



Administrative Office Of The Courts

Court Case Management System Request for Information

May 1, 2006

State of Washington
1206 Quince St. SE
P.O. Box 41170
Olympia, WA 98504-1170

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Project Background	4
2.1	Profile of the Washington State Court System	5
2.1.1	The Supreme Court	5
2.1.2	The Court of Appeals	6
2.1.3	The Superior Court	6
2.1.4	The Courts of Limited Jurisdiction	8
2.2	The JIS Customer Tiers	10
2.3	JIS Application Portfolio	10
2.4	Technology Landscape	11
2.4.1	z/OS Server	11
2.4.2	Distributed Environment	12
2.4.3	Data Warehouse	12
2.4.4	Network	12
2.5	Business Problem Description	13
2.6	Technical Considerations	13
2.6.1	Technical and statewide considerations	14
2.6.2	Legacy Data Integration	14
2.6.3	Integration	15
3.	System Requirements	15
3.1	System Functions	15
3.1.1	Case	15
3.1.2	Person and Participant	16
3.1.3	Basic Calendaring	17
3.1.4	Docketing	17
3.1.5	Hearings	17
3.1.6	Adjudication and Disposition	17
3.1.7	Non-Person Based Case Management (e.g., Parking)	18
3.1.8	Pre- and Post-Disposition Compliance	18
3.1.9	Basic Accounting and Receipting	18
3.1.10	Document Generation	18
3.1.11	Judicial Decision Making	18
3.1.12	Pre- and Post-Sentencing Probation	19
3.1.13	Resource Management	19
3.1.14	Reporting	19
3.1.15	Jury Management	19
3.1.16	Extended Financial Management and Accounting	19
3.1.17	Document and Exhibit Management	20
3.1.18	System Configuration Maintenance and Integrity	20
3.2	Non-functional Requirements	20
3.2.1	Availability	20
3.2.2	Performance	20
3.2.3	Reliability	20
3.2.4	Scalability	21
3.2.5	Security	21
3.2.6	Usability	21
3.2.7	Access to Justice Technology Principles	22

4.	Instructions to Vendors	22
4.1	Point of Contact	22
4.2	Submission of Responses	22
4.3	Public Records Notice	23
4.4	Response Content and Format	23
4.5	Pricing	23
5.	Appendixes	24

1. Introduction

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) issues this Request for Information (RFI) to solicit information from the vendor community that will be used to assist with the development of a Request for Proposal (RFP) to implement a statewide court case management system (CMS) for the appellate and trial courts in the state of Washington.

The RFI seeks information regarding the capabilities of vendors and the vendor's CMS solutions across a wide range of areas, including, but not limited to:

- The functionality of vendor provided CMS solutions
- The configurability of vendor provided CMS solutions
- The ability of vendor provided CMS solutions to integrate with legacy systems data and structures
- The capabilities of vendors to install the vendor provided CMS solution within the current hardware and data environment(s)
- The level of interest among the vendor community to provide a statewide CMS solution in Washington State
- Realistic costs for the purchase and implementation
- Realistic timeframes for installation and implementation

It is expected that the RFI responses will guide the AOC in seeking to balance desired user functionality with the marketplace in developing a viable RFP and whether the RFP will seek single product solutions or must accommodate multiple solutions by one or more vendors. The information provided in response to the RFI will be used to support planning efforts and RFP development. AOC is interested in producing an RFP that promotes vendor competition and creative technical solutions. This RFI is an earnest attempt to gain knowledge about products and solutions in the marketplace that will address current and future technology needs to support the appellate and trial courts in Washington State.

2. Project Background

The AOC hosts and maintains the Washington State Judicial Information System (JIS), consisting of a group of systems which serve as the primary case management applications for the appellate and trial courts in Washington State. The JIS serves as the statewide clearinghouse for misdemeanor criminal history information, outstanding warrants, and domestic violence protection orders. Through the various applications, the JIS provides administrative support for all levels of the judiciary consisting of the Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, Superior Courts, District Courts, Municipal Courts, and Traffic Violation Bureaus. JIS also provides essential data to justice system partners including the Washington State Patrol the Department of Corrections, the Secretary of State and local law enforcement, correctional, and prosecutorial agencies.

The Judicial Information System Committee (JISC), pursuant to Court Rule and state law, is the governing body for JIS. The AOC Information Services Division (ISD) is responsible for hosting, operating and maintaining the JIS. Additionally ISD is responsible for developing both new applications and improvements to existing applications. JIS customers (court staff and other users) regularly participate in defining business and application requirements and functional solutions through project steering committees and work groups.

Created in the 1970s, several of the core JIS applications are based upon dated technology which is not conducive to change and therefore have not adequately progressed to meet the case management and information systems needs of the courts over time. Beginning in the early 2000's AOC initiated a multi-year project to 'migrate' the JIS applications to an integrated system operating in a modern-day, web-based environment. Initial projects to migrate the appellate court and juvenile court systems have been largely completed, but other major components including case management for trial courts have not yet

moved forward.

In 2005 the JIS Committee undertook a thorough review and assessment of the migration effort. The review and assessment found both that the state of vendor produced systems has significantly matured since the initiation of the migration project and emphasized the role of JIS as a data interchange. The resulting roadmap for the continuation of the migration effort, therefore, identified the following group of projects (in priority order):

1. Data interchange structure (enable implementation of candidate data exchanges and allow JIS components to work together)
2. Core Court Case Management System (CMS)
3. Resource management and scheduling (calendar)
4. Reporting and information access
5. Pre- and Post-Sentencing Probation

2.1 Profile of the Washington State Court System

The Washington State Courts operate in a decentralized environment. Perhaps best described in the negative, Washington State does not have a unified court system and the Supreme Court does not operate in a direct, hierarchal administrative role governing the inferior courts. While all of the courts operate within the same statutory framework and under the same general court rules there is a degree of variation in the level and types of services provided, the administrative procedures and practices, and the division of labor and responsibilities among the various local justice system agencies. In supporting the appellate and trial courts JIS has served to provide a high level of data consistency and coordination across all courts and, to a certain extent, dampen the level of business process variation across courts. Each of the various courts described below currently uses a case management systems designed specifically for their business needs:

2.1.1 The Supreme Court

The Supreme Court, located at the State Capital in Olympia, is the state's "court of last resort" and consists of nine elected justices and one court commissioner. The judicial process of the court is supported by the Supreme Court Clerk's Office. The Clerk of the Supreme Court is appointed by the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court has mandatory jurisdiction over appeals in capital criminal cases and cases of certified questions from the Federal Courts. The Supreme Court has discretionary jurisdiction over cases coming from the court of appeals and the trial courts of the state.

The Supreme Court is supported by the ACORDS case management application.

2004 Caseload of the Washington State Supreme Court (cases filed)

<u>Originating from the Trial Courts</u>	
Criminal Appeals	8
Civil Appeals	48
Direct Discretionary Review	31
Death Penalty Review	0
Expenditure of Public Funds	64
<u>Originating from the Court of Appeals</u>	
Criminal Appeals	444
Civil Appeals	319
Motion for Discretionary Review	123
PRP Discretionary Review	321

Certifications/Transfers	7
<u>Other Actions Filed with the Court</u>	
Original Actions/Fed. Cert. Questions	175
WSBA/CJC Disciplinary Actions	139
TOTAL	1,697

2.1.2 The Court of Appeals

The Court of Appeals is an intermediate appellate court consisting of 22 elected judges serving three divisions as follows:

Division	Judges	Commissioners	Location	Area Served
Division I	10	4	Seattle	Northwest Counties
Division II	7	2	Tacoma	Southwest Counties
Division III	5	2	Spokane	Eastern Counties

Each Division is supported by a separate clerk appointed by the judges of the division and the clerk's office staff, law clerks, and staff attorneys.

As the intermediate court of appeals, the court is a non-discretionary appellate court meaning all appeals filed in the court must be accepted. Except when a petitioner is under a sentence of death, the Court of Appeals has original concurrent jurisdiction with the Supreme Court in personal restraint petition proceedings.

The Divisions of the Court of Appeals are supported by the ACORDS case management application.

2004 Caseload of the Court of Appeals (cases filed)

	Division I	Division II	Division III	Total
Criminal Appeals	541	553	397	1,491
Civil Appeals	675	405	285	1,365
Personal Restraint Petitions	458	409	229	1,096
Notices of Discretionary Review	208	101	125	434
Total	1,882	1,468	1,036	4,386

2.1.3 The Superior Court

The Superior Courts are Washington State's courts of general jurisdiction. The Superior Courts have concurrent civil jurisdiction with the District Courts up to \$50,000. The Superior Courts have exclusive original jurisdiction in all civil cases valued at more than \$50,000, in all cases in equity, and in all cases which involve the title or possession of real property, or the legality of any tax, impost, assessment, toll, or municipal fine. The Courts have exclusive original jurisdiction in all domestic relations (family law), adoption, paternity, probate, guardianship, mental illness, alcohol, and juvenile dependency cases. The Superior Courts have exclusive original jurisdiction in all felony crimes and juvenile offender cases. The Superior Courts also hear all appeals of cases arising from the District and Municipal Courts within the counties served by the court.

Additionally, the Superior Courts have concurrent jurisdiction with the District and Municipal Courts for civil anti-harassment, domestic violence, and sexual assault protection orders. These orders warrant separate mention and consideration because judges at each level of court must be able to search and find records (order histories) statewide for all parties involved in a protection order (petitioner, respondent, minor children) in order to ensure that duplicate and/or

conflicting orders of protection are not issued. This function is currently supported by the Judicial Access Browser System (JABS), a JIS application developed specifically for this purpose to meet the data requirements established in RCW 26.50.160 enacted by the State Legislature in 1995.

At the end of 2004 there were 178 elected superior court judges and 48.8 court commissioner FTE s serving in 31 judicial districts. Twenty-five of the 31 judicial districts are comprised of a single county. In the other 6 districts, between 1 and 6 judges serve two or three contiguous counties. In the multi-county judicial districts, the judges of the district sit in each county, however each county also has a separate and independent clerk of court (see below) and in many respects the court is a "separate" court in each of the counties served.

Most judicial districts are structured such that the juvenile court division operates as a separate entity, often in separate facilities, under the direction of the Superior Court. Each juvenile court's operations include the provision of probation services. A majority of the juvenile court operations also include the juvenile detention function. The juvenile courts are in the process of transferring to the new Juvenile & Corrections System (JCS) for case and detention management. A separate application supports risk assessment activities.

The County Clerk is the clerk of the court in each of the 39 counties. As clerk of the court, county clerks receive and initiate case filings, accept payments of filing fees, penalties, and restitution, and maintain the court's files and indices or dockets of all papers filed with the court and all actions taken by the courts. The clerks are elected in 35 counties and appointed in the other four. While the superior courts and county clerk's offices work in concert, the clerk's offices do constitute separate administrative entities under the direction of an independently elected official in all but a few counties.

In the majority of the Superior Courts, the court employs a court administrator whose office is responsible for managing the operations of the court including scheduling cases and resources, and, where offered, operating the mandatory arbitration program for civil cases. However, the responsibilities and division of labor among court administrative offices and county clerks varies county to county.

The Superior Courts are supported by the Superior Court Information System (SCOMIS) which serves as the primary docketing application for county clerks and supports case calendaring and minimal case management functions. Several counties have developed or purchased separate case management systems over the last 10 years and one superior court's internally developed application has entirely replaced the court's use of the SCOMIS application.

The thirty-nine counties served by the Superior Courts can be grouped into three categories based on 2004 filings:

- *Small* – Fewer than 3,000 cases filed per year; there are 21 counties in this category
- *Medium* – Between 3,000 and 15,000 cases filed per year; there are 13 counties in this category
- *Large* – More than 15,000 cases filed per year; there are 5 counties in this category

2004 Caseload of the Superior Courts (cases filed)

Criminal	48,161
Civil	128,009
Domestic Relations	37,703
Probate/Guardianship	18,895
Adoption/Paternity	11,336

Mental Illness/Alcohol	9,251
Juvenile Dependency	21,386
Juvenile Offender	25,329
Total Filings	300,070

2.1.4 The Courts of Limited Jurisdiction

The courts of limited jurisdiction (CLJ) in Washington State consist of the District and Municipal courts.

The District Courts are “county” courts with concurrent jurisdiction in civil cases up to \$50,000 with the Superior Courts and exclusive original jurisdiction in small claims actions up to \$4,000. The district courts also hear all traffic infraction, non-traffic infraction, civil county code and criminal misdemeanor cases arising within the unincorporated areas of the county. While not commonly exercised, District Courts also have jurisdiction to hear preliminary proceedings in felony cases and prosecutors in 12 counties file felony complaints in the district court with some regularity. The majority of these cases are dismissed or reduced to a misdemeanor. However, approximately 500 cases are “bound over” to Superior Court annually.

The District Courts also provide court services to approximately 115 cities either through a contract with the district court (97 cities) or as a municipal department (18 cities). Under the contract model the city cases are filed directly with the district court and processed within the regular business practices of the court, though they are often uniquely identified for purposes of tracking case filings by city jurisdiction. Under the municipal department model, the district court judge(s) serves as the judge of the municipal court working with a separate city court staff at a facility provided by the city.

At the end of 2004, there were 99 elected District Court Judges and 12.9 FTE court commissioners serving 44 district courts in the 39 counties in 55 locations. District Courts are supported by court administrative staff appointed by the district court judges.

In 2004, 119 cities were operating independent municipal courts. Municipal Courts have original exclusive jurisdiction over all traffic and non-traffic infractions, criminal misdemeanors and violations of city ordinances that occur within the city limits.

Municipal Court judges are elected positions in eight cities and are appointed in the remaining 111 cities. Municipal Courts are supported by court administrative staff appointed by the municipal court judges.

Approximately 71 District and Municipal Courts are supported by probation organizations either under the direct oversight of the court or as a separate office within the local government. More than 30,000 offenders are typically on probation at any given time.

Approximately 22 District and Municipal Courts operate Traffic Violations Bureaus which are separate administrative entities established under the auspices of the court to receive payments for uncontested traffic and non-traffic infractions and bail for bail forfeitable misdemeanor offenses.

Additionally, as previously stated under superior courts, both the District and Municipal courts have jurisdiction over civil anti-harassment, domestic violence, and sexual assault protection orders.

The District and Municipal courts are supported by the District Court Information System¹ (DISCIS). This system is used by the majority of limited jurisdiction courts with the primary exceptions consisting of very small municipal courts.

Significantly, the state's largest court in the number of cases filed, the Seattle Municipal Court, does not use DISCIS for case management. The court is supported by the Municipal Court Information System (MCIS), a separate application developed and maintained by the court. Like the JIS applications, MCIS is an older system and has many of the same operational issues as the AOC developed and maintained legacy systems. A data exchange between MCIS and DISCIS occurs for case and person data for current adjudicated criminal cases and as domestic violence cases and protection orders. When a new JIS core case management system is implemented, the Seattle Municipal Court plans to terminate MCIS and transition to the new system.

Additionally, while DISCIS (JIS) includes a parking citation module which is used by many District Courts and a number of Municipal Courts, many cities have developed or purchased separate applications for issuing and processing parking citations.

The 55 District Court locations can be grouped into three categories based on 2004 case filings:

- *Small* – Fewer than 3,000 cases filed per year; there were 10 courts in this category
- *Medium* – Between 3,000 and 15,000 cases filed per year; there were 23 courts in this category
- *Large* – More than 15,000 cases filed per year; there were 22 courts in this category

The 119 independent Municipal Courts can be grouped into three categories based on 2004 filings:

- *Small* – Fewer than 3,000 cases filed per year; there were 87 courts in this category
- *Medium* – Between 3,000 and 15,000 cases filed per year; there 24 courts in this category
- *Large* – More than 15,000 cases filed per year; there were 8 courts in this category

2004 Caseload of the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (cases filed)

	<u>District Court State/County</u>	<u>District Court Municipal</u>	<u>Independent Municipal</u>	<u>Total</u>
Traffic Infractions	552,582	94,962	289,529	937,073
Non-Traffic Infractions	15,439	3,231	14,704	33,374
DUI/Physical Control Misd.	27,509	4,348	11,776	43,633
Other Traffic Misdemeanors	34,963	10,890	32,835	78,688
Non-Traffic Misdemeanors	49,772	20,737	67,312	137,821
Domestic Violence	12,075	0	199	12,274
Civil	109,887	3	189	110,079
Small Claims	27,097	0	0	27,097
Felony Complaints	3,819	0	0	3,819
Parking Citations	19,783	15,926	599,219	634,928
Total Filings	852,926	150,097	1,015,763	2,018,786

¹ The District Court Information System (DISCIS) was renamed "JIS" in 1995. However, because the "JIS" acronym is also used to refer to the portfolio of applications and underlying databases supporting the courts in Washington State, the term DISCIS will be used in this document to reference the specific application which currently supports the district and municipal courts.

2.2 The JIS Customer Tiers

The list of JIS Customer needs continues to evolve as business practices and technology change. County and city budget constraints are forcing fewer court staff to handle rising case loads. These challenges, along with the varying needs of other JIS Customers, make it critical that the AOC continually evaluate the range of services to support all. As we look to the future, the AOC has defined a tiered system of classification to recognize the types of needs and JIS services that will best suit the customer.

Tier I – Full Service Tier:

This tier includes most JIS customers and is characterized by:

- JIS provides most case management functionality (custom developed or COTS software)
- JIS provides or funds much of the end user hardware
- JIS provides transport to counties, but no local network support
- JIS provides user Assistance (may include system training, business process, and documentation)

Tier II – A la carte:

- JIS customers which use a combination of JIS services, equipment and applications provided by AOC and internally developed or vendor provided technology solutions

Tier III – Data only:

- JIS customers which do not use any JIS application as their primary information system, but have a business need to integrate JIS data into their information systems
- These customers Include:
 - Other state and federal agencies
 - Commercial users and members of the public

2.3 JIS Application Portfolio

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) provides a range of technology services that support the court customers' automation needs. The initial set of applications, developed in the late 1970s and early 1980s at the AOC, are referred to as the "legacy" applications. Since then, the AOC has developed a steady stream of applications with additional functionality including major new applications released in the 1990s and early 2000s. **Table 1.a** displays the applications that make up the JIS application portfolio.

Table 1.a

Application / Service	Description
DISCIS	<i>District and Municipal Court Information System (DISCIS)</i> - This application is the primary accounting and case management used by the District and Municipal courts. This application also serves as the repository of person records and domestic violence protection order tracking supporting both the courts of limited jurisdiction and the superior courts including juvenile departments. A version of its accounting module supports the superior courts.
SCOMIS	<i>Superior Court Management Information System (SCOMIS)</i> – This application is the primary docketing system used by the county clerks in support of the Superior Courts. This application also provides minimal case calendaring and management functionality to the clerks and Superior Courts. This application is accessed by the other courts levels in view-only mode.
JABS	<i>Judicial Access Browser System (JABS)</i> – This application provides a user friendly view of criminal history, active warrants, domestic

	violence protective order and child custody order information. It is available to all court levels and used typically by judicial officers and clerical staff.
JCS	<i>Juvenile and Corrections System (JCS)</i> -- This application is the primary case and detention management system used by the Juvenile Courts. This application replaced JUVIS as the juvenile court case management tool and implementation is currently in progress, scheduled to continue through the spring of 2006.
ACORDS	<i>Appellate Court Records and Data System (ACORDS)</i> – This application is the primary case management system used by the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. Released in 2002, this application is a rewrite of the legacy ACORDS application.
CAPS	<i>Court Automated Proceeding System (CAPS)</i> – This application, currently in production and in use at one county, provides resource management and case event scheduling for the Superior Courts.
JRS	<i>Judicial Receipting System (JRS)</i> – This application is the receipting system used by the County Clerks’ offices in support of the Superior Courts. The application uploads data nightly to JIS.
Data Warehouse	The Data Warehouse provides court users with access through the Brio® and Hyperion® query tools to denormalized and dimensional data for ad hoc queries and reports; the query tools are also used to provide normalized report data to the ACORDS and CAPS applications.
Risk Assessment	A COTS (Commercial Off the Shelf) application hosted at the AOC, provides risk assessment surveys for Superior Court juvenile departments and District and Municipal Court probation organizations.
JIS-Link	JIS-Link is a fee based subscription service that provides online access to the JIS, ACORDS, and SCOMIS applications for non-court users, such as other state agencies, commercial businesses and the general public.
Website Services	In addition to information, both the public Washington Courts website and the judiciary’s Inside Washington Courts website (extranet) use embedded tools to provide services. These include notification of new appellate opinions, forms, event calendars and reports. A hearing date search function is provided on the public website.

2.4 Technology Landscape

The AOC Server Environment consists of two platforms: 1) z/OS IBM mainframe, and 2) Windows. Along with the servers, there are various network components which support the JIS environment.

The majority of the case management production work accessed by the courts resides on two z/OS mainframes. The exception to this is the Juvenile Corrections System (JCS) which resides on a Windows server.

2.4.1 z/OS Server

The IBM z/OS Server environment is running on two physical mainframes to support the JIS production workload. One processor runs the production “green screen” applications and the other runs the DB2 subsystem and WebSphere applications.

2.4.2 Distributed Environment

The AOC runs approximately 50 Intel based servers in a distributed environment. The operating system environment is mixed with most servers running Windows 2000 and a minority running Windows 2003.

2.4.3 Data Warehouse

AOC uses MS SQL Server 2000 for the data warehouse environment. Data is replicated to an operational data store (ODS) using a product called Data Mirror and is later transformed into a different data structure designed for queries/reports using a product called Informatica. AOC and court users use Hyperion-Brio to access data and web based queries.

2.4.4 Network

The JIS network primarily connects court workstations and printers across the state to servers in Olympia. The JIS network is made up of several parts which are described below. The AOC directly maintains or contracts for portions of the network connecting state judicial branch facilities in the Olympia area and the court of appeals sites. The AOC contracts with the state's Department of Information Services (DIS) for connectivity to state agencies through the State Government Network (SGN) and to local governments through the Intergovernmental (IGN), and connection to the Internet. See Appendix 2 for visual orientation.

Local Olympia Network

AOC owns and operates the network in Olympia that houses the various servers. AOC is connected to DIS by two 100 megabit Ethernet fibers. One connection is direct to DIS; the other connects to the Internet. Network monitoring of the local Olympia network, Temple of Justice, Courts of Appeal, and JIS courts is performed by OpManager. Network sessions outside the local Olympia network and COA segments must go through the AOC firewall before establishing connections to AOC servers. Access to AOC is offered through VPN.

Department of Information Services Network

DIS is used as a network transport. AOC does not monitor the network devices at DIS. DIS connects the local AOC network to the Temple of Justice, IGN courts, and JIS courts.

Temple of Justice

The Temple of Justice network is connected to DIS by a 100 megabit Ethernet fiber. The Temple of Justice Building houses the Supreme Court. The network devices that support the Supreme Court are a router, a firewall and several switches.

Courts of Appeal

The three divisions of the court of appeals are located in Seattle (COA1), Tacoma (COA2) and Spokane (COA3). All three divisions are connected by T1 service to a frame-relay cloud which is connected to the local Olympia network. Each COA has a router and several switches.

Intergovernmental Network Courts

Courts that are located in or near their respective county seat (except Wahkiakum) are connected either by T1 circuitry or Ethernet services to DIS. Counties running Ethernet are Yakima (100 megabit); King (4 megabit); and Thurston (10 megabit). DIS staff own and operate their network equipment including the routers that terminate in the county seats. County network staff or third party vendors maintain the county networks.

“JIS” Courts

Courts that are not connected through their respective counties connect directly to DIS using T1, fractional T1, or 56 kilobit frame relay circuits. AOC provides these courts with network equipment.

Internet Stub

Access to some JIS applications and VPN access is provided through the Internet stub.

Network Appliances

AOC utilizes various specialized appliances in the network configuration:

Appliance	Description
BIGIP	Provides load balancing of TCP/IP applications and SSL encryption. Currently, four boxes are being used.
Neoteris	Provides VPN access to the AOC internal network.
Nokia	Firewall-1 Services – Two appliances for the SGN connection, one for the internet, and one for the Supreme Court (the COA divisions are inside the AOC network and are supported by AOC firewalls).
BlueCat	Provides DNS services.

2.5 Business Problem Description

The Washington courts use a broadly functional, but aging judicial information system. Currently, each court level uses a separate application (See Table 1.a. above). Each of these applications present different challenges as changing and complex statutory and justice system requirements drive the need for enhanced functionality. Data entry is often redundant across court levels and criminal justice partners (e.g. Washington State Patrol).

The courts are experiencing increasing cost pressures and caseloads, but are unable to increase operational efficiency without enhancements to the existing information system. At the same time courts are trying to support diverse community and cultural needs, and innovative judicial methods (e.g., alternative sentencing, real-time adjudication information, self-service and after-hours support, and therapeutic courts such as drug and mental health courts).

In spite of its comprehensive functionality, the current system does not adequately support certain core court functions such as scheduling and resource management. Although the current system is person-based, it does not fully support court needs for robust statewide searching in order to combine all cases for a single individual into a single person record. Nor does the system adequately support cases based on vehicle information instead of person information (e.g., parking citations).

Further, the system does not provide adequate management reporting. Under increasing demands for performance accountability, the courts are unable to access JIS data to assess court process and outcomes.

2.6 Technical Considerations

The current JIS enterprise environment has been built up over the course of nearly thirty years and operates in a mixed environment across 39 counties and over 100 cities. Now and in the future the AOC will continue to be responsible for ensuring the highest level of support and quality of execution on all products and services rendered for court customers, justice partners, and the community.

As the AOC works through the process of executing the current JIS roadmap it will be critical to ensure that the technical landscape and enterprise views are addressed thoroughly by any product or service considered for addition to the JIS portfolio.

2.6.1 Technical and statewide considerations

- Integration constraints on a product within the existing enterprise environment
- Potential impacts or issues affecting how a given product will fit into the existing state, regional and local infrastructures include:
 - Skill set required
 - Resource requirements
 - Installation requirements
 - Infrastructure investment necessary to the support the product
 - Server hardware
 - Software
 - Network devices
 - Bandwidth capacity
- The options supported for deploying single or multiple instances of a software product:
 - Locally
 - Regionally
 - Statewide
- Product architecture compatibility with LDAP/RACF security structure (local/regional/statewide)
 - Server hardware
 - Software
 - Network devices
- Historical performance of the legacy applications show a sustained response time of 1-3 seconds on average. The AOC's early implementation of J2EE (web based) applications have generally executed in the 3+ range and higher with mixed results. Any product or service considered for addition to the JIS portfolio for deployment across 39 counties and servicing over 16,000 users must perform at the optimum scenario for sustained levels of performance and scalability.

2.6.2 Legacy Data Integration

All of the current case management related applications are based on a central data repository that is used to store all of the state's case and criminal history information. In most cases the existing legacy applications are directly coupled to the legacy data store. Due to this fact, the legacy data model cannot be re-factored without significant cost to any of the existing case management applications which remain in the JIS portfolio.

Any new CMS application should ideally provide a mechanism for integrating with legacy data stores at the local and state level. If the application does not directly provide this data integration mechanism, a strategy should be provided for ensuring that the application interfaces are compatible with existing legacy data stores. If a new data model is required, a strategy for ensuring synchronization between the existing legacy data stores and the new data stores should be provided. This strategy needs to be compatible with the enterprise integration solutions being adopted (see Section 2.6.3 below).

Seattle Municipal Court (SMC) is currently a Tier III customer, but will move towards the Tier I class with the implementation of a vendor provided CMS solution for the JIS. SMC has two local case management systems supported by two repositories in two different environments. The main case management system is 4GL and the application code carries much of the relational

information about the data stores. There are dozens of data exchanges, automated batch and cron jobs, and many different interfaces. The probation case management system is written in advanced Revelation code, tightly coupled to the Revelation database.

2.6.3 Integration

The AOC is currently in the procurement phase of selecting and acquiring a suite of tools to support application integration needs. Vendor provided CMS solutions must use accepted industry standards related to integration (e.g., Web services, XML, etc.). A key factor in the selection of a new case management system will be the flexibility provided by the underlying architectural implementation in regards to the integration of data and processes.

3. System Requirements

The AOC is in the process of formally developing detailed system requirements for the CMS. The information gathered through this RFI will add to the process. To assist vendors in developing their responses to this RFI, preliminary system requirements are described below. These high-level requirements include major functionality offered by the current existing system, other applications, and manual processes, as well as minimal functionality desired in a new system.

The system requirements included in this RFI can be categorized as either functional or technical. Both categories are described in high-level terms below.

3.1 System Functions

The court community and AOC are interested in learning how vendor products deal with the following functional areas. These areas reflect the business needs identified by the court community. These functional areas do not constitute, nor should they be construed as, the final set of functional requirements that may be included in a RFP for the procurement of a CMS. Vendors should use the brief descriptions provided below to determine their ability to address the business needs of the court community.

Vendor responses should clearly describe how their solutions provide the functionality in each area. No vendor should refrain from responding to this RFI solely because it does not offer all of the functionality that might respond to the needs of the Washington courts.

3.1.1 Case

The case functionality includes, but is not limited to the following elements:

Initiation of the case record includes:

- Case number assignment
- Case type assignment
- Cause of action (sub-case type code)
- Capturing the original charge information (criminal and infraction case types) and claim information
- Relating charge and claim information to persons and participants
- Relating person records to the case (and creating new person records)
- Relating participants to the case (and creating new participants)
- Capturing pro se litigant contact information
- Establishing person and participant roles and relationships within the case
- Creating docket entries for initial case filings
- Issuing warrants, summons and other orders to appear

Initiation of the case record may include:

- Assignment of the case to a judicial officer (may be based on type of case, rotation, load balancing)
- Calendaring one or more hearings or other case events
- Issuance and docketing of a formal case scheduling order based on case type (differentiated case management)
- Establishing a link between the case and one or more other cases in the same court or a different court which may be at a different court level
- Identifying cases for time-sensitive processing

Maintenance of the case record may include, but is not limited to:

- Changing the status of the case (active, stayed, warrant, resolved, completed, etc.)
- Adding and/or end-dating persons and participants
- Adding and/or modifying charges and claims (counter, cross, third party)
- Sealing, expunging and archiving
- Disqualification of one or more judicial officers (affidavits of prejudice and recusals)
- Processing warrants, summons, and other orders to appear
- Recording failures to appear

3.1.2 Person and Participant

The application needs to identify and track persons involved with cases and other matters that come before the court and that are within the scope of the CMS. These persons have the following attributes:

- Their roles can include defendant, litigant or party, judicial officer, attorney, witness, law enforcement officer, guardian ad litem, interpreter, etc. The JIS uses the term “participant” to relate a person to a case and indicate the person’s role
- They can be people or legal entities
- They can be well identified or only loosely identified as when the only information available is the name on a pleading. Well identified means the system has enough identifying information, both in the database and in incoming documents, to be able to, based on business rules, relate persons to more than one case; “loosely identified” is everything else. The application needs to be able to handle both well identified and loosely identified persons and relate them to cases

Person functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Creating, modifying, merging, and deleting person records
- Maintaining an audit trail of court users creating, modifying, merging and deleting person records
- Maintaining the person record history, including associated and date-ended address, telephone, and e-mail information
- Robust person searches including weighted, phonetic, and alpha searches and fuzzy matches
- Relating a person to a case as a “case participant”
- Providing views of statewide data related to a person including criminal history, driving record (infraction history) and domestic violence protection order cases

For background: The terms “person” and “person record” have specific meanings within the context of JIS and refer to a “uniquely identified human being.” The person record is used to relate driving record, juvenile offender, misdemeanor, felony, warrant, and domestic violence protection order information and history to a uniquely identified individual person. Both the court community and justice system partners, such as local law enforcement, the State Patrol and the Department of Licensing, depend on the reliability and accuracy of these person records maintained within the DISCIS application database. Rigorous business rules

apply to creating, modifying, and merging person records and a clear audit trail and person record history is maintained.

In Washington, most civil case filings do not include identifying information, except for names of parties and other participants. Therefore, court clerks do not collect or enter into JIS identifying information in such cases. In the current JIS, case participants in these situations may appear in the participant data stores multiple times.

3.1.3 Basic Calendaring

Basic calendaring functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Generally supporting “individual calendar” and “master calendar” systems or a combination thereof within a single court
- Defining and configuring specific court calendars using one or more of the following criteria: judicial officer, attorneys, permissible case and hearing type(s), location, start and end time, and limits on the number of cases, hearings or events
- Scheduling hearings and non-hearing events associated with a case to a specific calendar (including “cases” initiated without assignment of a case number)
- Properly identifying events not associated with a case
- Activities associated with creating, formatting, maintaining, and distributing court calendars for each type of hearing and conference

3.1.4 Docketing

Docketing functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Creating and maintaining a chronological record of all documents filed in a case and maintained in the official court file
- Creating and maintaining a chronological record of all hearings and events scheduled and all hearing and event outcomes in a case
- Creating and maintaining a chronological record of all court actions, decisions, orders in a case
- Some non-docketing events or system actions may trigger automatic creation of docket entries in the case or another case
- Some docket entries may trigger automatic actions in other portions of the system

3.1.5 Hearings

Hearing functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Recording the outcome of hearings and non-hearing events
- Generating notices and/or court orders required as a result of the hearing outcome (e.g., pre-sentence investigations, directions related to court ordered pre-trial services such as alcohol or other evaluations)
- Recording the case participants present at the hearing
- Rescheduling the hearing or scheduling another hearing as a direct result of the current hearing
- Creating and producing minute entries

3.1.6 Adjudication and Disposition

The adjudication and disposition functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Recording and relating adjudications and dispositions to each individual charge, allegation, or claim within a case
- Recording and relating adjudications and dispositions to individual defendants or parties in a case
- Recording and relating adjudications and dispositions occur and may result from a court

decision after jury, non-jury trial, guilty plea, bail forfeiture, dismissal, bind over, transfer out to another jurisdiction, consolidation, arbitration decision, default dismissal, withdrawal, settlement, or in appellate matters issuance of an opinion and mandate processing

3.1.7 Non-Person Based Case Management (e.g., Parking)

Non-Person based case management functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Initiating and creating a case record based upon a vehicle license plate number
- Subsequently relating the vehicle license plate number to the registered owner of the vehicle
- Maintain case and vehicle information, violation details, schedule hearings, record hearing outcomes, and case disposition

3.1.8 Pre- and Post-Disposition Compliance

Pre- and post-disposition compliance functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Monitoring and enforcing compliance with pre-trial release conditions and post-disposition sentence and supervision conditions in criminal cases including payments of legal financial obligations (restitution, fines, fees, etc.). This may occur proactively (court initiated) or reactively (initiated by a probation department)
- Monitoring compliance with terms of court orders in non-criminal cases (e.g., child support, spousal support payments, completion of court ordered treatment or evaluations)

3.1.9 Basic Accounting and Receipting

Basic accounting and receipting functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Maintaining account, case, and person financial records
- Initiating internal and external fund transfers
- Producing account statements and other documents related to a case or person
- Producing account statements and other documents commonly associated with the end of an accounting period (e.g., daily, weekly, monthly)
- Common accounting activities such as tracking the collection of funds, issuing receipts, cashier close-out, and cashier management

3.1.10 Document Generation

Document generation functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- The creation, printing, distribution, service, tracking, and docketing of system created documents (e.g., orders, warrants, notices, and letters)
- Document utilities which support the creation and maintenance of document templates to merge standard text with case and person data at the state and local levels.
- The generation of electronic forms

3.1.11 Judicial Decision Making

Judicial decision making functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Single sign-on system access to data from all court levels
- Views of system data specifically designed to support judicial officer decision making such as criminal history (local, state, national) and domestic violence protection order history
- Views and navigation of case and person data specifically designed to support judicial officer decision making such as all active cases involving an individual or family or all future hearings across case types and courts

- Hyperlinks to statutes from docket entries or documents such as domestic violence protection orders
- Embedded links to other systems inside or outside the CMS (child support guidelines, sentencing grids, etc.) based upon the case type or person being viewed
- Views of the status of all cases assigned to a judicial officer
- Views all future scheduled hearings and non-hearing events or calendars assigned for an individual judicial officer
- Integration of a judicial officer's court hearing schedule with other personal calendar events such as meetings, tasks, and reminders

3.1.12 Pre- and Post-Sentencing Probation

Pre- and post-sentence probation functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Assignment of cases to probation officers and balancing of probation officer caseloads
- Differentiated probation status (e.g., reporting or non-reporting probation)
- Creating, maintaining, and tracking conditions of probation and compliance
- Creating and maintaining probationer reporting schedules and appointments
- Creating and maintaining probation officer schedules and appointments
- Management of multiple probation violation instances within a case
- Display and reports of individual probationer basic case record, conditions, and compliance

3.1.13 Resource Management

Resource management functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Creation and maintenance of inventory, schedules, and activities of internal and external resources
- Automated scheduling or assignment of resources to cases, persons, hearings, and calendars

3.1.14 Reporting

Reporting functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Generating individual court, court level and statewide summaries of case filings, hearings, hearing outcomes, charges, charge dispositions, case status, and age of cases based on case type to conform to federal, state, and local requirements
- Exception reports based on statewide and locally configured parameters
- Detail reports on individual cases or persons
- Electronic (desktop PC) management reports
- Ad hoc report creation at the state and local levels based on all available system data elements and parameters

3.1.15 Jury Management

Jury management functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Random selection of jurors for the issuance of summons to appear
- Creation and distribution of jury summonses
- Recording jury summons responses, both paper and on-line
- Recording a juror's appearance and attendance record
- Payment of juror fees
- Assignment of jurors to trial panels

3.1.16 Extended Financial Management and Accounting

Extended financial management and accounting includes, but is not limited to:

- Extensive collections monitoring and management which allows the courts to easily monitor accounts and to issue invoices, warrants and other documents for parties owing money to the courts
- Create customized financial reports in compliance with Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) standards at a statewide and local level
- Integrate with local accounting systems and with third party vendor e-filing systems

3.1.17 Document and Exhibit Management

Document and exhibit management functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Creating, storing, managing, tracking, archiving, and disposing of manual, electronic and imaged case files
- Receiving, tracking, and returning or destroying exhibits and other property gathered by the court

3.1.18 System Configuration Maintenance and Integrity

System configuration and maintenance functionality includes, but is not limited to:

- Ensuring the security and integrity of the case processing system, its data and its documents during normal operations and after a system failure or outage
- Establishing business rules set up in the code translation tables (e.g., the charge severity hierarchy, fines based on violation and local business rules, priority ranking for funds collected, funds paid out, and for reconciliation of all fund categories distributed as provided by ordinance, order, or law)

3.2 Non-functional Requirements

3.2.1 Availability

Availability addresses the readiness and stability of the system and ensures that the CMS provides court users with uninterrupted service. Any unplanned disruption in services can have significant legal ramifications, including exposing the Washington State court system to liability.

The system needs the capability to be available 24/7/365. The system should ensure availability through a combination of hardware and software management services based on industry standards and best practices. The system should provide state preservation so that critical transactional information is not lost in the event that an underlying fail-over mechanism is utilized.

The system should provide graceful fault management so that fail-over mechanisms are transparent to the user and disruptions cause the least possible impact.

3.2.2 Performance

Performance is measured by the system's ability to meet latency, throughput and resource utilization requirements.

The system should have the ability to achieve required performance through a combination of hardware and software management services based on industry standards and best practices.

The system should have the ability to support at least 6,000 concurrent users during peak transaction periods while experiencing no noticeable degradation in response time.

3.2.3 Reliability

Reliability is the ability of the system to perform without failure and, in the event of an unplanned

disruption, to quickly be restored to service.

3.2.4 Scalability

Scalability refers to the system's ability to provide increased processing capacity with no noticeable degradation of user response time.

The system should have the ability to increase horizontal capacity – which pertains to concurrent usage and the number of simultaneous users on the system at a given point.

The system should have the ability to increase vertical capacity – which pertains to the size of the transactions being processed by the system.

3.2.5 Security

The system's ability to authenticate individual users and control the information and functionality available to a user, based on the user's role or organization, the service requested, and the information requested. Confidential information is made available, based on business rules that reflect legal determinations of status, only to those with proper authorization. Update privileges are permitted, based on business rules related to roles, only to those authorized to perform functions based on their job assignments.

3.2.6 Usability

Usability is the characteristic of being easy to use. Ease of use can be measured by how quickly a task is performed, how many mistakes are made, how quickly the system is learned, and how satisfied people are who perform the task. The following are some general usability guidelines and principles that the system should deliver:

Accessibility – Access and use of a technology and information product by any person regardless of physical abilities or technological readiness.

The AOC is committed to providing access to information technology both to the public and to users in the judicial systems throughout the state, including individuals with disabilities. Accessibility for individuals with disabilities is a global best practice. The AOC looks to sources such as the World Wide Web Consortium's (W3C) Web Accessibility Initiative and Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act for guidance and best practices for procuring, developing and maintaining accessible information technology, and expects vendors to do the same.

Responsiveness – The degree to which a user *perceives* a system as reacting quickly to user input. Responsiveness is not the same as speed. Slow systems can be perceived as highly responsive if they consistently provide some quick feedback to users.

Aesthetics – The visual appeal of the system based on common principles of visual design; balance, hierarchy, contrast, etc.

Consistency – “Standard” system behaviors that become familiar to users over time.

Anticipation – The ability of the system to anticipate the user's wants and needs. The system should not expect users to search for or gather information or evoke necessary tools. The system should bring to the user all the information and tools needed for each step of the process.

Feature exposure – The ability of the user to see clearly see what functions are available.

Shortcuts – Key strokes that enact the same commands available in the menus.

Help – A variety of help options to guide the user including: Goal-oriented, Descriptive, Procedural, Interpretive, and Navigational.

3.2.7 Access to Justice Technology Principles

Washington Judicial Branch technology applications, including case management systems, need to take into consideration the Access to Justice Technology Principles which were adopted by the Washington Supreme Court. These principles inform the process by which justice system entities evaluate and implement technology initiatives. They are designed to ensure that such initiatives promote access to justice and do not unnecessarily or inadvertently create barriers for those who are or may be excluded or underserved. The AOC will apply the principles in evaluating technology for the courts. The ATJ Technology Principles are found at:

http://www.courts.wa.gov/court_rules/?fa=court_rules.list&group=am&set=ATJ

4. Instructions to Vendors

This document shall not be construed as a request or authorization to perform work at the AOC's expense. Any work performed by a vendor to respond to this RFI will be at the vendor's own discretion and expense; the AOC will not be obligated for any vendor costs related to this RFI. This RFI does not represent a commitment to purchase or lease any product. Submission of a response constitutes acknowledgement that the vendor has read and agrees to be bound by such terms.

The AOC intends to publish a formal Request for Proposal for the products described in this document prior to December 2006. There is no guarantee that the AOC will publish an RFP or, if an RFP is issued, that it will occur in the timeframe described in this RFI. While this RFI is the product of an intensive information gathering process and has been subjected to an extensive review, the AOC makes no claims as to the accuracy of the information contained in it.

4.1 Point of Contact

All communication with the AOC must be directed to the single point of contact for this project, as follows:

Name: Manny Najarro
Address: 1206 Quince St. SE
P.O. Box 41170
Olympia, WA 98504-1170
Telephone: 360.704.4028
FAX: 360.586.8869
E-mail: manuel.najarro@courts.wa.gov

4.2 Submission of Responses

There will be no formal question and answer period for the RFI. Vendors should make whatever assumptions they deem necessary to provide the requested information. **These assumptions should be clearly stated.**

Responses must be submitted by email to: manuel.najarro@courts.wa.gov no later than **5 p.m. PDT** on Tuesday, **May 30, 2006.**

In response the AOC will:

- Send a confirming email reply acknowledging receipt
- Review all summary submissions and may selectively invite vendors to perform a live demonstration of their product(s) beginning in July and continuing through September 2006

4.3 Public Records Notice

Responses shall be deemed public records under the Public Disclosure Act, Chapter 42.17 RCW. Any information contained in the response that is considered by the vendor proprietary and exempt from disclosure under the provisions of RCW 42.17.250 to .340 must be clearly designated by a transmittal letter identifying the portions claimed exempt by page noting the particular basis for each such exemption. Failure to include such a transmittal letter in a response will be deemed a waiver by a vendor of any assertion of exemption from disclosure of any portion of their response. In addition to the transmittal letter, each page claimed to be exempt from disclosure must be clearly identified by the word "confidential" printed in the lower right hand corner of the page. Any claim by a vendor that the entire proposal is exempt from disclosure will not be honored.

If a request is made to view or obtain a copy of a vendor's response, the AOC will comply with applicable public disclosure requirements. If any information in the response is marked as proprietary, such information will not be made available until the affected vendor has been given an opportunity to seek an injunction or restraining order against the requested disclosure.

4.4 Response Content and Format

To facilitate a timely and comprehensive evaluation of all vendor information, responses should be submitted using the supplied Word format with the appendixes (A through D). Vendors should provide answers that are as complete as possible.

Where appropriate, vendors should provide background artifacts to substantiate or illustrate how their products address the various business and technical requirements outlined in this document. Such artifacts should be submitted in electronic form (PDF file, Word document, or link to webpage).

Typical artifacts may include but are not limited to:

- User documentation (user manual)
- Application screen shots
- Functions overview (description of core functions)
- System documentation (functional and technical specifications)

4.5 Pricing

Initial Costs

Please provide general information on all initial costs to license, install, and implement your solution in a state of comparable size to Washington State. Additionally, please provide general estimates for the following:

- Logistics and Planning
- Design and Implementation
- Training
- Data Conversion
- Hardware and software
- Infrastructure/Network
- Assumptions and Additions. Please state general assumptions made in determining the one-time costs.

(Note: Also include general costs for annual maintenance)

Pricing table

Please provide the requested cost information using the included table on Appendix F to capture the results and summarize all initial costs to license, install, and implement your solution in a state of comparable size to Washington State.

5. Appendixes

A - General Questions (see attachment)

B - Business Questions (see attachment)

C - Technical Questions (see attachment)

D - Non-functional Questions (see attachment)

E - Network Diagrams (see attachment)

F - Pricing Table (see attachment)