

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS  
 ADDENDUM 1 to RFP #2021-013  
 NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS  
 Case Management System

	Questions	Answers
1.	When is going to be the due date and the hour for questions and answers for the RFP 2021-013 Case Management System bid with due date on 5/28/2021.	See Section 1.2 of the RFP.
2.	Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)	Yes. See Appendix B-1.3 regarding hosting location.
3.	Whether we need to come over there for meetings?	The vendor should be prepared to meet remotely or in-person, but the expectation is that it will primarily be remote.
4.	Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)	See Appendix B-1.3.
5.	Can we submit the proposals via email?	See Section 2.
6.	Are you an O365 subscriber? If so, what license types and volumes do you have?	Yes. License type is government cloud.
7.	What version of SharePoint are you using and do you intend to remain up to date on major SharePoint versions as they are release? Is SharePoint installed on-premise?	The Commission is not currently utilizing SharePoint. The State of New Hampshire has a statewide implementation of Sharepoint through an enterprise agreement.
8.	The solution you describe is an ideal and we believe no existing system blends these together in a single offering. Also, we believe no other organization has the identical needs as the Commission and the requirements for document management functions, scheduling management and accounting (invoicing) may require several components. As such, we believe that there is no ‘turnkey’ solution that can simply be installed. The requirements indicate that configuration, customization and custom integrations will need to be implemented. Do you agree with these statements?	See RFP regarding customization and configuration requirements.
9.	There is a desire to ‘author’ document from SharePoint and use the proposed software to store final documents for retrieval, enable search and reporting. Is there a reason that SharePoint is not being considered for these functions? Alternatively, is ‘authoring’ documents form Microsoft Office in a way that is integrated with the document management system a better description of the requirement.	The Commission is not seeking a document management system that tracks drafts and revisions. The system will be managing final filed documents only as the repository of the official records of the Commission’s work. See Appendix B-1, Section “Not in scope”

10.	Would you consider a Phase I implementation of a document management system to meet core DMS needs while deferring the integration of scheduling and accounting to a Phase II?	Phased implementation may be considered.
11.	Page 33, In scope requirement for the system: Docketed matters. We interpret this to mean that documents can be saved into folder structure organized as in Figure 4. Is that correct?	Figure 4 is a representation of the current file structure. The state is interested in proposer's solutions for data storage and structure.
12.	Page 33, In scope requirement for the system: All filings related to docketed matters. We interpret this to mean that documents can be saved into folder structure organized as in Figure 4. Is that correct?	Figure 4 is a representation of the current file structure. The state is interested in proposer's solutions for data storage and structure.
13.	Page 33, In scope requirement for the system: Discovery requests from multiple parties, discovery responses, and management of same Non-docketed registrations, reports, and other filings. We interpret this to mean that an org structure like in Figure 2 from the RFP can be implemented and that a discovery request process can be implemented to track the status of the discovery package creation and the status of same. The system will facilitate the discovery process by allowing search of the Document Management system. Is that your vision?	The Commission is not seeking a document management system that tracks drafts and revisions. The system will be managing final filed documents only as the repository of the official records of the Commission's work. See Appendix B-1, Section "Not in scope". For discovery, proposed solutions that include a discovery tracking process with cataloging or search functions are preferred.
14.	What does "Service list maintenance and notification workflows" mean? Can you provide a use case?	The service list includes the email contacts within a docket. The list is used to provide notification and service based upon the role of the contact. See <a href="https://www.puc.nh.gov/ServiceList/ViewServiceList.aspx">https://www.puc.nh.gov/ServiceList/ViewServiceList.aspx</a>
15.	Can you provide an example of a template and a process workflow map?	Templates and process workflow maps will be developed as part of the project.
16.	Does automated imply email? Who is a "party" to a docket? Do all parties get all distributions?	Automated relates to the generation of the communication. For purposes of Public Utilities Commission dockets, "party" is defined by administrative rule as "defined by RSA 541-A, XII, namely, "each person or agency named or admitted as a party, or properly seeking and entitled to be admitted as a party." N.H. Admin. R., Puc 201.10. Parties generally get all distributions. Non-parties receive a subset of the distributions. For example, non-parties would not receive discovery responses or confidential information.
17.	Can you provide an example event driven template and enumerate the list of all the event driven templates? What data is to be pre-populated and from where? We presume from an associated docket. Do you have a list of properties for a docket that defines the set of docket metadata. Are there other entities that have metadata and what are they?	Templates and process workflow maps will be developed as part of the project.
18.	Can you describe an 'event'? What needs to happen in an instance of automatic scheduling?	See Appendix B-1, Statement of Work
19.	Regarding scope requirement: What deadlines are to be tracked? When are notifications due?	Docket and registration related dates. For example, filing deadlines, expiration dates of registration. Notification timelines are deadline type dependent.

20.	What does “Notification of follow-up actions based on Commission orders” mean?	Commission orders include future requirements of the parties. Those orders have related deadlines. Related notifications would be based upon the deadlines set forth in the order.
21.	What is envisioned for the “Automated noticing of events to the general public and/or to parties to the docket”	This relates to the use of the service list. Notification of follow-up actions via email for statutory requirements for the next step of the process in the life of a docket, the next filing deadline, final order, hearing date, etc.
22.	Can you please provide a bit more details on what the Commission is expecting the proposed tool to do for this item? Is the Commission expecting the tool to complete calculations and generate invoices, or just provide a template for Commission users to input these values?	This functionality is optional. To the extent it is included, calculation and generation of invoices would be preferred.
23.	<p>With respect to the data migration portion of the response, can the Commission provide some details around the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· How large is the database in GB, broken down by data volume (case management data, etc.) and document/file volume?</li> <li>· Total number of documents to be converted?</li> <li>· Total number of files to be converted?</li> <li>· What are the file types stored, examples (.tif, .pdf, .docx)?</li> <li>· Does the current system store any documents with a proprietary file format?</li> <li>· How large is the current file store (GB) for all the document files stored in the repository?</li> <li>· Are file paths stored in clear text in the database or does the database obfuscate or encrypt the file paths?</li> <li>· Are notes or annotations to be converted?</li> <li>· Do document renditions or versions need to be converted?</li> <li>· Can the document files be opened directly from the file share using standard viewers, examples (MS Word, Adobe PDF Viewer, MS Paint, MS Excel)?</li> <li>· Are the document files compressed or zipped?</li> <li>· Are the document files encrypted?</li> <li>· Product Name and version?</li> <li>· Product vendor?</li> <li>· Database platform?</li> <li>· Do any COLD (Computer Output to Laser Disk) documents need to be converted?</li> </ul>	<p>Migration may vary dependent upon the proposed solution. See Section 1.1.5 for file types.</p> <p>The current system does not store any documents with a proprietary format.</p> <p>The current file store has about 99,505 files for a total of approximately 65.2 GB. This is inclusive of files that will not be part of the project.</p> <p>See Appendix B-1 for in scope and not in scope requirements related to annotations, version management, editing, etc.</p> <p>For any document management approach proposed, standard viewers would be utilized.</p> <p>The current files are not compressed.</p> <p>No COLD documents need to be converted.</p>
24.	In B.2 of Appendix B (Case Management RFP document) it appears to reference an external attachment, Appendix B, with tabs that needs to be filled out and returned with the RFP. We do not see any attachments on the Bid site. Can you confirm that this file exists and post it to the Bid site?	See Addendum 2 to RFP #2021-013.

25.	Can you please describe (in more detail) the integration needs for Outlook and SharePoint?	Outlook would be used to generate emails to service lists, event scheduling, and calendaring. SharePoint is not currently used but would be considered as part of a proposed solution for document storage and retrieval
26.	Can you elaborate on what exactly you are looking for in regards to Calendar Synchronization?	Calendars are used to present hearing and technical session dates.
27.	Has NH PUC already explored options available on the market? Have you seen any demonstrations of such solutions? Have you gotten pricing from existing providers?	The Commission is utilizing this procurement to determine what solutions and pricing are available.
28.	Do you have a clear layout of your document retention schedule? Our platform does provide retention capabilities, but do you need us to configure this for all document types? If so, can you provide the rules for such configuration?	Document retention schedules may apply. Any applicable rules for configuration will be provided.
29.	Can you provide details regarding the expected implementation timeline and budget?	Implementation timeline and budget is dependent upon proposed solutions.
30.	Is the state willing to consider other types of solutions focused on this domain; i.e. Low-Code, COTS, Custom?	The state is willing to consider all proposed solutions that meet the required functionalities.
31.	Is the state willing to negotiate the terms defined in the warranty section?	The State will consider negotiating the terms defined in the warranty section.
32.	Roughly how many workflows is the state expecting to be implemented?	Workflows will be developed as part of the project.
33.	Can you provide details regarding the nature of the integration with Outlook that is required?	Integration with Outlook is required for purposes of calendaring and notification.
34.	Can the State please clarify the types of roles and permissions required by 'ad-hoc' users as referenced on page 3 as "Approximately 50 ad hoc individuals or organizations intervening in a particular docket in any given year that will need short-term credentials". Will these users require access only to individual dockets or additional internal user workflow mechanisms?	'Ad hoc' users may include occasional intervenors who are parties or stakeholders in individual dockets.. These may be individuals or organizations. These users would not have access to internal user workflow mechanisms.
35.	Regarding the Legacy System to be migrated, can you provide the following details about that system? a. What database is it on b. Is there one database to be converted c. Will the State provide a subject matter expert to assist with data mapping	The current system includes multiple databases. Yes – the state will provide a subject matter expert to assist with data mapping.
36.	Can you confirm that the proposed solution will not be used for document generation only document storage and an interface with Sharepoint is where documents will be generated?	See Appendix B-1. Integration with Sharepoint is not mandatory.
37.	Are there any required interfaces with 3 <sup>rd</sup> party systems? If so, can you provide the system and if the data is inbound, outbound, or both?	No.

38.	Besides the 53 internal users does the State anticipate the other 250 users will access limited data through the States web portal?	The user numbers are estimates. Access for external users via a portal, or other proposed secure means is expected.
39.	What are you looking for? (Court case management solution, docketing, e-filing, virtual hearings, evidence sharing, etc.)	Yes – these examples are consistent with the expected solutions.
40.	What type of court do you work for?	The Public Utilities Commission is a quasi-judicial administrative decision-making body.
41.	Approximately how many cases does the court have each year?	Approximately 200 dockets are opened annually. There are numerous ongoing dockets that occur in multiple years.
42.	Has the court established a budget for procuring a new court case management system?	Budget is dependent upon proposed solutions.