Wave 3 includes Benefits Administration, Learning Solution, Performance Management, Succession Planning. Whereas, in Section 4, Figure IV-3, Functionality Waves for the Proposed Implementation Schedule indicates Wave 3 includes e-Recruiting, Performance Management, Travel, Personnel Cost Planning and Simulation, and Learning Solution. Can you verify the correct scope?	1/23/2008	Figure IV-2 is the correct scope.
9	Section V.2.1	1/17/2007	Does the AOC consider partnering firms to be the same as a subcontracting relationship?	1/23/2008	Yes, partnering is the same as subcontracting.
10	Section V2.1 paragraph 3, page V-2, and Section, V.3.1, Administrative Requirements, page V-3, paragraph 2	1/17/2007	ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENT 1: Bidder must agree to accept full Prime Contractor responsibility for coordinating and controlling all aspects of the contract and any Subcontractors. The Bidder must certify that Subcontractor(s) shall not exceed 20% of the fees paid on a project basis, as stated in the Agreement (see Appendix H, Master Services Agreement (MSA) for specific requirements). The Bidder must check "Yes" on the Matrix provided as Form 5.1 in Appendix C, Bid Response Forms, indicating compliance, or "No" on the Matrix indicating non-compliance with the requirement. Would the AOC consider changing the 20% to 35% percent?	1/23/2008	See the AOC Response to Question #4.
11	Phoenix RFP Section 1.doc, Section 1.4 Program Scope, Page 7	1/22/2008	Is it acceptable for the vendor to quote only for Upgrade Project and not the Optional New Functionality Projects and Optional Existing Functional Projects?	1/23/2008	No, the AOC is looking for a Bidder to propose on all components of the RFP.
12	Phoenix RFP Section 1.doc, Section 1.4 Optional Existing Functionality Projects, Page 7	1/22/2008	Has Business Process Re-Engineering been done on the Existing Functionality Projects or is the Vendor required to provide the same?	1/23/2008	If reengineering is necessary based on the changes proposed, the Bidder would be responsible for that activity during deployment.
13	Phoenix RFP Appendix B-02	1/22/2008	Will the upgrade environment be provided by AOC or is the vendor required to host it in his own environment till the deployment stage?	1/23/2008	The AOC will host the upgrade environment.
14	General, no section or page	1/22/2008	Is AOC open to Offshoring/Nearshoring the RFP Project Work?	1/23/2008	See RFP Appendix H, Master Services Agreement, Section 4.1.
15	Section V, Paragraph v.2.2	1/22/2008	What is meant by "The Contractor must be certified with the California Secretary of State to do business in California."? We must have a valid CA Corporation Number or Business License...please define certified to do business.	1/23/2008	The text "The Contractor must be certified with the California Secretary of State to do business in California." means that the Contractor must have a license to do business in the State of California.
16	General, no section or page number	1/25/2008	Our assumption for the scope of Budget Admin and Control during the Upgrade Phase of the Phoenix program includes Budget Execution and not Budget Preparation. Budget Execution includes, Budget Adjustments, like amendments or transfers as well as the activation of AVC (Availability Control). Can you please confirm our assumption?	1/30/2008	Budget Administration and Control during the Upgrade Project includes Budget Execution (e.g. budget adjustments, AVC, etc.) and not Budget Preparation.
17	General, no section or page number	1/25/2008	Where there any significant changes in the Trust Accounting design identified after the completion of the Blueprint document on June 7 2007?	1/30/2008	No, there were no significant changes in the Trust Accounting design after the completion of the blueprint document on June 7, 2007.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
18	General, no section or page number	1/25/2008	Is the deployment schedule with the PSCD module to be deployed in April 2008 on schedule?	1/30/2008	The deployment schedule for those courts scheduled to go live with PSCD by April 2008 is on schedule.
19	General, no section or page number	1/25/2008	What is the planned deployment schedule of the Trust Accounting functionality to the remaining courts?	1/30/2008	The deployment schedule for the remaining courts is to be proposed by the Bidders.
20	RFP Section VII.1, page VII-1 ; Section VII.3.10, page VII-9	1/28/2008	<p>The instructions for preparing the Cost Workbooks require that costs be based on AOC's provided Master Services Agreement (MSA) terms and conditions and Mandatory Requirements of the RFP (not the Bidder's exceptions to the MSA).</p> <p><i>There are terms in the MSA to which Bidders may be unable to contract and would not be able to provide associated pricing for acceptance of that term. As a result, the price would not represent an assumption of no changes to the terms and conditions of the MSA. Instead, the price bid would represent the total price for evaluation purposes subject to successful negotiation of contract terms.</i></p> <p><i>Is the pricing approach described above acceptable?</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, will AOC confirm that both parties' obligations are subject to successful negotiation and mutual agreement of the MSA based on the exceptions noted?</i></p>	1/30/2008	<p>If there are terms in the MSA to which a Bidder is unwilling to agree under any pricing (for the purposes of this Answer 20, an "Exception"), Bidder should submit such Exception to the AOC as part of the written question and answer process along with a detailed explanation of its Exception and a proposed alternative to the Exception that is as close as possible to the Exception but to which the Bidder would be willing to agree. The AOC will evaluate the Exceptions raised by a Bidder in such Bidder's submitted written question on a case-by-case basis, and the AOC will publish its written answer to all Bidders indicating the AOC's response to whether Bidders are required to price the MSA requirement or price their Exception. Unless the AOC explicitly indicates otherwise in its written answer in response to a specific Exception, the Bidders will be required to price using the AOC's provided Master Services Agreement (MSA) terms and conditions and Mandatory Requirements of the RFP and not the Bidder's Exceptions thereto or the Bidder's Issues List. Please note that Exception paragraph) and issues with the terms and conditions of the MSA raised in a Bidder's Issues List will be part of the AOC's evaluation criteria. These Exceptions and issues will be discussed between the AOC and each Finalist Bidder during the pre-BAFO clarification sessions. All Exceptions and issues on the Issues List of the Bidder to whom the AOC ultimately decides to award the contract will be resolved before the AOC and such Bidder execute the Agreement.</p>

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
21	RFP Section VII.1, page VII-1	1/28/2008	<p>The RFP requires that the Bidders "Clearly identify and explain all of the pricing assumptions made, upon which pricing is predicated including the cost/pricing impact if the assumption turns out not to be valid."</p> <p>This level of detail is extremely difficult to determine at this phase in a procurement and is not likely to result in reliable guidance.</p> <p>Will AOC consider deleting or further clarifying this requirement?</p>	1/30/2008	<p>The AOC will not delete this requirement, but will clarify it further.</p> <p>The AOC realizes that a Bidder may find that there may be specific areas of the RFP that may not be clear enough or detailed enough. In these areas, the Bidder may need to make certain assumptions in order to put together its Proposal. If any of these assumptions are such that there would be a cost/pricing impact if the assumption turns out not to be valid, the Bidder should identify and explain these assumptions and provide the amount that the cost/pricing impact would be were it to turn out that the assumption was not valid. Further clarifications of any assumptions and pricing will be conducted with the Finalist Bidders during the Finalist Bidders Clarification Sessions before the BAFO Proposals are due.</p>
22	RFP Section VII.2.5, page VIII-4	1/28/2008	<p>The RFP states "Bidder must submit one (1) signed original copy of the Phoenix Program Contract and SOW in this portion of their response." However, if the Bidder is submitting Form 8.1 indicating exceptions to the MSA, the Bidder cannot submit a signed contract. Should the Bidder assume that submission of Form 8.1 and complying with the requirements of Form 8.1 is sufficient to meet this requirement?</p>	1/30/2008	<p>Bidders must complete and submit one (1) signed original copy of Form 8.1, Bidder's Acceptance of the AOC's Contract Terms as part of their responses. Form 8.1 has been modified and is part of Addendum 2.</p>
23	RFP Section VI.3.3.1, page VI-7; Table VI-3	1/28/2008	<p>The RFP instructs Bidders to complete Form 6.3 for each individual performing the roles specified in Table VI-3. However, some of these roles will not be filled until well after Contract inception, and some may not be filled at all, if AOC does not exercise its option for Optional Services. Therefore, for roles that will not be filled at project inception, may the Bidder offer representative resumes, rather than proposing specific individuals?</p>	1/30/2008	<p>For the Upgrade Project and Optional Services, Form 6.3 must be completed for each individual performing the roles specified in Table VI-3. The AOC understands the individuals proposed for the Optional Services may not be available when we exercise this option and an alternative resource will need to be proposed and approved.</p>
24	RFP Section IV.6, page IV-17; Table IV-2	1/28/2008	<p>Does the timeline presented in the RFP include stabilization and post go-live support?</p>	1/30/2008	<p>The Upgrade Project timeline does not include stabilization and post go-live support; however, proposals shall include stabilization and post go-live support for all waves.</p>
25	RFP Section VI.4.2.1, page VI-19	1/28/2008	<p>Can you provide current training curriculum, including the number of training courses, modules and delivery format?</p>	1/30/2008	<p>The AOC will look at this and decide in the next week what they may be able to publish.</p>
26	RFP Section IV.5.1.9, page IV-13	1/28/2008	<p>Can you provide detail on how many of your 8 large courts that will have inventory management in the future?</p>	1/30/2008	<p>The AOC has had extensive discussion with one large court regarding the implementation of Inventory Management. Vendors should propose the implementation of one large court, and additional courts will be negotiated during BAFO.</p>
27	RFP Section VI.4.2.1.h page VI-19	1/28/2008	<p>In section VI.4.2.1.h in the RFP on page 19 instructs the bidder to provide DEDs and samples for each of the deliverables identified in the RFP Appendix A, SOW. In Appendix A, page 10, the RFP lists eleven (11) deliverables which the bidder has to complete a DED within the proposal. In section VIII.2.5 on page 4 the RFP instructs the bidder to NOT complete the DED until submission of the BAFO proposal. Can you confirm the required DED documents for the proposal submission?</p>	1/30/2008	<p>DEDs and samples shall be submitted for the 11 deliverables identified in Appendix A, Statement of Work, at time of Proposal submission. Note that the SOW does not have to be completed until BAFO. See the associated change to RFP Section VIII.2.5, Volume IV: Completed Contract and Statement of Work (SOW), in Addendum 2.</p>

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
28	General, no section or page number	1/28/2008	One of the leading practices that system integrators use to reduce costs is to conduct a small portion of the consulting work off-site (but within the US) through Delivery Centers. Delivery Centers allow economies of scale/skill for tasks such as application development, data conversion, and interfaces (for example) where physical proximity to the client site is not necessarily required. Conducting some portion of the work off-site allows AOC to benefit from lower consulting labor costs and reduced consulting travel costs. <i>May a Bidder assume for the Proposal that AOC will allow the Contractor to conduct some of the consulting work "off-site" within the US (not off-shore or near-shore) (specifying the components, the estimated hours, and the rationale for off-site work clearly in the proposal)?</i> Preparing two prices, one with all on-site work, and one with some off-site, is very difficult for the vendor community given the short time frame.	1/30/2008	The Bidder may assume for the Proposal that AOC will allow the Contractor to conduct some of the consulting work "off-site" within the US (not off-shore or near-shore) (specifying the components, the estimated hours, and the rationale for off-site work clearly in the Proposal); however, the AOC may impose constraints on certain subsets of data being stored, accessed, or transmitted offsite. At the moment, the AOC does not know which subsets of data may be subject to these additional restrictions.
29	Appendix B-01	1/28/2008	In the Technical Requirements section Appendix B-01 under Bidder-Proposed Enterprise Technology Tools, line item numbers 29 and 31 can be addressed by SAP Governance Risk & Compliance (GRC), and Test Data Migration Server (TDMS) respectively. Should System Integrators include the software quotations from SAP in their proposal, and assume that if the AOC wishes to license the additional SAP modules they will do so directly from SAP?	1/30/2008	Bidders shall list all software quotations included in their Proposed Solutions. The AOC may procure and license the software from the Bidder or from another source at the AOC's discretion.
30	General, no section or page number	1/28/2008	We respectfully request a deadline extension of two weeks in order to allow time for our public sector references to complete the necessary forms required by the RFP.	1/30/2008	The AOC is extending the Proposal Due Date to 2/19/2008. The Key Action Dates will be revised in Addendum #2.
31	Bidder's Library	1/28/2008	My team has been unable to locate the following two bidder's library documents: 1003948 B-04 Upgrade Assessment Integration Plan 20070927 v1.0 (SAP).pdf and 1003948 B-04 Upgrade Assessment Integration Plan 20070927 v1.0 (SAP-2).pdf	1/30/2008	The documents have been added to the Bidder's Library.
32	Appendix D and VII-9 Payment Schedule	1/30/2008	In the "Optional New Functionality Deployment Projects and Optional Existing Functionality Projects Payment Schedule" in the section beginning on row 200, there are cost categories for Project Preparation, Blueprint, Realization, and Final Preparation. However, in Appendix D, on the tab labeled "VII-4 Opt Existing Func Deploy" there are no cost categories for Project Preparation, Blueprint, Realization, and Final Preparation. Can we add lines for Project Preparation, Blueprint, Realization, and Final Preparation to tab "VII-4 Opt Existing Func Deploy"?	1/31/2008	Vendors can insert additional lines for the various phases of the project lifecycle for each court size; however, lines for court size cannot be removed from the spreadsheet. Be advised, to use the lifecycle phases identified in the RFP (e.g. Project Preparation, Business Blueprint, Realization, Final Preparation and Go Live and Deployment Support).
33	Section VII.3.3, paragraph 6 and Appendix D	1/30/2008	The paragraph begins with, "Although Costs are not detailed by deliverable in this worksheet," it is noted that some deliverables will be "completed once," while other deliverables will be completed "multiple times." The Appendix D Tab "VII-4 Opt Existing Func Deploy," does not have any provision for one-time costs.	1/31/2008	All Project Costs are considered one time costs. If Bidders are planning to provide an initial deliverable and subsequent updates to that deliverable for individual payments in the Payment Schedule, each of those deliveries should be listed separately within a Project. If an initial deliverable can be reused across Projects, Bidders shall consider that possibility in its assumptions for pricing subsequent Projects.
34	Form 6.3	1/30/2008	For Key Personnel for Optional Added Functional Requirements, do we need to provide a resume, and two references since these are classified as 'optional services'?	1/31/2008	See answer to question #23 above.

AOC Question Number	RFP Reference (Section, Page, Paragraph)	Submission Date	Bidder Question/Request	Response Date	AOC Response
35	General, no section or page	1/30/2008	What are the database sizes for the following SAP systems: Production, Test, and Development?	1/31/2008	Production = 300 GB; Stage = 300 GB; Training = 220 GB; Test 1 = 210 GB; Test 2 = 300 GB; and Development = 130
36	Figure IV-2, and Section IV, page 17	1/30/2008	Can you clarify what is meant by " Budget Admin and Control " as shown in the "Upgrade project" Section Figure IV-2 Proposed Implementation Schedule for the Phoenix Program (Section IV , page 17) (as opposed to " Budget Prep & Planning " in New Functionality Wave-2 Project in same Figure).	1/31/2008	See answer to question #16 above.