ATTACHMENT A
DCSC-26-RFP-60 LEGAL CASE & DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY PROSPECTIVE OFFERS APRIL 13, 2026

1. **Question**: Our software employs a named user licensing model tied to two main types of users: Full Users and Participant Users. Full User can be granted the ability to do anything within the repository including administering the system, importing documents, and editing metadata. Participant Users are read-only users who can also participate (submit/approve) in forms processes. Do you know the number of users between these two licenses? Or would you like us to submit general pricing tiers only?
   Answer: OGC requires licenses for six (6) staff members and the ability to assign multiple levels of access and permissions. See RFP §§ C.3, C.5.11, C.5.31, C.5.50-.53.

2. **Question**: For accessing District Empire will need full rights (upload, edit cases) and how many will need read-only rights (only view the Document or participate in workflow process)?
   Answer: See Answer to Question No. 1.

3. **Question**: Is District Empire preference more towards Cloud or On-Premises Legal Case and Document Management System?
   Answer: See RFP §§ C.6(b), (c).

4. **Question**: Do you have a budget already available for this project? If yes, what is the maximum budget you are planning to spend on this project?
   Answer: The Courts does not share this information.

5. **Question**: Has the District Empire seen demonstrations of any Legal Case and Document Management System Implementation with Electronic Forms for Legal Case and Document Management System. If yes, what is the name of the solution and vendor which provided the demonstration?
   Answer: The Courts does not share this information.

6. **Question**: Is there any expected timeframe within which you would like this system to go-live?
   Answer: OGC would like to implement the system within 6 to 9 months of contract award.

7. **Question**: Is this a new requirement? If not, can you please provide the name of the incumbent, the current contract value and eligibility criteria to re-compete?
   Answer: This is a new requirement.

8. **Question**: Can we request extending the due date of the proposal?
   Answer: The deadline for submission of proposals is extended to July 8, 2026.

9. **Question**: We would like to kindly request a two-week extension to the submission deadline for the Legal Case & Document Management System DCSC-26-RFP-60.
   Answer: The deadline for submission of proposals is extended to July 8, 2026.

10. **Question**: FedRAMP Requirement - The RFP references a "FedRAMP authorized Cloud Service Provider." Please confirm whether FedRAMP authorization is mandatory for award, or if CJIS-compliant government cloud environments (e.g., AWS GovCloud or Azure Government) will be considered acceptable alternatives.
    Answer: FedRAMP authorization is required for contract award. See RFP §§ C.5.45, C.6(b).

11. **Question**: AI Capability Requirement - RFP includes generative AI and intelligent document processing capabilities. Please clarify whether these capabilities are required at time of proposal submission or may be delivered via phased implementation, roadmap, or third-party integrations and delivered within an agreed time frame. Should AI capabilities be priced as part of the base license, or may they be proposed as optional or add-on components?
    Answer: RFP § C.5.6 is required at the time of proposal submission and must be priced as part of the base license.

12. **Question**: Box / ShareFile Requirement - The RFP lists Box.com and Citrix ShareFile compatibility. Please confirm whether real-time integration is required, or if migration and consolidation into the proposed system is acceptable.
    Answer: Real-time integration is not required. The solution must support either APIs, built-in connectors, mapped network drives, or sync folders.

13. **Question**: SSO / Entra ID - The RFP requires single sign-on using Microsoft Entra ID or Active Directory. Please confirm whether SSO must be native at go-live or if SSO via third-party identity providers is acceptable.

Answer: SSO must be configured by the vendor and tested before go-live. The vendor must ensure their SSO implementation approach works with Microsoft Entra ID or Active Directory.

14. **Question**: Migration Scope Clarification - Please provide additional details regarding document migration expectations, including:
    • Required metadata extraction vs. existing folder structure preservation. **Answer**: Both may be required to assign, for example, data or document code profiles.
    • Level of indexing required. **Answer**: See RFP §§ C.5.9, C.7(d).
    • Expectations for deduplication and validation. **Answer**: 90 to 95% percent accuracy.
    • Role of Courts staff in data cleanup. **Answer**: Minimal to moderate.

15. **Question**: Legacy Data Strategy - Does the Courts require full migration of all historical data, or would a hybrid approach (e.g., partial migration with read-only legacy access) be acceptable?
    Answer: OGC requires full migration of all historical documents and files. See RFP §§ C.3, C.4.(i), C.7(d). Offerors may propose any technical approach, including a hybrid approach as indicated in the question, that will meet OGC's needs to migrate existing files into the proposed system.

16. **Question**: File Types & Edge Cases - Beyond the listed file types, are there any additional formats, encrypted files, or legacy file structures that vendors should account for during migration?
    Answer: The vast majority of files types are PDF and MS Word saved on an NTFS network drive. Additional formats may include but are not limited to MSG, Excel, PPT, VTT, MP4, TIF, JPG, and HTML files. See RFP §§ C.3, C.7(d), C.5.9-.10, .37. The typical file structure is OGC network drive → [folders] → [one or more subfolders] → documents. Folders and subfolders are currently titled or arranged by one or more of the following: subject matter, staff member, committee, calendar year, fiscal year, etc.

17. **Question**: Workflow Requirements (Refined) - Are there specific workflow rules, approval processes, or routing requirements (e.g., contract review, litigation workflows) that must be enforced within the system?
    Answer: Yes. See RFP §§ C.4(c), C.5.6. These require development and will be addressed during project initiation and installation/ implementation.

18. **Question**: Matter Intake & Case Tracking - Are there standardized intake processes or matter classification structures the Courts expects vendors to support or replicate?
Answer: No. See RFP §§ C.5.2, C.7(d)(iii).

19. **Question**: Document Automation - Please estimate the number of standard and complex document templates required and whether automated document assembly tied to case data is expected at go-live.
Answer: OGC does not have complex document templates; the integration of standard document templates will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/implementation. Automated document assembly is expected at go-live.

20. **Question**: eDiscovery Expectations - Please clarify the expected scope of eDiscovery capabilities, including: Required data sources, Expected review workflows; redaction and legal hold requirements; integration with external tolls (if any).
Answer: OGC expects eDiscovery functionality to support its litigation, investigation, administrative, and records-related obligations. At a minimum, the solution must: (1) support data ingestion from Microsoft Outlook/Exchange, shared network drives, document repositories, and records maintained within the proposed system; (2) provide document organization, search, filtering, tagging, and basic review workflows; (3) include legal hold management capabilities consistent with Answers to Questions No. 32(b) and 86; and (4) support litigation-ready export or interface/compatibility with third-party eDiscovery platforms for advanced review, analytics, and production. Advanced capabilities such as predictive coding, technology-assisted review, automated preservation enforcement, and large-scale hosted review are not required but may be proposed as additional features.

21. **Question**: Evidence / File Sharing - Does the Courts require external sharing portals for secure document or evidence distribution (e.g., to outside counsel), or will sharing remain internal?
Answer: OGC anticipates a limited need for secure external sharing of documents with outside counsel, experts, vendors, and other authorized parties. Internal collaboration will remain the primary method of sharing. The solution must support secure, permission-based external sharing (including access controls, encryption, expiration settings, and auditability) or interface with existing court-approved secure file-sharing platforms. See also Answers to Questions No. 20 and 32 regarding eDiscovery exports and collaboration with external review platforms.

22. **Question**: Reporting Needs - What key reports or analytics do the Office of General Counsel require (e.g., workload tracking, contract lifecycle, litigation metrics)?
Answer: This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/implementation. See also Answer to Question No. 23.

23. **Question**: Dashboard Expectations - Are real-time dashboards required for leadership reporting, and if so, what metrics are most critical?
Answer: Yes. Matter Volume, Matter Type and Categories, Matter Client, Matter Lifecycles (including, e.g., response, completion, and resolution) for Individual, Rules, Contracts, Employment, Litigation, Policy, Data Request, Claim, and other types of matters.

24. **Question**: Go-Live Expectations - Do the Courts have a target go-live timeline/date or preferred implementation window?
Answer: See Answer to Question No. 6.

25. **Question**: Phased vs Full Rollout - Does the Courts prefer a phased implementation approach or a full system deployment at go-live?
Answer: Full system deployment is strongly preferred.

26. **Question**: Training Expectations - Beyond the required on-site training, are there expectations for ongoing training, refresher sessions, or role-based training tracks?
Answer: See RFP § C.7(e).

27. **Question**: NIST / Security Alignment - The RFP references NIST 800-53 controls. Please confirm whether formal certification is required or if alignment with these controls is sufficient.
Answer: Written evidence of compliance with NIST controls is required.

28. **Question**: Contractor Access Restrictions - Please clarify expectations regarding contractor access to sensitive data during implementation and support, including any required controls or restrictions.
Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.43, H.3; Answer to Question No. 120.

29. **Question**: Evaluation Committee - Can the Courts provide insight into the roles or functional areas represented on the evaluation committee?
Answer: The Courts does not share this information.

30. **Question**: Budget - Is there an estimated budget range established for this procurement?
Answer: The Courts does not share this information.

31. **Question**: Success Criteria - What does a successful implementation look like for the Courts in the first 6–12 months postgo-live?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.4, E, J.8.

32. **eDiscovery**
    a. **Question**: Please clarify the expected scope of eDiscovery functionality. Is full eDiscovery (including legal hold, review workflows, and production) required within the system, or is it acceptable to support eDiscovery through export or integration with external tools?
    Answer: See Answer to Question No. 20. OGC does not require a fully integrated end-to-end eDiscovery platform. The system must provide core eDiscovery functionality, including legal hold management, document organization, search, tagging, filtering, and basic review workflows, while supporting export and/or interface/compatibility with external eDiscovery platforms for advanced review, analytics, and production.

    b. **Question**: Are there specific requirements for legal hold management, chain of custody tracking, or litigation-ready export formats?
    Answer: The system must provide legal hold management, auditable tracking of document activity sufficient to support evidentiary integrity, and litigation-ready export capabilities (including PDF, TIFF, metadata, and comparable industry-standard formats). Advanced forensic collection, predictive coding, and automated preservation enforcement are not required. See also Answer to Question No. 86.

    Advanced capabilities (e.g., automated preservation enforcement, forensic collection, predictive coding) are not required but may be proposed as additional features.

c. **Question**: Should the proposed solution include full eDiscovery review capabilities, or is support for downstream eDiscovery processes sufficient?
Answer: See Answer to Question No. 20. Full in-system eDiscovery review capabilities are not required. The solution must support downstream eDiscovery processes through document organization, retrieval, search, tagging, legal hold management, and structured export to external review platforms.

33. Case and matter management

a. **Question**: Does the system need to provide full case or matter management functionality, or is document-centric organization with metadata sufficient?
Answer: Full case and matter management functionality is required. See RFP §§ C.5.2, .5, .25, .26; C.4(f).

b. **Question**: Are features such as case status tracking, task management, and deadline tracking required?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.2, .5, .25, .26; C.4(f).

34. Cloud and security

a. **Question**: Are there any required compliance frameworks (e.g., FedRAMP, NIST, CJIS), or is a secure commercial cloud environment acceptable?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.45, C.6(b).

b. **Question**: Is there a preferred hosting environment (Azure, AWS, or vendor-hosted)?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.45, C.6(b)-(c).

35. Migration

a. **Question**: Should the existing folder structure be preserved, or should it be transformed into a metadata-driven structure?
Answer: Both may be required. OGC expects this will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/implementation. See RFP §§ C.7(b)-(e).

b. **Question**: Is automated classification during migration acceptable or preferred?

Answer: Automated classification is strongly preferred.

c. **Question**: What level of validation and reconciliation is expected after migration?
Answer: See Answer to Question No. 14.

36. Data types and volume

a. **Question**: Can you provide a breakdown of file types (e.g., PDF, Word, email, multimedia)?
Answer: A breakdown of number of files by file type is not available. See also Answer to Question No. 16.

b. **Question**: Are there any large files such as video or audio that require special handling?
Answer: See Answer to Question No. 16.

37. Search and metadata

a. **Question**: What are the primary search use cases (keyword, metadata filtering, full-text)?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.9, C.7(b)-(c). This will be further addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/ implementation.

b. **Question**: Are metadata standards already defined, or will they need to be established?
Answer: Metadata standards will need to be defined. See RFP § C.7(d); Answer to Question No. 14.

c. **Question**: Are there any requirements for indexing handprint or cursive?
Answer: Yes. This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/ implementation.

38. Security model

a. **Question**: Are matter-level access restrictions (ethical walls) required?
Answer: Yes. See RFP §§ C.5.31, .50 – .54.

b. **Question**: Should security be applied at the folder level, document level, or both?

Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.11, .31, .50 – .54.

39. **Email management**
    a. **Question**: Is email considered part of the official record and required to be managed within the system?
       Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.10, .37; Answer to Question No. 20.

    b. **Question**: Is integration with Microsoft Outlook required?
       Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.4, .10, .37, .38; Answers to Questions No. 40 and 88.

40. **Question**: Integration - Are there any systems the solution must integrate with?
    Answer: Only software compatibility is necessary. See Answer to Questions No. 12 and 88.

41. **Question**: Evaluation Criteria - Can you clarify the relative weighting of technical capability, past performance, and price?
    Answer: See RFP §§ M.3, M.7, L.8.

42. **Question**: Success criteria - What are the key success factors for this implementation within the first 6 to 12 months?
    Answer: See Answer to Question No. 31.

43. **Data classification and regulatory requirements**
    a. **Question**: Can you confirm whether any data falls under specific regulatory or classification requirements (e.g., CJIS, PII, or other restricted data types)?
       Answer: OGC data may include multiple restricted data types including but not limited to PII, sensitive legal information, information originating from other Courts systems, privileged, deliberative process, high risk, procurement sensitive, and trade secrets/proprietary. To the extent that OGC handles Juvenile or JUSTIS-derived data, such information would be subject to heightened confidentiality and security requirements. See RFP §§ C.5.31 and C.5.53 – .56.

    b. **Question**: Are there any data residency or jurisdictional requirements?
       Answer: Yes. The Contractor must maintain the Cloud in a U.S.-based, East Coast data center. See RFP § C.6(b).

44. Migration data quality

a. **Question**: What is the expected level of data quality in the existing repository (e.g., duplicate files, inconsistent naming, missing metadata)?
Answer: The existing data includes duplicate files and inconsistent naming. The extent of missing metadata is unknown at this time. See RFP §§ C.4(i), C.7(d).

b. **Question**: Are there expectations for data cleanup or normalization as part of the migration effort?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.4(i), C.7(d).

45. Performance and service expectations

a. **Question**: Are there defined performance expectations such as search response time or document retrieval time?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.19 - .21.

b. **Question**: Are there required service level agreements for system availability?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.19 - .21; C.7(f).

46. Question: Support model - What are the expectations for post-implementation support, including response times and on-site versus remote support?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.19 - .21; C.7(f).

47. Question: Acceptance criteria - What are the formal acceptance criteria for system delivery and migration completion?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.4, E, F.4. This will be further addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/implementation.

48. Question: Implementation timeline - What is the expected implementation timeline following award?
Answer: See Answer to Question No. 6.

49. **Question**: Data ownership and exit strategy - Are there requirements for data export or system transition at the end of the contract?
Answer: Yes. See RFP § H.5. This will be further addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/ implementation.

50. **Question**: Could the Courts kindly consider granting a three (3) week extension to the RFP submission deadline to allow sufficient time for the preparation of a comprehensive and high-quality response?
Answer: The deadline for submission of proposals is extended to July 8, 2026.

51. **Question**: Could the Courts please confirm where amendments and addenda will be posted, as the RFP indicates https://www.dccourts.gov/dc-courts/solicitations but the solicitation is currently not visible at that location?
Answer: The RFP and amendments are posted at SAM.gov and https://www.dccourts.gov/dc-courts/solicitations.

52. **Question**: Could the Courts provide additional clarity on the primary business objectives and operational outcomes this engagement is intended to support within the Office of General Counsel?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.4, C.5.

53. **Question**: Are there any priority use cases or functional areas (e.g., document management, legal matter tracking, eDiscovery, advisory workflows) that the Courts would like the solution to focus on? Kindly advise.
Answer: The examples above are priorities, as well as AI workflow, and rules and contract management. This will be further addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/implementation.

54. **Question**: While the current scope is aligned to the Office of General Counsel, is there a future vision to extend the solution across other divisions or court functions? Kindly advise.
Answer: Not at this time.

55. **Question**: How does the Court envision the governance model and operational oversight of the solution post-implementation? Kindly advise.
Answer: See RFP §§ C.6(c), C.7(f).

56. **Question**: Are there existing policies, standards, or legal operational frameworks that the solution must align with (e.g., records management, legal workflows, compliance protocols)? Please confirm.
Answer: Yes. See RFP §§ C.4(c), C.5.6. This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/ implementation.

57. **Question**: Could the Courts share a high-level understanding of the current processes or tools used for managing legal matters and documents, and any key challenges the new solution should address?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.1-C.4. This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/ implementation.

58. **Question**: Should the proposed solution be designed as a standalone capability, or is there an expectation to integrate with the Courts' existing enterprise systems and technology environment? Please confirm.
Answer: The proposed solution is a standalone application. There is no expectation that the solution be integrated with the Courts' existing enterprise systems.

59. **Question**: Are there specific expectations regarding records lifecycle management, including retention, archival, and handling of privileged or sensitive legal information? Kindly advise.
Answer: Yes. This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/implementation.

60. **Question**: Beyond the requirements outlined in the RFP, are there any additional security, compliance, or regulatory considerations that the Courts would like vendors to account for in their proposed approach? Please advise.
Answer: No.

61. **Question**: What are the key success criteria or performance indicators the Courts will use to evaluate the effectiveness of the implemented solution? Kindly advise.
Answer: See Answers to Questions No. 45 and 47.

62. **Question**: How does the Court envision the engagement model with the selected vendor, including collaboration with internal teams, communication structure, and level of ongoing support post-implementation? Please advise.
Answer: See Answer to Question No. 45.

63. **Question**: Could you please confirm if the intent of this procurement is to introduce a new solution platform, or to enhance and streamline existing systems within the Courts' current technology ecosystem?
Answer: See Answers to Questions No. 7, 58, and 98.

64. **Question**: Does the Court view this solution as part of a broader digital modernization initiative, and are there expectations for future capabilities such as automation, analytics, or AI-enabled functionality? Kindly confirm.
Answer: Yes. See Answers to Questions No. 7, 58, and 98.

65. **Question**: Could the Courts provide clarity on the expected delivery model for this engagement (e.g., project-based, phased delivery, or ongoing managed services)?
Answer: See Answers to Questions No. 25 and 45.

66. **Question**: Could the Courts outline the expected key deliverables and artifacts from the selected vendor (e.g., solution design, implementation, documentation, training, support)?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.7, F.4.

67. **Question**: Can you provide an approximate breakdown of annual workload by major matter categories (e.g., contracts/agreements, litigation support, employment matters, policy/rulemaking, advisory requests), including typical volume and relative complexity? Kindly advise.
Answer: We do not have this information.

68. **Question**: While OGC has 6 current staff (up to 10 in future), what is the specific breakdown by role (administrators vs. standard users)?
Answer: See Answer to Question No. 1. This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/ implementation.

69. **Question**: Can you describe the typical lifecycle of a matter from intake to closure?
Answer: Intake; assignment; scoping and escalation; consulting, collaboration, research, and execution; review and approval; reporting and closing. This will also be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/ implementation.

70. **Question**: What are the most common bottlenecks in your current process?
Answer: Tracking and identification of similar matter types and resolutions.

71. **Question**: Which workflows are most important to standardize vs. remain flexible?
Answer: Priority workflows include contract, rules, and AI workflows. This will also be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/implementation.

72. **Question**: How frequently do users collaborate on the same matter? Kindly advise.
Answer: Approximately 75% of the time.

73. **Question**: The RFP identifies 1.2 TB of data, but which specific data elements (parties, charges, financials) must be converted into structured profiles?
Answer: See Answers to Questions No. 16, 20, and 23.

74. **Question**: Are there known data quality issues in the existing 390,000 files?
Answer: No data quality issues are known at this time.

75. **Question**: Are data dictionaries or schemas available for the current NTFS network drive structure?
Answer: No. See also Answer to Question No. 16.

76. **Question**: What level of document classification accuracy is expected post-migration?
Answer: 90 to 95%

77. **Question**: Are there priority document sets or high-risk categories? Please clarify.
Answer: Yes. This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/ implementation. See also Answer to Question No. 43a.

78. **Question**: Are documents currently indexed with metadata, or are they largely unindexed?
Answer: See Answers to Questions No. 14, 15, 16, and 37.

79. **Question**: Are documents linked to multiple workload matters or entities within the current folder structure?

Answer: Yes. This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/ implementation.

80. **Question**: For contract management capabilities, does OGC prefer an embedded solution within the system (e.g., tracking, alerts, and document management), or would integration with an enterprise contract lifecycle management (CLM) platform be desirable if aligned with existing tools and workflows?
Answer: OGC prefers an embedded solution.

81. **Question**: Can OGC please clarify whether eDiscovery is expected to be a core, high-volume operational capability or a periodic support function, and the typical scale of use?
Answer: eDiscovery is expected to be a periodic, matter-driven support function rather than a high-volume operational capability. Usage will primarily arise in connection with litigation, investigations, administrative proceedings, and records-related matters. Document volumes are generally expected to be low to moderate, although occasional larger matters may occur. See also Answers to Questions No. 20, 32, and 83.

82. **Question**: Can OGC please clarify the expected depth of eDiscovery functionality (e.g., basic document retrieval and tagging vs. full lifecycle eDiscovery including custodian management, advanced analytics, and large-scale review workflows)?
Answer: See Answers to Questions No. 20 and 32. OGC requires eDiscovery functionality such as document retrieval, search, filtering, tagging, categorization, legal hold management, and basic review workflows. Full lifecycle eDiscovery capabilities, including advanced analytics, technology-assisted review (TAR), predictive coding, and large-scale hosted review, are not required but may be proposed as additional features.

83. **Question**: What are the most common eDiscovery scenarios (e.g., internal investigations, litigation support, records requests), and what is the typical volume of documents involved?
Answer: Common eDiscovery scenarios include litigation support, internal investigations, administrative proceedings, compliance-related matters, and records-related requests. Document volumes vary by matter but are generally low to moderate, with occasional larger matters. See also Answers to Questions No. 20, 32, and 81.

84. **Question**: Does OGC currently utilize any tools or platforms to support eDiscovery or document review processes? Kindly confirm.

Answer: OGC currently utilizes internal Court systems and standard litigation-support tools and may engage external platforms as needed for document review and eDiscovery. Vendors should assume that eDiscovery is not centralized in a single platform and that the ability to export to or interface/compatibility with, external review tools is important. See also Answers to Questions No. 20, 32, and 102.

85. Question: What are the primary data sources involved in eDiscovery (e.g., email systems, shared drives, document repositories), and are there specific systems that must be supported at go-live? Please confirm.
Answer: See Answer to Question No. 20. Primary data sources include Microsoft Outlook/Exchange, shared network drives and folders, internal document repositories, and case-related records maintained within the proposed system. The solution should support these sources at go-live or provide a clear implementation path for doing so.

86. Question: Can OGC clarify expectations around legal hold management (e.g., notification, acknowledgment tracking, preservation enforcement)?
Answer: OGC requires robust legal hold management as a core capability. At a minimum, the solution must support custodian identification and management, issuance of legal hold notices, acknowledgment and response tracking, modification and release of holds, periodic communications, and maintenance of a centralized, auditable record of legal hold activity. The system is not required to perform automated preservation enforcement across external systems, but the ability to support, interface, or integrate with such functionality may be proposed as an additional feature. See also Answer to Question No. 32(b).

87. Question: The RFP lists various IT environment components (Azure, M365, etc.), but which require real-time vs. batch integration? Please confirm.
Answer: Real-time integration is not required for any of the IT components listed in the RFP. Instead, the solution must support either APIs, built-in connectors, mapped network drives, or sync folders.

88. Question: Are specific interface specifications or data exchange standards available for these systems? Kindly advise.
Answer: The solution must interface with widely used Microsoft office applications. Real-time integration is not required. The solution must support either APIs, built-in connectors, mapped network drives, or sync folders.

89. Question: Re: Legacy management system - Are there any metadata standards or taxonomy currently used that

must be preserved?
Answer: See Answers to Question No. 14, 15, 16, and 37.

90. **Question**: Are there any restrictions on use of generative AI (e.g., data residency, model type)?
Answer: Yes. This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/ implementation.

91. **Question**: What FedRAMP level (Low/Moderate/High) is required?
Answer: FedRamp Moderate level is required. See RFP §§ C.5.25, C.6(b).

92. **Question:** Should the solution be deployed in Azure GovCloud specifically or a SaaS option running in AWS (FedRAMP High) an option?
Answer: See RFP §§ C.5.45, C.6(b)-(c); Answer to Question No. 91.

93. **Question**: (c) is missing from the proposal, is this an error or has it been accidentally omitted?
Answer: Yes. There is a typo on how the subsections under § C.7 are numbered. Sections C.7(d)-(g) have been renumbered C.7(c)-(f), respectively.

94. **Question**: Is there a file size limit or requirement for splitting attachments?
Answer: Yes. This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/implementation.

95. **Question**: Are resumes and appendices excluded from page limits?
Answer: Resumes are excluded from the page limits. See RFP § L.10(e); Answers to Questions No. 111 and 112.

96. **Question**: Can configuration via low-code platforms (e.g., Salesforce) be considered “minimal customization”?
Answer: Configuration through low-code platforms can be seen as "minimal customization" when it is declarative, upgrade-safe, scoped, and governed.

97. **Question**: Will an independent government cost estimate (IGCE) be shared or benchmark guidance provided?
Answer: The Courts does not share this information.

98. **Question**: The solicitation specifies a cloud-hosted COTS system for the Office of the General Counsel (OGC). Please

confirm whether the system and licenses must exclusively serve OGC, or whether there is any possibility of broader DCCS usage during the base or option years.
Answer: The system will exclusively serve OGC.

99. **Question**: The compatibility requirements list MS SharePoint, Citrix ShareFile, and Box.com. Please clarify whether the Courts require native, two-way integration with each listed application, or whether read/write compatibility and the ability to link/save documents to those platforms is sufficient.
Answer: Real-time integration is not required. The solution must support either APIs, built-in connectors, mapped network drives, or sync folders.

100. **Question**: The solicitation requires compatibility with Citrix Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI). Please describe the current VDI environment in more detail (e.g., Citrix version, publishing method) to allow offerors to accurately assess compatibility.
Answer: See RFP § C.7. The current environment is running Citrix Virtual Apps and Desktops 2203 LTSR CU7. We publish a small set of applications via a Citrix XenApp server running Windows Server 2019. The VDI portion of the environment is non-persistent, with desktops running Windows 11.

101. **Question:** Requirement 6 references GDPR compliance as part of generative AI capability. Please confirm whether GDPR compliance is a mandatory requirement given that OGC is a U.S.-based government entity, or whether it is aspirational/desired.
Answer: GDPR compliance is mandatory.

102. **Question:** Please clarify the expected scope and volume of eDiscovery activity — for example, frequency of matters, typical data volumes per matter, and whether the Courts use or plan to use outside e-discovery counsel or platforms that would require integration.
Answer: OGC anticipates eDiscovery activity will be matter-driven and periodic, rather than continuous or high-volume across all cases. Frequency will depend on litigation and investigative needs, with some matters requiring no eDiscovery and others requiring more substantial, targeted collections.

Typical data volumes vary by matter but are generally expected to range from limited custodial sets to larger, but still contained, collections depending on scope and complexity.

eDiscovery within OGC is expected to function as a periodic support capability rather than a high-volume, continuous operation.

- Frequency of Matters:
  eDiscovery needs arise on an as-needed basis, primarily in connection with litigation, internal investigations, and certain records-related matters.
- Typical Data Volumes:
  Most matters involve low to moderate document volumes. However, the system should be capable of supporting occasional matters with larger datasets through efficient organization and export functionality.
- Use of External Counsel / Platforms:
  OGC may engage outside counsel and/or third-party eDiscovery platforms for larger or more complex matters. Accordingly, the proposed solution must support litigation-ready export and/or interface/compatibility with commonly used eDiscovery tools.
- Scope Expectation:
  The system should support core in-system functions, including legal hold management, document organization, search, and tagging, while enabling seamless transition to external platforms for advanced review, analytics, and production when needed.

103. **Question**: Please confirm the expected NIST 800-53 r5 impact level (Low, Moderate, or High) for the system, as this will affect the security controls the contractor must address in the technical proposal.
Answer: Written evidence of compliance with both NIST 800-53 r5 and NIST-800-37 r2 controls at a moderate impact level is required. See RFP § C.5.44.

104. **Question:** Please confirm whether FedRAMP Authorized status is a mandatory pass/fail requirement or a highly desirable requirement, and if mandatory, which FedRAMP impact level (Low, Moderate, or High) is required.
Answer: FedRAMP Authorized and Moderate impact are required. See RFP §§ C.5.45, C.6(b).

105. **Question**: The Courts' cloud platform is listed as Microsoft Azure FedRAMP Government and Azure Commercial. Please confirm whether the system must be hosted exclusively within Azure FedRAMP Government (GovCloud) or whether Azure Commercial is also acceptable.
Answer: See Answer to Question No. 104.

106. **Question:** The RFP describes approximately 1.2 TB of files across ~390,000 files in 10,000 folders on an NTFS network drive. Please confirm: (1) whether the contractor will be provided with direct network or VPN access to the source drive for migration, or whether the Courts will transfer data to the contractor via another method; and (2) whether a data transfer agreement or additional security clearance will be required for migration personnel.
Answer: This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/implementation. See also Answer to Question No. 120; RFP § H.3.

107. **Question**: The RFP requires identification and deletion of duplicate files as part of migration. Please clarify whether the Courts will have final approval authority before any files are permanently deleted, and whether a pre-migration duplicate report is required as a formal deliverable.
Answer: OGC must have final approval authority for deletion and require a pre-migration report or other contractor-proposed method(s) to ensure our final approval. Contract deliverables are enumerated in RFP § F.4.

108. **Question**: The contractor is required to develop an 'overall strategy for electronic records management including policies, procedures, and taxonomy.' Please clarify whether OGC has existing naming conventions, retention schedules, or folder taxonomy preferences that should be incorporated, or whether the contractor is expected to propose these from scratch.
Answer: See Answers to Question No. 15 and 16.

109. **Question:** The RFP requires five (5) consecutive days of on-site post-implementation support and end-user training. Please confirm the expected location (DC Courts, 410 E Street NW) and whether the Courts can accommodate the contractor team on-site for those five days without restriction.
Answer: The training location is correct. OGC can accommodate the contractor team on-site, subject to the certain security and access requirements to be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/implementation.

110. **Question:** The RFP requires virtual training for future new users and administrator training 'as requested.' Please clarify: (1) whether virtual/on-demand training materials must be provided as a deliverable at contract award, or only when new users are onboarded; and (2) how many administrators are anticipated.

Answer: CLIN No. 0004 must include a virtual/on-demand or recorded training available for future new OGC users. The number of administrators is unknown. This will be addressed during project initiation/kick-off and installation/implementation.

111. **Question:** Tab B, item (v) requires the offeror to describe system documentation and provide 'sample materials or FEDRAMP excerpts, if possible.' Please confirm whether system documentation samples and excerpts are considered attachments (and thus excluded from the 20-page limit for Tab B), or whether they count against the page limit.
Answer: System documentation, sample materials, and FedRamp excerpts are excluded from the 20-page limit.

112. **Question**: Tab B, item (iv) requires a copy of the disaster recovery/business continuity plan to be attached to the proposal. Please confirm whether this attachment is excluded from the 20-page limit for Tab B.
Answer: The disaster recovery/business continuity plan is excluded from the 20-page limit.

113. **Question**: Tab A requires a copy of the offeror's license, maintenance agreement, SLA, and/or SaaS agreement. Please confirm whether these agreements are to be included as attachments separate from the Technical Proposal page limits.
Answer: The offeror's license, maintenance agreement, SLA, and/or SaaS agreement are excluded from the 20-page limit.

114. **Question**: The solicitation requires proposals to be submitted as two separate PDF files. Please confirm whether attachments (e.g., SLA, DR plan, past performance forms) should be combined within Volume 1 as appendices or submitted as separate files.
Answer: Attachments should be included in the PDF file for the respective volume.

115. **Question**: Tab D requires a completed Past Performance Evaluation Form (Attachment J.8) for each reference contract. Please confirm: (1) whether the evaluator must return the form directly to the offeror for inclusion in the proposal or submit it separately to the Courts; and (2) whether electronic/digital signatures on the form are acceptable.
Answer: Past Performance Evaluation Forms (Attachment J.8) must be timely submitted by the client/reference that completed the form directly to the Senior Contract Specialist identified in the RFP. Electronic/digital signatures are

acceptable. An offeror is responsible for ensuring that their clients/references submit past performance evaluation forms by the deadline stated in the RFP.

116. **Question**: The pricing note instructs offerors to price CLIN 0002 (Maintenance and Support) only if it is NOT included in the software license (CLIN 0001). Please confirm that if maintenance and support is bundled into the subscription/license fee, CLIN 0002 should be left blank (or noted as $0 / included), and that this will not be considered non-responsive.
Answer: If maintenance and support is included in the subscription/license fee (i.e., CLIN 0001), please clearly state that in your Price Proposal and leave CLIN 0002 blank.

117. **Question**: Section F.3 states the Courts may require up to 10 software licenses in future option years. Please confirm whether the unit price for additional licenses in option years should be separately priced in Tab B of the Price Proposal, or whether the per-unit price listed in CLINs 1001–4001 will control for any additional licenses ordered.
Answer: Please complete the Price/Cost Schedule as set forth in RFP § B.2.

118. **Question**: The price schedule lists CLIN 0003 as 'On-site Post-Implementation Support and End User Training' and CLIN 0004 as 'Installation, Document Migration, and Implementation,' but Table F.4 (Deliverables) lists them in reverse order. Please confirm the correct CLIN alignment to ensure the price schedule is completed accurately.
Answer: CLINs 0003 and 0004 in RFP § B.2 Price/Cost Schedule have been reserved. The CLINs in section F.4 are correct but simply listed chronologically.

119. **Question**: Section L.17 states the Courts 'may' invite highly rated offerors to provide a system demonstration not to exceed 90 minutes, but Section M.4 states demonstrations will not be separately scored. Please confirm: (1) whether a demonstration is anticipated as part of the evaluation process for this procurement; and (2) if so, whether it will be conducted in person at DC Courts or virtually.
Answer: Demonstrations, if requested, may be conducted in person or virtually at the offeror's expense and would be evaluated under the Technical Approach Evaluation Criterion.

120. **Question**: Section H.3 requires all contractor personnel to obtain security clearance per DCCS security policies. Please describe the type of clearance required (e.g., background check, fingerprinting, suitability determination) and

the anticipated timeline for clearance processing, as this may affect the contractor's ability to meet the 14-day software delivery and 21-day kickoff meeting deadlines.
Answer: All contractor personnel will be required to complete and sign a DCCS-provided Criminal History Form. The background check will include MPD, FBI, and WALES/NCIC checks and may take 3 to 5 business days to complete.

121. **Question**: The SLA requires a phone-based help desk Monday through Saturday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM Eastern Time. Please confirm whether Sunday support and/or after-hours emergency support (outside the stated window) is expected for any tier of service.
Answer: No.