



REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

ACQ-2016-0701-RFP

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS DOCUMENT

ROUND 1

October 12, 2016

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) published the Request for Qualifications and Quotations, ACQ-2016-0701-RFP, on August 26, 2016, for the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ) Case Management System (CMS) project and as modified by Amendment No. 1 published on October 7, 2016.

As required under RFP Section 1.18, answers to Vendor submitted questions are provided below.

Q1: What systems/ solutions will the new CMS integrate with? What vendor provides those and on what platform is each written?

A1: Integration information can be found in RFP Exhibit L – CLJ-CMS Integration Architecture. See Amendment No. 2 for further details.

Q2: What related procurements are forthcoming which are related to the CMS project, including (but not limited to) integration or IV&V services? If so, when will those take place and what procurement vehicle is expected for each?

A2: AOC does not have any planned procurements related to the CLJ-CM project. N/A

Q3: Who is the technical point of contact/project manager/lead for this project?

A3: This information is not available at this time. Per RFP Section 1.6, the sole point of contact in AOC for this procurement is the RFP Coordinator. Per RFP Section 1.7, all communications concerning this acquisition must be directed to the RFP

Coordinator. Unauthorized contact regarding the RFP with other state employees may result in disqualification.

Q4: Does the proposed solution in its entirety need to be present at the references for on-sites (including work done by major subcontractors)? Currently we have examples that demonstrate the entire process, but not at any singular location.

A4: RFP Section 2.5 requires completion of Exhibit H – Client On-Site Confirmation Form indicating what functionalities were implemented for the Vendor’s client. The same clients submitted in Exhibit H must be included as business references in Vendor response to RFP Section 2.4.3, and either RFP Section 2.4.1 or 2.4.2, as applicable.

Q5: **RFP Section 2.4.1 - Vendor Business References:** It is assumed the AOC wishes to engage an organization that has actual experience implementing court case management systems in a multi-jurisdictional, or statewide environment, where multiple court jurisdictions (counties or municipalities) are running off of single implementation of the software. Given this assumption, would the AOC consider adding language to the reference requirements that submitted references must be of a size and complexity similar to the AOC project and *they must be of similar architectural nature to the CLJ-CMS environment where a single instance of the system is meeting the needs of multiple counties or cities.*

A5: No.

Q6: **RFP Section 2.5 – Client On-Site Confirmation Form:** It is assumed that the AOC wishes to engage in onsite visits at actual similar statewide implementations. Given that assumption, would the AOC please consider adding clarity to the requirement such as follows:

Vendor proposal must include three (3) separate copies of EXHIBIT H, one of each named client. Of the three (3) clients submitted by Vendor, at least one (1) must be from a **statewide implementation** that has implemented and deployed the Vendor’s **proposed** Case Management System solution across **all applicable CLJ case types and multiple jurisdictions**. This must be an implementation and deployment of the system proposed for CLJ-CMS and must have been implemented and deployed within the last five (5) years.

A6: No. This proposed language could exclude vendors who would otherwise be qualified.

Q7: **RFP Section 2.3.19 – Prior Contract Performance – Termination for Default (M):** Must a vendor disclose all termination for defaults for not only the proposing/current business entity but also any business entities / companies that the vendor may have acquired as it relates to their case management business? This will give the AOC a clear picture for the organization’s overall ability to successfully deliver project similar in size to the AOC CLJ project.

- A7: Yes. Vendor, as a whole business entity, must disclose all termination for defaults related to case management business, which have occurred within the previous five (5) years.
- Q8: **RFP Section 2.3.20 – Prior Contract Performance – Termination for Convenience:** Must a vendor disclose all termination for convenience for not only the proposing/current business entity but also any business entities / companies that the vendor may have acquired as it relates to their case management business? This will give the AOC a clear picture for the organization's overall ability to successfully deliver project similar in size to the AOC CLJ project.
- A8: Yes. Vendor, as a whole business entity, must disclose all terminations for convenience related to case management business, which have occurred in the previous five (5) years.
- Q9: **RFP Section 3.2 – Financial Information:** If the Vendor is a wholly owned subsidiary of a larger organization must the Vendor submit all requested financial information for both the larger parent company and the subsidiary responsible for its case management operation?
- A9: Please refer to RFP Section 3.2.1.1.
- Q10: **RFP Section 2.5 – Client Onsite Confirmation Form:** the RFP states that *“The submitted referenced client sites must include, at a minimum, a central administrative organization, a large court operation, a small court operation, and their probation department(s)”*. Given that there are very few states that administer probation departments within the jurisdiction of their statewide judiciary, would the AOC consider state-level On-Site references that do not include probation departments in the scope of their project?
- A10: No. See RFP Amendment No. 2 for more information.
- Q11: **Exhibit M: Row 20 of the Instructions Tab,** for the description of “supports the Requirement” state that *“Requirement is currently existing in the proposed CLJ-CMS systems and services and has been deployed by the Vendor without configuration, customization, or custom development for another client in a manner that is also conformant with this requirement using the proposed CLJ-CMS systems and services. Under the “Detailed Response” column, Vendors must identify an implementation matching one of the client references provided under Volume I, Section 2.4 of the Vendor proposal. Failure to demonstrate this conformance through reference checks may be grounds for disqualifications resulting in further consideration.”* Our proposed solution has been implemented in hundreds of customers across the country, but every customer can configure the solution differently. Furthermore, information pertaining to how each customer configures the application is not retained on a customer by customer basis. As such, there will be circumstances where our appropriate response to the requirement would be “Supports the Requirement”, but we would not be able to identify customers where this requirement is currently met. We would, however, welcome and encourage the AOC to conduct reference checks with our provided references in the main RFP

response, and for the AOC to confirm any one of our solution's functionality with each of them. But from an RFP response perspective in Exhibit M, we suggest considering having vendors only be required to enter further detail in the "Detailed Response" column when supplemental information for "Supports the Requirement" responses is necessary. Would the AOC be open to considering this approach in filling out Exhibit M?

A11: Row 20 of the Instructions Tab of Exhibit M has been revised as provided under RFP Amendment No. 2. Under this same tab, the instructions regarding Vendor responses provided under the "Detailed Response" column have not changed.

Q12: Exhibit M and Main Document: Related to the prior question, section 2.4.1 of the main document, at the top of page 24, states "Do not include current AOC staff as references". However, there are many requirements throughout Exhibit M that are unique to the State of Washington. Given the RFP statements that indicate that the AOC would like to confirm functionality via reference checks, would the AOC be open to allowing the inclusion of two AOC staff (as requested in Exhibit E – Vendor Reference Form) to be included as a reference?

A12: No.

Q13: How many total users are anticipated to be in scope of this project? Can the AOC provide estimates around the breakdown of user counts between the three different categories of groups in scope of the project? Specifically, the user count breakdown between district courts, municipal courts, and probation departments?

A13: See RFP Amendment No. 2 for modifications to RFP Section 5.5.1.

Q14: For implementation / deployment planning purposes, can the AOC please provide the total number of physical locations that are anticipated to be in scope of this project (including all participating district court locations, municipal court locations, and probation department locations?)

A14: See RFP Amendment No. 2 for modification to RFP Sections 1.2.1 and 4.4.5.

Q15: Given the fixed price nature of the project, can the AOC please confirm that the intent is to include data conversion efforts from existing probation department data sources and/or systems? If inclusion is the intent, can the AOC please provide further information pertaining to the types of data sources and/or systems, the number of data sources and/or systems, and estimated total number of records/cases to be converted?

A15: Yes, data conversion is included as part of this project for the existing probation departments. Conversion criteria is unknown at this time as AOC does not currently maintain a statewide probation system.

Q16: To help ensure clarity of vendor responses, would the AOC please consider having a second round of questions and answers in the mid-to-late October timeframe?

- A16: See RFP Amendment No. 1 for modification to RFP Section 1.8.
- Q17: Whether companies from Outside USA (e.g., from India or Canada) can apply for this?
- A17: See RFP Section 4.2.1 for Minimum Organizational Requirements for details.
- Q18: Whether we need to come over there for meetings?
- A18: As required under the Work Plan, AOC expects the project team proposed in the Vendor's proposal to work on site at AOC. See Exhibit B (Draft Contract), Section 5.8 for alternative option. Also see RFP Amendment No. 2 for modifications to RFP Section 4.3.1.
- Q19: Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) from Outside USA (e.g., from India or Canada)?
- A19: See A18 above.
- Q20: Can we submit the proposals via email?
- A20: Per RFP section 1.9, emailed proposals will not be accepted and will be disqualified.
- Q21: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix, Court Admin. Tab:** The requirements matrix has several requirements listed for the system to be able to store information on non-case filings. Could the Court elaborate on or give an example of a non –case filing and how they are tracked?
- A21: See RFP Amendment No. 2 for more information which includes a modified Appendix M-3.
- Q22: **RFP Section 1.22.2 – Client On-Site Visits:** The RFP states that the vendors selected for on-site visits should have implemented and deployed the proposed version of Vendor's software. With this requirement in mind, and the fact that most vendors providing commercial off the shelf applications (COTS) continue to expand their product offerings. Would the AOC consider a proposal from an established COTS case management system vendor based on their next generation product that is under development and is scheduled to be completed based on the AOC's project timeline?
- A22: AOC is seeking a CLJ-CMS solution which has already been implemented successfully for several Vendor Clients. Refer to RFP Section 2.5 (Client On-Site Confirmation Form), requires Vendor to propose clients who currently have an operational implementation of the proposed CLJ-CMS solution.
- Q23: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Do the limited jurisdiction courts follow a 2-step jury qualification process or a 1-step qualification process? It appears they want jurors to service during a specific term and only call them in when they need them.

A23: A jury qualification process does not currently exist for the CLJ courts. AOC requests Vendor propose a jury qualification process as currently available in the proposed CMS.

Q24: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Does the state require a uni-directional interface with Voters Registration and DOL for the creation of juror records or are these agencies submitting applicable lists to be imported for the creation of juror records?

A24: See RFP Appendix M-2, page 9, for detailed information.

Q25: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Can the state provide the number of jury summons generated by county?

A25: This information is not available at this time.

Q26: **RFP Section 5 – Technical Requirements:** Do all end users have network access to the centralized environment, or will access be required via the internet for some users?

A26: See A1 above.

Q27: How many concurrent users are anticipated to be connected to the Courts and Jury Systems respectively?

A27: See Exhibit K, Requirement T4, for anticipated concurrent user count for the CLJ-CMS. See Amendment No. 2 for more information. AOC does not maintain any Jury Systems.

Q28: **RFP Section 2.1 (pg. 16):** The RFP restricts page size to 8 ½ X 11 inch paper. For complex documents like Microsoft Project plans and architecture diagrams, may Bidders use larger paper folded down to 8 ½ X 11 inch size?

A28: Yes.

Q29: **RFP Section 2.1 (pg. 16):** The RFP requires Bidders to respond using 12-point font. May Bidders use a smaller, still readable font for the following: headers and footers, requirement text, exhibits, and tables?

A29: Only footers and headers may be provided in Vendor proposal using 10- or 12-point font.

Q30: **RFP Section 2.1.4 (pg. 17):** In the RFP, it states, “Proposals must provide information in the same order as presented in this document.....” Many of the Exhibits (i.e. Exhibit C, E, F, and T) are requested at the beginning of Volume 1 and also in various places throughout the volumes. Do you want these Exhibit placed in the beginning of Volume one and just referenced in the other places where they are requested?

- A30: RFP Section 2.1.4 references Volume 4, not Volume 1. Exhibits C, E, F and T are administrative requirements set forth under RFP Sections 2.3.1 and 8. Per RFP Section 2.1.1, these exhibits, as part of the Administrative Requirements Response, must be included in Proposal Volume 1. See RFP Section 2 for order placement of documents required for any Proposal Volume.
- Q31: **RFP Section 2.1.4 (pg. 17):** Exhibit C is requested at the beginning of Volume I and referenced within Volume 1, Section 2.3.6. It is also requested to be provided as an Appendix to the Vendor's proposal. Please clarify where you prefer this Exhibit to be included in the proposal.
- A31: See A30 above.
- Q32: Appendices I, J, K, L and O are missing from the RFP package. Please provide copies.
- A32: The RFP does not contain any documents labeled as Appendices I, J, K, L and O.
- Q33: **RFP Section 2.1 (pg. 16):** Several requested documents/samples do not comply with font restrictions and they are not available in a native MS Office format for font adjustments. Please confirm that this is permissible to submit these documents as is.
- A33: Vendor should make every effort to provide all proposal documents in compliance with RFP Section 2.1. Vendor may submit other requested documents in alternate font. However, readability will be determined at AOC's sole discretion.
- Q34: **RFP Section 3.2.1 (pg. 26):** Given the length of our audited financial statements, can Bidders provide these documents in electronic format only?
- A34: Per RFP Section 3.2.1, financial statements are required to be included within each printed copy of Volume 1 of Vendor proposal.
- Q35: **RFP Section 3.2.3 (pg. 26):** Can the Agency please clarify how the D&B report/number will be used in the evaluation of the Bidders' responses? Please confirm that the D&B report/number for a parent company can be submitted as a subsidiary to ensure an accurate assessment of the financial stability of the organization.
- A35: Dun & Bradstreet D-U-N-S number will be used by AOC to retrieve financial information to determine stability of a proposing organization. D-U-N-S numbers must be provided in Vendor's proposal for each business entity (i.e., parent, subsidiaries, holding companies, etc.) and all physical locations of its operations.
- Q36: Should a separate Exhibit D be submitted in each of the requested sections (i.e., one in liquidated Damages Section, one in Contact Terms and Conditions Section, etc.)?

- A36: RFP Exhibit D must be submitted as a single document in Proposal Volume 1. The form has been formatted to allow Vendors to add rows to the table. Vendors are required to use this form to propose minor modifications and/or additions to Exhibit B (Draft Contract). AOC will consider the information provided in RFP Exhibit D during contract negotiations with the Apparently Successful Vendor (ASV).
- Q37: **RFP Section 1.4.1 (pg. 33):** Please confirm that the reference to Contact Appendix H - Draft Statement of Work, is for informational purposes only in order to assist the bidder in drafting a response and that a specific response to each section in Appendix H is not a requirement.
- A37: As indicated on page 1 of Contract Appendix H, the *Draft Statement of Work* is intended to be used as a reference in properly preparing a response to the CLJ-CMS RFP.
- Q38: **Exhibit B – Draft Contract:** Is the Parent Guarantee included in the draft contract required?
- A38: Yes. See A36 for information regarding Exhibit D.
- Q39: **Exhibit B – Draft Contract:** Is the Letter of Credit include in the draft contract required?
- A39: Yes. See A36 for information regarding Exhibit D.
- Q40: Please confirm that the following Exhibits are for information only and are not required to be included in the proposal response. Exhibit A, B, I, J, L, N, and Appendices A-L, M1-M3 and O and Attachment A.
- A40: All exhibits, appendices and the attachment noted above are provided in the CLJ-CMS RFP as reference documentation for Vendor to review in preparing a proposal.
- Q41: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement PE87 states that the system must have jurisdiction records for use when filing cases. Could the AOC clarify if the Jurisdiction determines which Court the case should be filed in or if this information is used for the disbursement of fees?
- A41: Yes, the jurisdiction determines which court the case should be filed in and any disbursement information.
- Q42: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement PE120 states that the system shall have statewide configurable data elements captured from link. Could the Court elaborate on what Link is?
- A42: In Exhibit M, see INT22 (PE92) and INT23 (PE93), under the “Integrations” tab, for associated requirements.

- Q43: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement VV6 states that the system shall return weighted match search results. Please elaborate on or give an example of what is meant by a weighed match search result.
- A43: “Weighted match” is a common search engine function, where results are prioritized by the number of elements that match search criteria. Requirement VV6 is associated with requirement VV5.
- Q44: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement VV25 states that the system shall generate an automatic response when status indicator has been selected. Please elaborate on a car status flag indicator and the automatic response.
- A44: In Exhibit M, see INT45 (VV23) and INT46 (VV24), under the “Integrations” tab, for associated requirements.
- Q45: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement VV32 states that the system must allow for a batch entry of vehicle related violations. Could the Court please clarify if this is batch manual data entry or an interface/import?
- A45: Requirement VV25 requires both batch manual data entry *and* an interface/import.
- Q46: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement CV9 states that the system must have statewide configurable Finding Codes. Could the Court elaborate on what is meant by finding codes and how they are defined and utilized? We assume these are these Finding of Fact codes?
- A46: Requirement CV9 references codes associated with civil findings and judgements as defined in Appendix M-3, Section 4.3.
- Q47: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement CV44 states that the system must be able to document multiple business rules related to Clerk’s Dismissals. Please provide examples of business rules related to clerk dismissals.
- A47: Requirement CV44 references the workflow associated with cases without civil findings and judgements as defined in Appendix M-3, Section 4.4.3.
- Q48: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement AC57 states that the system shall link pre-initiation trust activity to pre-initiation notes. Could the Court elaborate on pre-initiation trust activities and pre-initiation notes?
- A48: See requirements AC51 – AC56 under the “Accounting” tab for associated requirements. See also Appendix M-3, Sections 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, and 4.1 for additional details.
- Q49: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement AC81 states that the system must have required statewide configured data elements

available for receipt process. Could the Court provide a list of statewide configured data elements?

A49: See Appendix M-2 for required data elements for the selected CLJ-CMS. Additional data elements for the CLJ-CMS will be determined during configuration efforts with the selected Vendor.

Q50: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement AC119 states that the system must generate an exception notification when errors occur during vendor receipting. Could the AOC describe the vendor receipting process?

A50: See Requirements INT65 (AC25), INT66 (AC26), INT70 (AC120), and INT71 (AC121) for associated requirements. See also Appendix M-3, Sections 5.7 and 5.8.

Q51: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement AC158 states that the system shall have ability to capture restitution party preferences for payment option. Could the AOC outline what is meant by restitution party preferences?

A51: Requirement AC158 is related to how the party wants to receive their restitution payment (e.g., EFT, check by mail, pick up in person, etc.).

Q52: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement AC188 states that the system must allow a payable to be issued with locally configured data elements. Please provide examples of locally configured data elements.

A52: Examples, related to Requirement AC188, regarding locally configured data elements could require whether to include or exclude a mailing address on the payable per local policy.

Q53: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement AC192 states that the system must have ability for a user to have multiple cut-offs during an accounting period. Please describe in more detail the multiple cut-off during an accounting period process.

A53: Multiple cut-offs during an accounting period could, for example, require an end user receipting online payments to utilize a cutoff to reconcile Vendor reports against system balances which then would be followed by a second cut-off during the end-of-day process.

Q54: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement AC193 states that the system must have ability for court to cut-off an individual user or batch users during an accounting period. Please describe this process in more detail.

A54: See A53 above. At the local court level, the selected CLJ-CMS must allow selection of a cut-off for an individual or a group.

- Q55: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement AC244 states that the system shall have locally configurable business rules to adjust existing accounts received for specific actions taken on case. Could the Court elaborate or describe examples of locally configurable business rules?
- A55: Examples, related to Requirement AC244, could include a time pay fee being added to the accounts receivable when a time payment agreement form is generated or, if all charges are dismissed, the accounts receivable is zeroed out. The conditions for configuration would be based on a local court's policies.
- Q56: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement AC261-AC265 states that the system must allow for each BARS code attached to an A/R Type to have the ability to have one or more sub accounts. Could the Court elaborate on BARS codes?
- A56: BARS codes are defined and referenced in both Exhibit I and Appendix M-3. BARS codes may have one or more sub accounts to further direct where money remitted must be sent. Each sub account must also be associated with its own BARS code. Further information regarding BARS codes can be located at http://www.courts.wa.gov/jislink/index.cfm?fa=jislink.codeview&dir=clj_manual&file=bars.
- Q57: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement CL6 states that the system must support various business rules within configuration of a Master Calendar. Could the court elaborate on business rules within configuration of a Master Calendar?
- A57: Business rules used in configuring a Master Calendar set up specific parameters for scheduling court business and would be set based on local court operations and policies. For example, if Courtroom 1 on Tuesday at 9:00 AM is limited to hearing cases requiring an interpreter, then an end user would need to obtain further approval for scheduling any case not flagged as needing an interpreter in that same courtroom during the restricted day and time. See Appendix M-3 for additional information.
- Q58: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement CL52 states that the system must be able to display by filtered party type. Can the Court elaborate on what is meant by a filtered party type?
- A58: A filtered party type refers to displaying the queried search results by a selected party type.
- Q59: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement CL54 states that the system must have ability to allow for various filter types for preparing or displaying of calendar. Could the Court give examples of filter types?
- A59: An example would be search/display a specific calendar date, only the morning calendar on that date, and only the 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM calendar on that morning.

Other examples could include calendars for a specific courtroom, a specific court location, or assigned to a specific judge.

Q60: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement CL58 states that the system must not allow for hearing metrics to be locally configured or overridden by a local court. Please provide examples of locally configured hearing metrics.

A60: The amount of time spent by a judge to complete a hearing is assigned a number and categorized by hearing type. These hearing metrics are utilized by AOC to determine each court's judicial needs. Since local configured hearing metrics are not currently allowed, no examples are available.

Q61: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement CL62 states that the system must allow for preset local court variables to be overridden. Please provide examples of local court variables.

A61: Requirement CL62 requires the selected system to allow end users to overwrite any present local variables assigned to hearing types. For example, a local court allows 30 minutes as the standard time period for motions with testimony. On a case-by-case basis, local court staff would be allowed to overwrite the standard time period to allow extending it to 60 minutes. Other local court variables are also referenced in Requirements CL59 - CL61.

Q62: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement CL69 states that the system must have ability to indicate equipment variables on the Master Calendar. Please elaborate on what is meant by equipment variables.

A62: Requirement CL69 requires the Master Calendar to allow an inventory of available equipment (i.e., jury box, jury room, audio and video equipment, etc.) to be designated for use in a specific court room. See Appendix M-3 for further information regarding equipment.

Q63: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement CL74 states that the system must have various methods to notify Judicial Officers and staff of pending matters assigned for judicial review. Please provide examples of pending matters that would be assigned for judicial review.

A63: Such matters include ex parte motions, hearings by mail, other correspondence, etc. See also Appendix M-3 and Requirements CL70 – CL73 for further information regarding judicial review.

Q64: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement PR21 states that the system must have auto generated event entries based upon configuration. Please provide examples of auto generated event entries.

A64: Requirement PR21 does not address auto-generated event entries.

- Q65: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement PR52 states that the system must document specific data elements for each condition. Please provide a list of the specific data elements that are required for a condition.
- A65: Probation case condition data elements are to be determined during configuration. Examples would include the date the condition was imposed, the date the condition is due to be completed, how often the condition must be completed (e.g., daily, weekly, monthly), as well as the current status of the condition.
- Q66: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement PR139 states that the system must have locally configured business rules on which activities require supervisor authorization. Please provide examples of activities that require supervisor authorization.
- A66: Requirement PR139 requires the selected system to be able to configure local business rules related to supervisor authorization activities, such as combining two probation case files, making financial adjustments to a probation case, reassignment and/or deletion of the probation case, etc.
- Q67: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement PR142 states that the system must generate reports regarding performance details on demand. Please provide examples of performance details.
- A67: Requirement PR142 requires the selected system to generate on-demand reports providing performance tracking details. These reports should include, but not be limited to, timeliness for compliance to notifications, work queues, and required checks for assigned probation cases; processing new probation referrals, etc.
- Q68: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement AD76 states that the system must have ability to have locally configured default settings for conditional elements. Please provide examples of locally configured default settings for conditional elements.
- A68: Regarding Requirement AD76, data elements may be different on each non-case filing type, which may have one or more default elements that are used consistently. Such data elements [i.e., Law Enforcement Agency (LEA) information, Judicial Officer name, current date as the filing date, etc.] would be auto-completed by default in the selected system.
- Q69: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement GR104 states that the system shall initiate work flow process when appeal has been filed or remanded from higher court. Please describe examples of these workflow processes.
- A69: Regarding Requirement GR104, an example for workflow processes would include a change in workflow process if an appeal status is switched from “On Appeal” to “Off Appeal.” This action would result in a notification to the clerk assigned for calendaring to schedule a hearing to review the decision.

- Q70: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement GR186 states that the system shall generate an alert when case matching configured criteria is dually entered in multiple courts. Please define case matching configured criteria.
- A70: Case matching configured criteria include, but not be limited not, case number, case type, LEA, violation date, etc.
- Q71: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement GR284 states that the system must require WACIC data elements to be completed when documenting protection type orders on case. Can the Court provide a list of WACIC data elements?
- A71: Data Elements related to Washington Crime Information Center (WACIC) can be found in Appendix M-2.
- Q72: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement GR358 states that the system must auto generate an event entry when case details are modified. Please give an example of an event entry that is generated when case details are updated.
- A72: As related to Requirement GR358, case detail updates which auto-generate an event entry would include modifications to the case parties, resulting in a system generated event entry reflecting the completed action.
- Q73: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement GR373 states that the system must restart automatic case processes immediately upon stay appeal status removal. Could the Court elaborate on these processes?
- A73: Once an appeal status is removed within the selected system, an automatic restart must be initiated for processes to resume at the same point in the case life cycle when the case was flagged for appeal.
- Q74: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement GR382 states that the system must be able to implement multiple business rules on appeal handling. Could the Court elaborate on the business rules for appeal handling?
- A74: Business rules related to appeal handling might include limitation on civil cases with judgements of less than \$250, filing restriction must occur within 30 days following finding/judgment date, etc.
- Q75: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement GR386 states that the system must be able to establish statewide work flows for a competency type status handling. Could the Court elaborate on the competency type status handling process?
- A75: Statewide work flows related to a competency type status handling process may include triggering actions such as due dates, sending communications regarding the competency order to multiple parties, and scheduling the competency review

hearing. Different rules will be required based on local processes and policies and may be dependent on the current custody status of the defendant.

Q76: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement GR387 states that the system must be able to establish statewide business rules for a Restoration type case status. Could the Court elaborate on these business rules?

A76: Statewide business rules for a restoration type case status might include triggering actions such as due dates, sending communications regarding restoration requirements to multiple parties, sending notification to National Instant Criminal Background System (NICS) and Department of Licensing (DOL) for firearm rights reporting (GR297), entry of the restoration status, etc.

Q77: **Exhibit M – Business Requirements Compliance Matrix:** Requirement GR429-GR431 Could the Court elaborate on the Orders – Case Conditions Business Rules process?

A77: Under business rules related to the case conditions process for orders, some conditions may only be imposed on certain charges or case types. Under the pre-trial or post disposition, for example, a case condition of “No Alcohol or Drugs” is routinely ordered on a “Driving Under the Influence” charge and should be entered via business rules based on the charge. The case condition cannot be imposed on a traffic infraction case type and should not be allowed to be entered on the accompanying infraction based on the case type.

Q78: **Appendix H – Draft Statement of Work:** How many courts are to be migrated? Is the jury data and court data within the same database/fileset for each court?

A78: See A14 above. No.

Q79: **Appendix H – Draft Statement of Work:** Does each court have a different legacy system? If not, please provide the name of each court and the legacy system that court is on (or at least an indication of how many are on the same legacy system.)

A79: No, each court does not have a different legacy system. There are currently approximately 300 courts using JIS, the legacy system for the limited jurisdiction courts. Seattle Municipal Court operates its own legacy CMS.

Q80: **Appendix H – Draft Statement of Work:** What are the number of cases for each court that will be converted?

A80: There are currently 19.7 million total cases in JIS. AOC expects conversion of all cases.

Q81: **Appendix H – Draft Statement of Work:** Does the AOC expect the vendor to execute conversion scripts during the statewide rollout?

A81: Vendor is expected to execute the conversion scripts during the statewide rollout.

Q82: **Appendix H – Draft Statement of Work:** Please explain what is meant by the phrase “...deployed regionally by court and probation department”? Does a region consist of multiple courts? If so, please provide a breakdown of courts by region.

A82: Regions are expected to have a relative mixture of court sizes within a geographic area. Definitions have not been finalized as to size and number of regions.

Any modifications to the RFP required as a result to answers provided by AOC will be provided in an amendment to the RFP. Any such amendment will be published as a separate RFP document and will be available in WEBS and at www.courts.wa.gov/procure/.

STATE OF WASHINGTON

1206 QUINCE ST SE • P.O. Box 41170 • Olympia, WA 98504-1170
360-753-3365 • 360-586-8869 Fax • www.courts.wa.gov