

RFP Prepared by
The Supreme Court of Ohio



THE SUPREME COURT *of* OHIO

**Request for Proposals for a Hosted Case Management
System RFP Number 2011-1**

**Appendix H - SCO Pilto Courts Databases and Imaging
Systems**

4 August 2011

NOTICE

R.C. Section 9.24 prohibits the Supreme Court from awarding a contract to any Vendor against whom the Auditor of State has issued a finding for recovery if the finding for recovery is unresolved at the time of award. By submitting a proposal, a Vendor warrants that it is not now, and will not become subject to an unresolved finding for recovery under R.C. Section 9.24, prior to the award of any contract arising out of this Request for Proposals, without notifying the Supreme Court of such finding.

Database Inventory

Court (1 Line per Database)	System Name / Version Application Vendor	DBMS / File Structure	# Party Records	# Case Records	# Columns	DB Size	Comments
Court 1 - Lucas County	FACTS v 7.2 - Tiburon	IBM Informix v 11.5	902,080	282,818	n/a	55 GB	
Court 2 - Holmes County Juv/Probate	WRITS v6.70 - CourtView Justice Solutions	Indexed Sequential Access Method (ISAM)	38,308	9,337	n/a	422 MB	

Note: Courts that will use the SCO CMS have current systems that include the following Data Base Types: (1) SQL, (2) Oracle, (3) FilePro and (4) ISAM and will include a range of different versions.

Doc Mgmt Systems

Document Management Systems Inventory (1 line per system)	System Name / Version Application Vendor	DBMS / File Structure	Image File Types	File-Type Versions	# Documents	# Pages / Images	Do you have an existing system? If so do you want to keep it, replace it with a system managed by the SCO or are undecided?	Documents are indexed to existing CMS (Y/N)	Comments
Court 1 - Lucas County Common Pleas	OnBase 9.0 - Hyland Software	Microsoft SQL Server 2005	TIF	TIF Group 4	3,956,835	23,149,857	Undecided	Yes	
Court 2 - Holmes County Juv/Probate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No existing Document Management System	No	

Note: The SCO anticipates three potential scenarios for Document Management implementation. (1) courts with an existing document management system that must be converted to the SCO solution. (2) courts with an existing document management system that they plan to continue using which will need to interface with the SCO CMS. and, (3) courts with no current document management system that choose to use the SCO solution.