



Maricopa County Justice Courts

**A Comparative Analysis for the Selection of an
Electronic Document Management System**



Each Proposal was Evaluated Based on Criteria Defined in the Evaluation Matrix

The following overlying guidelines were also considered:

- **Cost**
- **Compatibility with established Arizona Supreme Court standards**
- **Impact of implementing a non-standard system against other similar state projects**

Project Evaluation Matrix

Matrix Based Upon The Following Elements Listed Below:

<u>Central Document Repository</u>	<u>Document Scanning</u>	<u>Project Costs</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ <i>Feasibility</i>▪ <i>Project Planning</i>▪ <i>Training</i>▪ <i>Hosting Options</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ <i>Feasibility</i>▪ <i>Document Management</i>▪ <i>Training</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ <i>Central Document Repository</i>▪ <i>Document Scanning</i>

Final Scoring



SCORING:	Intresys	OSAM
I. CENTRAL DOCUMENT REPOSITORY		
A. FEASIBILITY	21	21
B. PROJECT PLANNING	8	6
C. TRAINING	4	6
D. HOSTING OPTIONS	10	10
CATEGORY TOTAL:	43	43
II. DOCUMENT SCANNING		
A. FEASIBILITY	12	20
B. DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT	10	10
C. TRAINING	4	4
CATEGORY TOTAL:	26	34
III. PROJECT COSTS		
A. CENTRAL DOCUMENT REPOSITORY	1	5
B. DOCUMENT SCANNING	3	3
CATEGORY TOTAL:	4	8
TOTAL SCORE:	73	85

Project Costs

Pricing for both proposals includes software licensing, maintenance costs, storage costs, one-time setup charges and professional services.

Intresys proposal includes training costs and remote office hardware maintenance.

OSAM proposal includes backlog storage costs.

	<u>Option 1:</u> License Purchase and Remote Hosting	<u>Option 2:</u> Software Service and Remote Hosting (no software license purchase)	<u>Backlog Scanning</u> (Cost estimates are based on 25 courts, 12 physical locations and 4.5 million pages in backlog files)	<u>"Day One"</u> <u>Forward Scanning</u> (Cost estimates based on on-site scanning at 12 physical locations for a total of 2.8 million pages over 12 months)
	Year 1 - \$1,146,154 Year 2 - \$192,259 Year 3 - \$192,259 TOTAL - \$1,530,672	Year 1 - \$757,154 Year 2 - \$207,000 Year 3 - \$228,000 TOTAL - \$1,192,154	\$505,000	Estimates not included in proposal.
	Year 1 - \$606,707 Year 2 - \$175,662 Year 3 - \$183,318 TOTAL - \$965,687	Year 1 - \$403,929 Year 2 - \$222,660 Year 3 - \$231,012 TOTAL - \$857,601	\$410,330	\$227,081

Questions ?

				Intresys	OSAM	
	Negative	Neutral	Positive			
Criteria	1	3	5	Rating	Rating	Comments
I. CENTRAL DOCUMENT REPOSITORY						
A. FEASIBILITY						
The proposal has a clear set of objectives and goals.	Lacks clear goals and objectives	Describes some goals and objectives	Well defined goals and objectives	5	5	
The proposal is well defined and clearly describes how the Project goals will be achieved.	Lacks a clear implementation plan	Identifies general implementation plan; lacks detail.	Well defined implementation plan.	5	3	
Vendor has a clear understanding of the project and customer's business processes and needs.	Lacks understanding of the project or customer's business	Some understanding of the project and customer's business	Clear understanding of project and customer's business	3	5	
Proposed timelines to achieve project objectives are realistic and are within project timelines.	Timelines not defined or do not appear realistic	Some timelines defined and may be realistic based on customer's business practices.	Timelines clearly defined and appear realistic based on customer's business practices.	3	3	
Proposal addresses both electronic filing, paper filing options from a technical and business perspective.	Filing options not defined.	Filing options not clearly defined for technical and business applications.	Filing options clearly defined.	5	5	
B. PROJECT PLANNING						
Vendor will provide project management services to assist with project	Project management/project manager not identified	Some project management services defined/project manager included in some phases	Project management services and/or project manager included for entire project	5	3	
Proposal identifies a project implementation schedule for project life cycle.	Project implementation schedule not defined.	Project implementation schedule defined for some phases of project life cycle	Project implementation schedule defined for full project lifecycle	3	3	Each vendor proposes an estimated completion time period but provides no detail on deliverables by time.
C. TRAINING						
Proposal identifies administrative/end-user training services to court staff for document imaging, document retrieval.	Training not identified.	Some training identified and offered as a service	Training services offered to all staff	3	3	
Proposal identifies "go live" support after implementation.	"Go Live" support not identified.	Some "Go Live" support identified.	"Go Live" support clearly identified for all phases of implementation.	1	3	
D. HOSTING OPTIONS						
Vendor offers options for license/hosting, hosting only	Options not identified	Option(s) not clearly identified.	Options clearly identified.	5	5	
Vendor offers option to convert hosting solution to in-house solution which includes software buyout (if applicable), transfer/conversion of existing images.	Conversion option not identified.	Conversion option(s) not clearly identified.	Conversion option(s) clearly identified.	5	5	

				Intresys	OSAM	
	Negative	Neutral	Positive			
Criteria	1	3	5	Rating	Rating	Comments
II. DOCUMENT SCANNING						
A. FEASIBILITY						
Proposal defines a "Day One" forward process to provide scanning services to all 25 courts at 12 locations.	Scanning services not identified for "Day One" forward processes.	Scanning services not clearly identified for a "Day One" forward process.	Scanning services clearly identified for a "Day One" forward process	3	5	Intresys does not clearly differentiate between "Day One" and "backlog" scanning.
Proposal defines a "backlog" process to provide one-time scanning services to all 25 courts at 12 locations.	Scanning services not identified for "backlog" case processes.	Scanning services not clearly identified for "backlog" case process.	Scanning services clearly identified for "backlog" case process	3	5	Intresys does not clearly differentiate between "Day One" and "backlog" scanning.
Proposal supports onsite scanning services for all 12 locations for "Day One" forward on a daily basis	Onsite scanning not offered or defined	Onsite scanning services identified for some locations.	Onsite scanning services identified for all locations.	3	5	Intresys does not clearly identify onsite scanning services.
Proposal supports onsite scanning services for "backlog" case files.	Onsite scanning not offered or defined	Onsite scanning services identified for some locations.	Onsite scanning services identified for all locations.	3	5	Intresys does not clearly identify onsite scanning services.
B. DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT						
Vendor's expertise in document management and integration with a case management system.	Vendor's expertise not identified.	Vendor has some experience with document management and CMS integration.	Vendor has a proven track record in document management and CMS integration.	5	5	Intresys would contract with IKON Business Solutions for imaging services. Rating is based on this partnership.
Vendor's expertise in understanding business practices and incorporating those business practices in a document management system	Vendor's expertise not identified.	Vendor has some experience with incorporating business practices in a document management system.	Vendor has a proven track record in incorporating business practices in a document management system.	5	5	Intresys would contract with IKON Business Solutions for imaging services. Rating is based on this partnership.
C. TRAINING						
Proposal identifies administrative/end-user training services to court staff for document imaging, document retrieval.	Training not identified.	Some training identified and offered as a service	Training services offered to all staff	3	3	
Proposal identifies "go live" support after implementation.	"Go Live" support not identified.	Some "Go Live" support identified.	"Go Live" support clearly identified for all phases of implementation.	1	1	

				Intresys	OSAM	
	Negative	Neutral	Positive			
Criteria	1	3	5	Rating	Rating	Comments
III. PROJECT COSTS						
A. CENTRAL DOCUMENT REPOSITORY						
Project cost estimates are reasonable and comparable to competitor's proposal for similar services.	Cost estimates appear excessive or are not comparable for similar services.	Some cost estimates are comparable for similar services.	Cost estimates are significantly lower for similar services.	1	5	
B. DOCUMENT SCANNING						
Project cost estimates are reasonable and comparable to competitor's proposal for similar services.	Cost estimates appear excessive or are not comparable for similar services.	Some cost estimates are comparable for similar services.	Cost estimates are significantly lower for similar services.	3	3	