



CITY OF HOUSTON
FINANCE DEPARTMENT
Strategic Procurement Division

Sylvester Turner

Mayor

Carolyn Hanahan
Acting Chief Procurement Officer
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

T. 832.393.9127
F. 832.393.8755
<https://purchasing.houstontx.gov>

January 12, 2016

Subject: Enterprise Legal Management (ELM) Software – Addendum No. 4
Reference: Request for Proposal (RFP) No. S67-T25606
To: All Prospective Proposers

Please see the responses to questions from prospective proposers.

Additional Vendor Questions – ELM RFP

Question	Response
General	
1. Will a copy of the RFP in Microsoft Word be posted to the bid site?	A Microsoft Word version was posted to the site on 12/14/15.
2. What is the budget for this project?	TBD
3. Our system is priced based on the number of current users. How many concurrent users shall we use for pricing purposes?	Please provide pricing for concurrent users at the price points for 100, 150 and 200 users.
4. Has the City evaluated or viewed any other vendor's products? If yes, please provide details.	No
5. Does the bid response need to be submitted electronically via the bid site?	No, please refer to Pg. 32, of the RFP; Part V – Submission of Proposal; Section A. Instructions of Submission.
Technical	
1. Are solutions that utilize VDI technology to access the system (Citrix, RDP, VMware View) acceptable?	No, solutions that utilize VDI technology to access the system (Citrix, RDP, VMware View) are not acceptable.
2. Will any users be connecting via VPN?	Yes, users will be connecting through VPN. See RFP pages 28, Pilot Test – Data sets and 37, question 8 under Maintenance.

<p>3. The RFP mentions assisting with integrating the ELM System with various departmental systems or data repositories, such as Texas Public Information Act database, deed restrictions database, and support Outlook Database connections ("ODBC") for alternate database ("dB") connectivity and data import/export. Are the above integrations to be priced as part of this RFP? If so, what are the technical and business requirements for each?</p>	<p>Yes, the above integrations are to be priced as part of the RFP. The technical business requirements the TPIA and Deed restrictions database are set forth on page 8 and 9, respectively.</p> <p>ODBC is the standard. All we need is the linkage between the ELM system and Outlook database.</p>
<p>4. The RFP requests integration information about strategic relationship, partnerships, or alliances with Microsoft Office, Westlaw and other Thompson-Reuters products, Lexis, Google, Chrome, SharePoint, Proofpoint, SAP, e-Discovery software products, etc. Are integrations with Westlaw, Lexis, Proofpoint, SAP and e-Discovery software to be priced as part of this RFP? If so, what are the technical and business requirements for each?</p>	<p>Yes, the above integrations are to be priced as part of the RFP. Integration with these systems should be based on common industry knowledge and practices.</p>
<p>5. What other technical information (data model, data mapping, etc.) is available for the data migration?</p>	<p>Subject to execution of a confidentiality agreement, the legacy SQL database and legacy front-end can be made available for examination by the vendor candidate in coordination with the COH SQL Analyst. This information will inform the technical information for data migration. The location, date, and time for examining the legacy system will be provided in a subsequent letter of clarification.</p>
<p>6. How many source files (databases) will require data migration?</p>	<p>One source file (database), the existing Client Profiles system will require data migration.</p>
<p>Implementation</p>	
<p>1. Will any consultant be assisting with product selection or implementation? If a consultant is involved please identify them. If assisting with the implementation, what systems have they had experience with in the past?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Functionality</p>	
<p>2. Do the Financial requirements include Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, General Ledger, and Billing Realization etc. functionality?</p>	<p>No, the financial requirements do not include Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, General Ledger, and Billing Realization etc. functionality.</p>
<p>3. Under the Neighborhood Service Reporting requirements there is an item that indicates Aging Report-queries that produce aging reports for 30, 60, 09, and 120 days? what type of data is being aged and will the report data be integrated into an accounting system?</p>	<p>Data regarding the matters handled by the Neighborhood division is being aged. This report is primarily designed to identify how long a file has been assigned to the Legal Department or a particular department. No, the reporting data will not be integrated into the accounting system.</p>

4. What jurisdictions will be required for Docketing and the monitoring of Court Rules?	The City primarily handles cases in Texas, state and federal courts.
5. What other systems will be integrated into the new case management system?	None, other than those listed in the RFP.
2. What is being used for file room/records management to track physical paper-based files? Is the desire to replace or integrate with it?	A system maintained by our Records Management division of the City is used to manage physical records. No, the Legal Department does not desire to replace or integrate with that system.
3. Does the City wish to create and maintain court rules internally or to use a third-party service?	The City is looking for out of the box functionality that would allow the entry of court deadlines.
6. What are the functional and technical requirements for the proposed pilot system?	The proposed pilot system should meet all of the functional and technical requirements of the system being offered by the Proposer in response to the RFP.
7. What are the success criteria for the pilot system?	The success criteria for the pilot system are listed on page 28 of the RFP. The evaluation criteria for the pilot system will focus, without limitation, the Technical Competence criteria set forth on pages 31-32 of the RFP.
8. Will each of the 10 sections provide separate success criteria for the pilot system?	No, each of the 10 sections will use the same success criteria for the pilot system.
Please see our attached questions for the City of Houston ELM RFP#S67-T25606	
9. In Exhibit II, Attachment D, Contract Compliance M/WBE Utilization Report. Can you confirm that vendors are not supposed to fill this out and submit it with our offering (since it is a utilization report)?	You can identify/disclose the potential subcontractor's, but in the amount, % of total contract, etc. you can include to be determined at this time.
10. Is Appendix I in the pricing proposal a reference to the ELM Requirements Spreadsheet?	Appendix I is the ELM requirements spreadsheet. The ELM requirements spreadsheet should not contain any pricing information. Number 22. Price Proposal should be corrected to read: "...The pricing proposal should account for/specify the following information:"
11. Can the City provide a date in which it will sign and send back the requested NDA sent on Tuesday 12/15?	An NDA was not issued as part of this RFP

12. As a private company, the vendor does not typically release financial information. Can this be provided upon award?	No, the financial stability is a stated evaluation criteria. Failure to provide the Financial Stability Information, listed on page 38 of the RFP will be grounds for disqualification.
13. Has the City had prior meetings or demos with any vendors for requirements gathering to understand if the items identified as required are available in a COTS product, or is this a wish list of required items?	The requirements are a wish list of required items, gathered from a variety of sources of market research.
14. With the current COTS products on the market, additional customizations and integrations will be required. Can the City provide a budget range for us to ascertain if we can complete the required items within the budget range?	Specify the costs for each. In other words, specify by items/features that are included in the COTS product and the corresponding price. Then, separately identify items/features that are not included in the COTS product and the corresponding price.
15. Since the vendor has both true web-based offerings as well as client server-based (which can be accessed remotely through a web browser via an application server), what is the City's preference for the on-premise deployment?	A client/server version would be a better solution. We will need the vendor to demo their web based solution and speak to how they update process works for the web app.
16. Given the list of vendor questions requiring responses and the required deliverables for a compliant proposal (full legal redline, ~200 questions in the added ELM Requirements spreadsheet), would the City extend the deadline until February 5 th ?	Yes, the City will extend the deadline to February 4 th .
17. In terms of pricing for the ELM Functionality Spreadsheet, is the vendor supposed to include in the price all required and optional items? Or just the required items for consistent comparison?	Separately identify the price for all required elements and then identify the cost for all optional elements. Please specify exactly which items are included in each pricing category.
ELM Requirements Spreadsheet	
10. If the vendor cannot satisfy all required items in the ELM Requirements spreadsheet, does that disqualify the vendor from selection?	Not necessarily. Some of the items on the ELM requirements spreadsheet are optional or preferred. The inability to provide optional items will not result in disqualification from selection.
11. On tab Rec Mgt in the ELM Requirements Table Excel Sheet, the vendor requests Bar Code Scanning be augmented from required to optional.	This feature has been downgraded from Required to Optional.
12. On tab Doc Mgmt, the vendor requests item D33 (batch printing) be augmented from required to optional.	The City declines this request.
13. On tab Doc Mgmt, the vendor requests item D34 (bulk transactions) be augmented from required to optional.	The City declines this request.
14. On tab Rec Mgmt, item Rec1, can the City satisfy this requirement by having IT remove the ability for users to save to their local hard drive?	Yes, Group Policy can be invoked to control the access to the local disk drives (and possibly for USBs as well).

<p>15. Would the City be willing to remove requirement G2 (file storage) in the General Tab, modify this as optional, or satisfy this requirement through third party software?</p>	<p>This requirement can be satisfied through third party software that is integrated with the ELM System offered by the proposer.</p>
<p>16. On Tab Tracking Case, item Tracase10</p>	
<p>a. Does “correspondence” mean e-mail (or are we trying to track correspondence via couriers or USPS?)</p>	<p>Correspondence means email or documents loaded into the system. It does not mean tracking via couriers or USPS.</p>
<p>b. Can you further define individual involvement? Are you trying to track correspondence by job role? By person?</p>	<p>We are trying to track involvement by person.</p>
<p>17. On Tab General, item G26, can the Web browser’s spell-checker satisfy this requirement?</p>	<p>G26 applies to the notes and comments field. It is not clear how a Web browser would satisfy that requirement. The City is looking for a feature similar to the “spell check” feature in Microsoft Word. If the Web browser provides similar functionality to “spell check” in Microsoft Word, then that feature could satisfy this requirement.</p>
<p>18. On Tab Customization, item Cust 5, regarding update statues, is the City looking to update their own statues, fees, etc., or have these changed statues flow through from a service like CompuLaw?</p>	<p>The City is looking to update its own statutes or fees. This feature would only need to be used on occasion. If CompuLaw is a third party software that is integrated with the ELM system offered by the proposer, the CompuLaw feature could satisfy this requirement. Provide separate pricing for the third party integration/software if any.</p> <p>This feature has been downgraded from Required to Optional.</p>
<p>19. On Tab Customization, item Cust 9, there is a missing supported functionality list. Can you please provide the missing items?</p>	<p>The missing items refers to the case types listed on page 7 of the RFP.</p>
<p>20. On Tab Doc Mgmt, can you please clarify item D29 in terms of sub documents? Are you looking for document merge templates where the Case Management System would add pre-populated data from the CMS into document templates?</p>	<p>Yes, this functionality would be very helpful for repetitive mailings.</p>
<p>21. On tab TimeSav_User Friendly, item Time17, in a web-based application, you have to open a document to print. This can be accomplished in a client-based application, however the City makes numerous references to desiring a web-based application. Can you please clarify?</p>	<p>A client/server version would be a better solution.</p> <p>We will need the vendor to demo their web based solution and speak to how they update process works for the web app.</p>

22. On tab TimeSav_User Friendly, item Time23, this is functionality of Microsoft Word and isn't typical of web-based applications. Is there a specific application that the City has viewed for case management that contains this functionality so we can further determine what is required?	No, there is not a specific application that contains this functionality. The City wants to ensure that the features of Microsoft, such as automatic saving based on time intervals, are available and usable in the ELM system.
23. The vendor requests item Time 28 on Tab TimeSav_User Friendly be removed, or changed from required to optional. How important is this requirement in the list of required items?	This feature has been downgraded from Required to Optional.
24. On Tab Tracking Case, item Tracase2, can you further define statute enhancers and modifiers? Is this charging language typically found in prosecutor systems?	This feature has been deleted. There is no need to respond to it in the Requirements Table.
25. On Tab ViewsDisplay, the vendor requests item VD3 be changed to optional.	This feature has been downgraded from Required to Optional. But, please note, it would be a required feature at the Admin Level access (e.g. the profile for users in the Contracts section should display certain fields, while the profile for users in the Litigation section would need to be modified to display very different fields).
26. On Tab Customization, item 1c, the vendor requests the City make this item optional, or remove the words "embedded website/software programs."	The words "embedded website/software programs" has been removed.
27. While the following features and functionality can certainly be accomplished through integrations or third party tools, the vendor would like to advise the City that the following required functions may be quite costly for the functionality they provide. It may be in the City's best interest to identify these items as optional:	Provide separate and clearly delineated pricing for each optional feature.
a. Item G4 Word Perfect integration	Integration with Word Perfect is optional, but highly preferred.
b. Item G22 Auto populating city/state based on Zip Code	This feature has been downgraded from Required to Optional.
c. Item D19 Document image editing. This is typically done through redacting software.	This feature has been downgraded from Required to Optional.
d. Items 12 a, and b are typically done through Acrobat, which the City likely already has licenses.	This feature has been downgraded from Required to Optional.

If you have additional questions or require further clarification please contact Division Manager, Brenda Chagoya at (832) 393-8723 or via email brenda.chagoya@houstontx.gov

When issued, Letter(s) of Clarification shall automatically become a part of the proposal documents and shall supersede any previous specification(s) and/or provision(s) in conflict with the Letter(s) of Clarification. All revisions, responses, and answers incorporated into the Letter(s) of Clarification are collaboratively from both the Strategic Purchasing Division and the applicable City Department(s). It is the responsibility of the proposers to ensure that it has obtained all such letter(s). By submitting a proposal on this project, proposers shall be deemed to have received all Letter(s) of Clarification and to have incorporated them into this proposal.