

*Q. Will you allow for any redaction work to be performed offshore?*

**A. A proposal that includes off-shore work will not be disqualified, but such a proposal should have enough information included for proper consideration.**

*Q. What is the DPI of any scanned TIFF / PDF images at present (i.e. 200DPI, 300DPI, etc...)?*

**A. AOC expects most of the images to be 300 DPI.**

*Q. Having responded to many redaction RFP's over the past ten years, customers usually have a process in place to validate a vendor's accuracy rather than just take their marketed accuracy rate at face value. Will your selection process include a real world accuracy test of both the software plus manual validation process / staff that vendors will be proffering in their responses to you as part of your selection process?*

**A. It may. Under Section 6.2 of the RFP - If multiple vendors satisfy the requirements and project goals and provide viable cost proposals, the AOC reserves the right to invite selected vendors to conduct demonstrations to assist in the decision whether to award a contract. The AOC may, at its discretion, conduct customer visits to view successful redaction implementations.**

*Q. Will there be an onsite visit to validate the processing capabilities and security of vendor environments as part of the evaluation process?*

**A. AOC has no specific plans to conduct onsite visits, but may, at its discretion, conduct customer visits or vendor visits to determine that the vendor has the demonstrated ability to satisfy the requirements.**

*Q. The RFP states that there is no need to provide a forward file solution as it is the responsibility of the attorney/filer to redact the privacy information on new documents prior to submission. However, then the RFP requests information for forward filing like events – software support/maintenance, software release schedules, etc.... As most back file processing is a purchased service (i.e. customers provide images to redact and receive back accurately redacted images) have we misread the RFP and the thinking is that there might be some forward file processing?*

**A. The answer is found in Section 3.1.4 System Integration Requirements of the RFP:**

**Because the burden of ongoing redaction is placed upon attorneys and filing parties, there is no anticipated need for an ongoing redaction solution for **newly filed documents**. However, **many courts are engaged in projects to scan back files of court records**, so the solution must be capable of interactive redaction of newly scanned historical documents in addition to redacting a repository of previously scanned court documents. The redaction capabilities of the various DMS used by the courts are unknown, so the extent of use of the redaction solution resulting from this RFP is also unknown.**

*Q. Is the primary goal of the state to procure a redaction service where by all redactions are performed by the vendor and their staff or for the state to purchase redaction software to perform redactions in house?*

**A. The primary goal is to acquire a redaction solution that may include either software or services or both. For example, in response to Section 3.1.3 where a court is actively engaged in a project to scan historical files, a vendor may propose a service-based solution for interactive redaction of newly scanned historical documents such that the scanned files are periodically provided to the vendor for redaction prior to making the files accessible to the public.**

*Q. As part of a redaction process, there is usually automated software processing, and then a manual review/correction of a percentage of the images processed by software. In most back file projects this is performed usually by the redaction vendor as such delivers a final product (with contracted for accuracy and liability resident solely on the vendor) to the customer.*

*Is it the desire of the courts in this RFP to have a complete solution such that the elected redaction provider does complete processing of the documents, OR, is the court willing to provide the manual validation of the software processed documents using their own staff?*

**A. The availability of the court staff to provide manual validation will depend on the court. A vendor may wish to provide the courts the option of complete processing by the vendor or manual validation by court staff. Section 3.2 of the RFP states that the successful implementation of the redaction project will result in the following:**

- redaction of electronic documents currently stored in the central Contexte database;

- redaction of documents when delivered to the AOC for storage in the Contexte repository as part of an electronic filing implementation;
- a state contract that will allow courts to purchase the services of the vendor for redaction of electronic documents currently stored in local DMS repositories;
- a state contract that will allow court users to purchase vendor software or services to be able to interactively redact documents as part of an historical back-file scanning project.

*Q. Can you provide the total number of pages of documents that is presently in the central Contexte repository (5.6 #1 page 11)?*

**A. Currently only appellate court documents and newly scanned documents in two small circuit courts are stored in the Contexte repository; however, within the next 30 days AOC expects to have stored the Pulaski County Circuit Court repository. The estimate of total pages for these courts is 4,832,721.**

*Q. Can you provide the total number of pages that you expect will be added to it? An estimate if not actual numbers?*

**A. As of March 10, 2014, we estimate 7,829,382 pages have been reported by courts using the Contexte imaging functionality.**

*Q. Is the total number of documents/pages that are filed within the state available? By County or court circuit? The reason for this request is to provide best possible volume pricing.*

**A. AOC has no information about the number of documents or pages that have been scanned by courts not using the Contexte case management system. The number of pages is a user entered field in Contexte, so it may not be reliable in some cases. However, in Contexte, as of March 18, 2014, the breakdown by court is as follows:**

<b>COURT</b>	<b>No. Of Pages</b>	<b>No. Of Documents</b>
BENTON	478833	541156
CLARK	917	43920
CONWAY	4921	36550
CRAIGHEAD	251583	108512
CRAWFORD	428188	155634
CROSS	30041	22488
FAULKNER	615437	866119
GARLAND	137	1010177
GRANT	61016	25513
HEMPSTEAD	64621	29080
HOT SPRING	199578	77171
LEE	30097	11257
LOGAN	63846	29049
LONOKE	65	12792
MILLER	8124	43680
MONROE	1447	4799
NEVADA	86	9285
PHILLIPS	8233	9183
POINSETT	916	428
PULASKI	4828335	3376040
SALINE	363130	581170
SCOTT	59081	16342
SEARCY		978
ST. FRANCIS	102534	43204
STATE OF ARKANSAS	4001	11256
VAN BUREN	86903	207015
WOODRUFF	1983	4604
YELL	21855	21885

*Q. Are there any redaction solutions currently in use?*

**A. AOC is not aware of any redaction solutions currently in use by the courts.**

*Q. Are there any solutions that have been evaluated so far? If so, from which vendors?*

**A. No solutions have been evaluated by the AOC.**

*Q. Are all the types of information desired to be redacted at present known to the Courts?*

**A. Administrative Order 19 establishes what information is considered confidential.**

**Section VII.A. provides:**

**(1) information that is excluded from public access pursuant to federal law;**

**(2) information that is excluded from public access pursuant to the Arkansas Code Annotated;**

**(3) information that is excluded from public access by order or rule of court;**

**(4) Social Security numbers;**

**(5) account numbers of specific assets, liabilities, accounts, credit cards, and personal identification numbers**

**(PINs);**

**(6) information about cases expunged or sealed pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. §§ 16-90-901, et seq.;**

**(7) notes, communications, and deliberative materials regarding decisions of judges, jurors, court staff, and judicial agencies;**

**(8) all home and business addresses of petitioners who request anonymity when seeking a domestic order of protection.**

*Q. Can you extend the submission of the RFP response by two additional weeks so that we (and all the other vendors) have time to perform due diligence, review the answers to the clarification questions, and provide a best possible response to your RFP?*

**A. The RFP has been amended to extend the submission date to 12:00 p.m. on May 9, 2014.**

---

*Q. Aside from the redaction of SSN's as stated in the RFP, is there a desire to protect your investment in the processing having additional "privacy fields" located, classified, and appropriate metadata provided such that any "production" of additional images if required in the future will not have to incur any additional processing costs (i.e. "Futureproof" processing?)*

**A. AOC will consider all qualified responses.**

*Q. If the Court desires vendor responses to include for both off site processing services (i.e. images shipped to vendor and fully processed redacted documents returned) as well as for a software purchase and then the software run onsite by the Courts (and additional manpower provided by the Courts), is one solution preferred over the other?*

**A. There is currently no preference for a type of solution as long as it meets the goals of the RFP.**

*Q. Where exactly will the final redacted images need to be returned to and stored at? In the central Contexte database/repository? In each individual Clerk's DMS's? In both?*

**A. If working with AOC in processing the current central repository or as part of an eFiling implementation, then the redacted files may need to be provided to both AOC and the Court. If working with a court not as part of an AOC project, then the redacted files would need to be provided to the court only.**

*Q. Does the final destination repository have the ability to store both the redacted and non-redacted documents, or will redaction co-ordinates be required to be supplied along with any redacted images/documents returned?*

**A. AOC assumes that the destination repository will store both the redacted and non-redacted documents.**

*Q. 3.1.3 Paragraph 3 Page 9 states that it is expected that local images are expected to be copied to the central database. Is it the desire that the redaction of these images occur during this stage of image transfer into the central repository, or will the local DMS's still be responsible for housing and providing the redacted images when requested by the public (3.1.1.paragraph 2).*

A. As part of an electronic filing implementation, the AOC may receive the court's document repository for storage in the central repository. Prior to making the documents available to the public, the documents must be redacted. After transfer to the central DMS, the AOC can provide public access to documents only through the central repository; however, courts may separately provide access through their local repositories. AOC is aware of at least one county (Craighead County Circuit) that does not allow document access through CourtConnect, but does allow access to documents through its DMS vendor. AOC expects that documents provided to AOC, if not already redacted, will be processed pursuant to this contract prior to storage and public access being made available from the central repository.

*Q. Is there an established (or expected) format and process that such transfers will occur in (i.e. web services, file transfer, shipping of USB drives and import of received files) that the redaction processing can be injected into here?*

A. There is no established (or expected) format or process.

*Q. Is "redaction on demand", or redacting only when a document has been requested for public use a potential solution to your redaction requirements?*

A. Yes

*Q. If so, does the ability exist to obtain the documents from the system that is aware of the "demand" available and if so via web services?*

A. AOC expects that the ability exists to process a document when it is requested from Public CourtConnect (<https://caseinfo.aoc.arkansas.gov>); however, the web services do not currently exist and would need to be developed.

*Q. As Xerox provides redaction solutions, how can we obtain information about the interfaces that would exist within their CMS (RFP page 12 bullet 6)? Can we obtain information on the available interfaces to be able to answer your questions on how this integration will occur?*

A. AOC is not permitted to disclose proprietary information about the Contexte case management system. However, if a contract is awarded that requires integration with the Contexte, the Vendor will be required to enter into a Non-Disclosure Agreement with Xerox so that confidential information may be shared between Xerox and the Vendor. Because AOC recognizes that not all vendors submitting proposals will have already integrated with the Contexte, vendors who have integrated their solutions with other case management systems should describe with sufficient detail the process by which an integration effort is undertaken so that AOC may evaluate the proposal.

*Q. What is the desired return time on images provided for redaction?*

A. The turn-around-time for processing documents will likely be a term within the resulting contract.

*Q. Is there a date by which all documents from 2009 forward have to be redacted?*

A. Filers have been required to redact documents from 2009 forward.

*Q. Is there a preponderance of one DMS vendor being used for storage of local court images in the state to date? If so what is the product? If not, is there a breakdown of DMS's available to determine the interfaces required?*

A. AOC is not aware of a preponderance of one DMS vendor and does not have a breakdown of DMS's. AOC has interfaced Contexte with DISC, Apprentice, and Fidlar. AOC is also aware of the use of BIS, New Dawn, and Eclipse but there is no Contexte integration with those DMS vendors.

[Dynamic Information Solutions Company Inc.](#)

[Apprentice Information Systems, Inc.](#)

[Fidlar Technologies](#)

*Q. Is there a desire for an in-house centralized system to be able to process redactions for all local Clerks/Courts?*

A. An in-house centralized system would only be used as part of an electronic filing project. AOC expects that courts may want to contract separately to redact existing images because use of the Contexte case management system and participation in the eFiling project is voluntary.

*Q. If you are purchasing a redaction service (i.e. to redact back file images) do you still desire the RFP response to include answers to section 9.7.5 which seem to focus on how the redaction software is created / maintained?*

**A. A proposal for a service solution should answer N/A in any section requesting information about a software solution that does not apply to the vendor's response.**

*Q. Page 18 bullets 13 and 15 minimal requirements mention extraction and indexing.*

*Is data extraction and indexing a requirement of our redaction RFP? If so, can you please explain the requirements so we can provide specific information on extraction, classification, and automatic docketing / indexing of court documents as well as redaction technology information?*

**A. AOC expects that if a vendor proposes a software solution, the software will use OCR to “extract” the data in order to analyze the patterns necessary for redaction. AOC further expects that some software solutions may use recognized patterns to classify documents for purposes of redaction. Automatic docketing or indexing data for inclusion in the case management system or for updating indexing data in a DMS database is not in the scope of this RFP.**

*Q. Page 19 bullet one – can you please explain what will be used to determine the output of two or more redacted versions from a single pass?*

**A. AOC expects that if a vendor proposes a software solution, the solution will allow redaction rules for different document types. Some document types, such as Judgments and Orders may have different rules for public consumption, quasi-official consumption such as for title companies, or un-redacted court consumption. If multiple rules apply to a particular document type, then the output based on those rules would be multiple redacted documents where an object redacted for one class of user may not be redacted for another class of users. Section II of Administrative Order 19 provides:**

**Section II. Who Has Access Under This Order.**

**A. All persons have access to court records as provided in this order, except as provided in section II(B) of this order.**

**B. The following persons, in accordance with their functions within the judicial system, may have greater access to court records:**

**(1) employees of the court, court agency, or clerk of court;**

**(2) private or governmental persons or entities who assist a court in providing court services;**

**(3) public agencies whose access to court records is defined by other statutes, rules, orders or policies; and**

**(4) the parties to a case or their lawyers with respect to their own case.**

*Q. When will responses to questions be provided?*

**A. AOC has tried to respond as quickly as possible to the large number of questions that were submitted.**

*Q. Due to the complexity of the requirements, will the Court consider an extension of the RFP response by 14 days from the date the responses to the questions are posted?*

**A. The RFP has been amended to extend the submission date to 12:00 p.m. on May 9, 2014.**

*Q. How many courts are currently in the process of scanning historical images, or have budgeted back scanning projects?*

**A. AOC does not have this information.**

*Q. How many courts have indicated they will be redacting historical images?*

**A. Most circuit courts have been scanning at least judgments and orders for many years. The courthouses are overflowing with paper, so AOC expects that most courts, as their budgets permit, will wish to have these documents scanned and redacted.**

*Q. Is there a plan to store historical documents in the centralized repository or will they continue to store in the local DMS?*

A. When a court begins eFiling, for any historical documents to be accessible from the case management system, they will be required to be stored in the central repository. However, all courts will have the option to retain a copy in the local DMS.

*Q. Is there a published rollout schedule available for courts to comply with e-Filing?*

A. AOC is beginning its second eFiling project. There is no published schedule. Participation is voluntary.

*Q. How many image pages are currently filed electronically?*

A. For the 2013 Calendar year, there were a total of 236,754 approved documents filed electronically.

*Q. What percentage of the overall case volume is filed electronically?*

A. Currently only Pulaski County Circuit Court is electronically filing. In 2012, the caseload in Pulaski County Circuit Court was about 15% of the state's circuit court caseload. See <https://courts.arkansas.gov/forms-and-publications/annual-reports> for additional statistical information on Arkansas courts. After one year of an electronic filing mandate, approximately half of the documents in Pulaski County Circuit are electronically filed, representing about 7% of the state's circuit court caseload.

*Q. What is the targeted e-filing volume?*

A. After one year of an electronic filing mandate, approximately half of the documents in Pulaski County Circuit are electronically filed, so this is a reasonable goal in future courts in the next several years.

*Q. 3.2 states the project will result in the redaction of documents when delivered to the AOC for storage in Contexte as part of the e-filing implementation. This seems to contradict 3.1.4 which states there is no anticipated need for redaction of newly filed documents. Please explain.*

A. Newly **filed** documents are required to be redacted by the filer. Newly **SCANNED** documents may include pre-2009 documents that were not required to be redacted at the time of filing but which are required to be redacted prior to making the documents remotely accessible to the public.

3.1.3 provides: As part of the electronic filing project, the eFlex software was integrated with the DocsServer solution from Dynamic Information Solutions Company, Inc. (D.I.S.C.) (website: <http://www.discllc.com>), which has also been integrated with Contexte. However, **in order to facilitate the rollout of electronic filing, future eFlex implementations will use the centralized integrated Contexte image repository for document storage**, and, as with the appellate project, make copies of the images available to the courts for storage in a local DMS. For each eFiling implementation, the **AOC expects to retrieve images from the court's local DMS and store them in the central image repository**. At go-live for eFiling, all scanned and electronically filed documents will first be converted to PDF then stored in the central Contexte repository. Subsequently eFiled or scanned documents will be stored in the Contexte repository then a copy will be made available for storage in a local DMS.

3.1.4 provides: Because the burden of ongoing redaction is placed upon attorneys and filing parties, there is no anticipated need for an ongoing redaction solution for **newly filed documents**. However, many courts are engaged in projects to scan **back files of court records**, so the solution must be capable of interactive redaction of newly scanned historical documents in addition to redacting a repository of previously scanned court documents.

*Q. How many image pages are currently stored in local DMS?*

A. AOC does not have this information.

*Q. If an image page total isn't available, how many courts are currently scanning and storing images in their local DMS?*

A. AOC doesn't have this information. Anecdotal information suggests that most circuit courts are at least scanning judgments and orders but not pleadings, and almost no district courts are currently scanning.

*Q. What document types will require redaction?*

A. Only documents in cases that are available to the public require redaction. Juvenile and certain probate cases are not available to the public.

Q. The RFP indicated five subject matter divisions: Criminal, Civil, Juvenile, Probate and Domestic Relations. Does the AOC anticipate land records could be redacted as part of this contract?

A. Land records are not court records and are not included in the scope of this RFP.

Q. Does the AOC expect more District Courts to transition to Contexte other than the 4 currently pending implementation?

A. Participation is voluntary. AOC is actively encouraging all courts to participate. However, AOC expects that few district courts are actively scanning documents today.

Q. Administrative Order Number 19 specifies redaction of SSN, account number and addresses in specific situations. Please confirm that all counties redaction rules are identical or would there be situations where individual counties have unique redaction rules?

A. Administrative Order 19 establishes a minimum requirement for confidential information. Because Section V provides some court discretion, it is conceivable that courts could have different rules if redacting a local repository. AOC does not expect court-specific redaction rules if redacting documents delivered to the central repository.

Q. Numerous places in the RFP redaction services are mentioned. Please clarify how the AOC is expecting pricing. Would this be considered:

- a. a statewide license
- b. a software sale at the individual county level would redaction services be provided by the [vendor]

A. Section 5.6 provides:

There are two categories required for the cost proposal:

1. The cost to AOC for software and services to meet the first two project goals:

- redaction of electronic documents currently stored in the central Contexte database;
- redaction of documents when delivered to the AOC for storage in the Contexte repository as part of an electronic filing implementation;

2. The cost for individual courts should they desire to engage the vendor to meet the second two project goals:

- a state contract that will allow courts to purchase the services of the vendor for redaction of images and electronic documents currently stored in local DMS repositories;
- a state contract that will allow court users to purchase vendor software or services to be able to interactively redact documents as part of an historical back-file scanning project.

Because participation in the Contexte case management system and eFiling is voluntary, and because courts are currently imaging and providing public access to documents through their document management systems, the AOC is expecting pricing to AOC for the first two bullet points and separate pricing for the individual courts for the last two bullet points should they wish to take advantage of the resulting contract. AOC is not expecting to incur the cost for redacting images for courts that are not now and may never participate in the case management and electronic filing systems.

Q. Does the AOC envision the redaction software will be installed at the individual counties or centralized at the state level?

A. AOC envisions that a redaction software solution would be centralized for courts using AOC applications and locally for the other courts.

Q. The RFP states CourtConnect includes hyperlinks to local Document Management Systems. Are all Court Connect counties including access to the electronic images? If not, how many courts are currently providing access to the electronic case files?

A. All courts with imaging include access to the images available through CourtConnect. The following Contexte courts are not yet imaging in Contexte:

Baxter Co Circuit Clerk  
Boone Co. Circuit Clerk  
Boone Co. Circuit Probate  
Carroll Co East Probate  
Carroll Co West Probate  
Carroll Co East Circuit  
Carroll Co West Circuit  
Marion Co. Circuit Clerk  
Marion Co Circuit Clerk  
Newton Co. Circuit Clerk  
Hot Spring Co District Court in Malvern  
Independence Co District Court in Batesville  
Montgomery Co District Court in Mount Ida  
Clark County District Court in Arkadelphia  
Crawford County District Court in Van Buren  
Pulaski County District Court in Little Rock

*Q. On Page 16, an example refers to an inline redaction process where the document is redacted prior to delivery to the requested user's web browser. It is our understanding from other sections in the RFP that the document in that particular example would already be redacted. Can you explain a scenario where the AOC would like us to pursue on-demand redaction?*

*A. AOC anticipated that a vendor may propose a redaction-on-demand software solution that would only redact on-the-fly when an image is requested instead of a solution that would require the processing of millions of documents, most of which likely don't include confidential information and which may never even be requested to be viewed by the public.*

*Q. On Page 12 it requests bidders to list the software license cost for a statewide implementation of the system in all courts in all counties. Is that all 75 Circuit Courts and 84 District courts regardless of whether they are currently using Contexte or are scheduled to implement in the near future? Do you indeed want vendors to provide one price for a statewide implementation or pricing to add counties as they request redaction functionality?*

*A. The AOC expects a resulting contract that may be utilized both by the AOC for courts using the centralized DMS and by the courts directly if they have a DMS and wish to redact documents in order to permit remote public access. If the vendor is proposing a software solution, the cost for a statewide license should be provided – which could be used by courts regardless whether they are using Contexte.*

The RFP requests that vendors:

Describe your approach to charging for software licensing, and list the software license cost for statewide implementation of the system in all courts in all counties. Because of limited funding and the inability to determine the extent of the need for the software in courts using a DMS, vendors are encouraged to be creative in proposing ways to manage the cost, such as graduated per-seat licensing as the number of available courts utilizing the software increases.

*Q. Section 2.1 mentions the source document may be stored in Word, PDF, TIFF and other file formats. Please elaborate on the other types of file formats the proposed solution needs to be able to handle.*

*In the Introduction, the RFP states, "the source document may be stored in a word processing document, PDF, TIFF, and other file formats" for informational purposes. In 9.3 the vendor will state which formats are eligible for redaction processing.*

*Q. Will the AOC be able to provide a representative set of sample documents (originals, redacted versions of originals, or "faked" versions of originals) that will need to be processed for redactions?*

*A. When analyzing the responses to the RFP, the AOC may provide a sample set to selected vendors for the purpose of determining the vendor's ability to demonstrate stated capabilities.*

Q. Section 3.1.2 mentions the AOC is implementing the Tybera eFlex solution and will begin rolling out the solution to other courts in 2014. Is the AOC able to publish the anticipated rollout schedule for 2014, and provide any available information regarding planned rollouts in 2015?

A. At this time, AOC has only 2 counties (Grant and Hot Spring) scheduled for 2014. AOC will not know until later this year how many eFiling implementations to expect in 2015.

Q. The RFP mentions 5 different potential repositories for the documents - Contexte, Laserfiche, D.I.S.C, Apprentice Information Systems, and Fidlar. Can you please estimate how many of the district/appellate/circuit courts use each of these systems?

A. The total number of courts on Contexte using an approved document management system:

D.I.S.C. - 30

Apprentice Information Systems - 17

Fidlar Technologies - 5

Contexte - 5

Laserfiche - 2

Q. For each of the potential document repositories (Contexte, Laserfiche, D.I.S.C, Apprentice Information Systems, and Fidlar), please elaborate on whether that system has native redaction functions that allow for specifying / marking redactions in ways other than by storing a duplicate copy of the document with the burned in redactions. We are aware for instance that Laserfiche supports this kind of functionality (thereby allowing for native and intuitive role-based access to original vs. redacted documents), but would like to know if the other systems provide this kind of functionality as well.

A. AOC does not have access to this information.

Q. In section 3.1.3, the RFP mentions that at go-live all scanned and electronically filed documents will be converted to PDF and then stored in Contexte. Can the AOC please estimate how many documents/pages will be stored in Contexte as part of this one-time conversion?

A. This section is describing the process for loading documents into the central repository for each court during an eFlex implementation project. This isn't a one-time conversion. This is a court-by-court conversion as eFlex is implemented throughout the state. AOC cannot provide an estimate.

Q. In section 3.1.3, the RFP mentions that at go-live all scanned and electronically filed documents will be converted to PDF and then stored in Contexte. Will these "historical" documents/pages need to go through the redaction process?

A. Only the documents that were filed with the court prior to January 1, 2009 (regardless when they were scanned) will be required to be redacted.

Q. Section 3.1.4 mentions there is no anticipated need for an ongoing redaction solution for newly filed documents. For the newly filed documents, is the AOC interested in considering highly accurate automated redaction software to attempt the finding and redaction of any sensitive data the attorneys may have missed redacting? And if so would the AOC want to review/modify the application workflows within the Xerox Contexte system to accommodate this?

A. Although not required because of the presumption of redaction prior to filing, such a solution is not required but AOC would consider this if proposed.

Q. Does the AOC have a preference for running the server side of the redaction software (where the OCRing and searching of sensitive data happens) centrally vs. having independent installations of the redaction software for each court?

A. AOC does not have a preference, but vendors may wish to provide separate cost proposals for each solution.

Q. In total among all the courts, what is the estimate of the number of client workstations from which court staff may want to initiate redaction?

A. Assuming that there will be approximately 3,000 court Contexte users when state-wide rollout is complete, and assuming that no more than 10% would require a redaction workstation, at this time a best guess for the number of client workstations statewide would be approximately 300.

*Q. Please elaborate on the following requirement with some examples or use-cases: "The system is able to rapidly recognize or 'fingerprint' document types based on previous examples".*

*A. Many documents filed are in the same form or format such as coversheets or sentencing orders and the redactable information should be found in the same place in all of the documents. AOC anticipates that some software may be able to recognize the commonality of these documents during processing to simplify and speed the redaction process.*

*Q. This RFP is mainly focused on finding a redaction solution. Please elaborate on this requirement in the context of how it fits into the proposed integrated redaction solution and use-cases where this requirement comes into play: "The system is able to read bar codes or QR codes inherently".*

*A. Many court cases involve debt collection. Parties frequently file supporting documents evidencing a debt. AOC anticipates that some of these documents may have been filed, particularly from financial institutions, where account information may have been encoded in barcodes. Because account numbers are considered to be confidential, and because the barcodes may contain information required to be redacted, AOC expects that redaction software would be able to decode these items and determine whether the barcode itself may also need to be redacted.*

*Q. This RFP is mainly focused on redaction, but this requirement mentions data capture and classification - could you please elaborate on the types of documents that need to be classified, how you envision the classification result to be used in the workflow / integration, and what types of fields of data you wish to capture automatically with the proposed solution: "The system has a powerful one-pass OCR engine that allows both the capture of metadata, indexing, classification, and redaction".*

*A. OCR/data capture and classification are mentioned only to the extent that they are required for processing filed documents to identify information required to be redacted. There is no expectation that such data would be used to update DMS or case management system indexing or information.*

*Q. Is the pricing for this RFP expected to include the cost for document classification and data capture (indexing) as well?*

*A. OCR/data capture and classification are mentioned only to the extent that they are required for processing filed documents to identify information required to be redacted.*

*Q. The RFP mentions a requirement towards the end of section 9.8 for the system to be able to output two or more redacted versions based upon different rules. Please elaborate on use-cases where this requirement would come into play, and how you envision the multiple redacted versions being stored back in Contexte (and possibly the local DMS) and how the user would search and find a particular version of the redacted document.*

*A. AOC expects that if a vendor proposes a software solution, the solution will allow redaction rules for different document types. Some document types, such as Judgments and Orders may have different rules for public consumption, quasi-official consumption such as for title companies, or un-redacted court consumption. If multiple rules apply to a particular document type, then the output based on those rules would be multiple redacted documents where an object redacted for one class of user may not be redacted for another class of users. Section II of Administrative Order 19 provides:*

*Section II. Who Has Access Under This Order.*

*A. All persons have access to court records as provided in this order, except as provided in section II(B) of this order.*

*B. The following persons, in accordance with their functions within the judicial system, may have greater access to court records:*

*(1) employees of the court, court agency, or clerk of court;*

*(2) private or governmental persons or entities who assist a court in providing court services;*

*(3) public agencies whose access to court records is defined by other statutes, rules, orders or policies; and*

*(4) the parties to a case or their lawyers with respect to their own case.*

*Q. Pg. 17, 9.7.4 Describe encryption technologies used by your product. Is the state asking us to describe encryption technology that allows/prevents access to redacted documents or encryption of user passwords, etc.?*

*A. Assuming a vendor proposes a software solution, if the proposal is for a hosted or central installation for use by the courts, AOC anticipates that documents containing confidential information would have to be transferred from the local court to the remote redaction system or service for processing. Therefore, AOC inquires about the technology used to secure such transfers.*

*Q. Page 9 of the RFP states, "At go-live for eFiling, all scanned and electronically filed documents will first be converted to PDF then stored in the central Contexte repository. Our assumption is when it states "all scanned documents will be stored in Contexte" that means not only newly scanned documents, but copies of all previously scanned documents will be uploaded to the Contexte repository as well. Can you please confirm our understanding is correct?*

*A. It is a correct understanding that transfer of a courts document repository to the central Contexte repository will be part of an eFiling implementation project for many courts. Some courts already have extensive document repositories that will be loaded into the Contexte repository when a court begins eFiling.*

*Q. Does the AOC envision maintaining two copies of documents, i.e. a redacted copy as well as an original copy, for historical and official business as well as new redacted documents if needed due for redaction rule changes?*

*A. AOC expects that some vendors may propose the retention of two copies of documents.*

*Q. Does the AOC desire to have the Contexte application modified to allow a user based on security setting access to the original or redacted versions of documents?*

*A. Contexte already has the functionality to associate a security level to an individual document. This functionality is currently in use where an attorney is required to file both redacted and un-redacted copies of documents.*

*Q. As courts migrate to the Xerox Contexte system will the local court be responsible for providing redacted images or will the AOC be responsible for performing this task?*

*A. AOC anticipates both scenarios. If a court has contracted for redaction as a result of this contract, the court may provide a file set already containing redacted images that would require no further redaction by AOC. If a court has not already redacted the documents, then redaction of the courts files would be included in the project to load the images into the central repository as part of eFiling implementation.*

*Q. How will redaction of documents associated with new appeals be handled? And who will be responsible for documents that require redaction prior to loading into the Laserfiche system?*

*A. Redaction of documents for new appeals is the responsibility of the attorneys. The appellate courts' Laserfiche system is the same as a local repository for other courts. The "official" documents are stored in the Contexte repository and working copies are sent to the Laserfiche repository for use by the appellate staff. Documents scanned into the Contexte repository are automatically transferred to the Laserfiche repository.*