

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Unified Judicial Branch
600 East Boulevard Avenue
Bismarck, North Dakota

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) AMENDMENT

May 2, 2008

RFP NUMBER AND TITLE: 180-08-01, Case Management System Replacement

AMENDMENT NUMBER: 1

Section 1.06 of the RFP established a deadline for receipt of questions. The responses to these questions are provided as addenda to the RFP. When necessary, the RFP has been amended.

Main RFP Questions

1. **Question:** How many concurrent users will be accessing this system? If at all possible, could you please provide a breakdown per County to assist in an accurate implementation plan?

Response: UCIS has about 400 users defined with about 250-300 of them concurrent users. The public data warehouse has an additional 450 users accessing the information with about 4500 hits per month. However, we anticipate additional users on the new system due to the increased functionality we are expecting. Roughly 80% of the county and municipal courts have 1-2 users each. The largest 4 courts (Cass, Burleigh, Grand Forks, Ward) have more than 25 users each. The remaining courts have 5-15 users each. For more information, review the 2007 Annual Report at: <http://www.ndcourts.com/court/news/ndcourts2007a.pdf>.

No amendment necessary.

2. **Question:** RFP 3.02 H - Do you have detailed process roadmaps today for the required business processes that are identified in the detailed requirements attachment that need to be implemented in the system and if so can we get copies of those? If so, what level of automation is expected within an overall process or sub-process?

Response: The current processes are in varying states of being documented and may not provide much value. We anticipate new processes and levels of automation with the new system. All current documentation will be made available to the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

3. **Question:** RFP 3.02 K - Is there a requirement to send transaction history to / interface with a data warehouse as part of vendor solutions? If so, what interfaces will need to be created? Please describe in detail.

Response: The State currently has two data warehouse applications. We have a private warehouse and a public warehouse. UCIS is hosted on an AS/400. Our private warehouse is hosted on a Windows server and our public warehouse is hosted on a separate Windows server.

Data is replicated from our CMS to the data warehouses via a third party application called DataMirror, an IBM product. DataMirror replicates table data in real-time from our AS/400 to two separate Windows servers running SQL Server. Virtually all of the table data from the CMS is transferred to our private warehouse. For the public warehouse, all restricted data is filtered out by DataMirror and only public data is transferred.

The private warehouse is in place to provide limited (secure) access to non-public data for non-court users (i.e., Sheriff, States Attorney, other State government workers). Our private data warehouse has varying levels of security based on user id to protect restricted case information. The private warehouse can only be accessed by users within the state firewall who have made requests to the Courts for access to the system. The warehouse is provided for information only. Changes to data cannot be executed via the warehouse. If the vendor provides a read-only access solution that provides multiple security levels within their CMS package then we do not need a separate private data warehouse application.

The public warehouse is a public facing website that allows anyone with internet access to look up public court data such as citations, judgments, court calendars and civil/criminal filings. We are also open to vendor solutions for a public facing warehouse, but this is not a requirement.

No amendment necessary.

4. **Question:** RFP 3.02 K - There seems to be a requirement for flat file, standard formats for batch processing. Is this true and if so can the list of interfaces be segregated as to batch VS real-time data integration?

Response: Please refer to the Interface Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

5. **Question:** RFP 3.02 K - Please provide additional reporting detail, including data columns to be included, record breaks criteria, and other information and formatting that is required for the report?

Response: Please refer to the Interface Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

6. **Question:** RFP 3.02 K - Would you please provide a copy of each report?

For data integration purposes, what quantity of records, schedule, record layout and transaction type will be exchanged with:

- ND Department of Transportation,
- ND Health Department,
- Council on Abused Women's Victim Witness Program (Rape & Abuse Centers),
- State and Local Law Enforcement,
- State's Attorneys, Secretary of State,
- Tax Commissioners Office,
- Bureau of Criminal Investigation,
- Municipal Courts, Information Technology Department.
- Court Reporters,
- Diversion Agencies,
- ND Association of Counties,
- Guardian Ad Litem Program,
- Abstract Companies,
- Community Service & Restitution Office,
- Supreme Court,
- Juvenile Court,
- Jury Management system,
- Public Schools,
- other States,

- Federal Government,
- ND Department of Human Services,
- Child Support,
- ND Game and Fish,
- Public Defenders,
- Parole & Probation,
- Local and Regional Correctional Facilities,
- ND Department of Corrections,
- ND State Hospital,
- ND Attorney General Office,
- Tribal Courts,
- State Treasurer,
- ND State Archives,
- Board of Law Examiners

Is an Interface Control Document available for each of these systems?
Please provide more detailed specifications.

Response: Please refer to the Interface Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

7. **Question:** RFP 3.02 A - Please describe your expectations for the “pilot”. Will this include a CMS implementation for one court, or a full implementation of CMS, DMS and eFiling for one court?

Response: The pilot installation, if it is determined to provide the highest value to the State, would likely include implementation of CMS, DMS, and eFiling for one court. The scope of the pilot will be developed with the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

8. **Question:** RFP 2.02 - Has a decision been made on whether the application will be hosted at the Judicial Branch technology facilities or State data center?

Response: The application will be hosted at the Judicial Branch technology facilities.

No amendment necessary.

9. **Question:** RFP 3.02 C - Given the limited support staff for the Courts, has the Court considered a hosted solution or outsourced managed services arrangements? Are these options to be evaluated in the response to this RFP?

Response: The Court has not considered a hosted solution or outsourced managed services arrangement. These options will not be evaluated if proposed by any vendor.

No amendment necessary.

10. **Question:** RFP 2.03 - Can you confirm that your intent is to select one vendor to complete all of the Courts implementation through this RFP, subject to funding approval in subsequent biennium budget approvals? There will be no additional RFP for the Courts systems?

Response: It is the intent of the State to issue only this RFP and select a single vendor for the implementation of a solution statewide, subject to funding approved.

No amendment necessary.

11. **Question:** RFP 2.03 - Can you confirm the range for estimated budget requirements for the 09-11 biennium budget will:
 < \$ 1 M
 \$1M - 2M
 \$2 M – 3 M
 >\$3M

Response: Greater than \$3,000,000.

No amendment necessary.

12. **Question:** RFP 3.02 L - Can you provide more details to assist in the Data Conversion estimation, number of tables, number of elements, etc.?

Response: Please refer to the Conversion Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

13. **Question:** Are all jurisdictions required to use the statewide system or is the selection of a CMS system discretionary?

Response: All district courts are required to use the statewide system.

No amendment necessary.

14. **Question:** Can you provide an approximation of the number of users you anticipate using the system statewide? Please include agencies which may interface with system as well.

Response: UCIS has about 400 users defined with about 250-300 of them concurrent users. The public data warehouse has an additional 450 users accessing the information with about 4500 hits per month. However, we anticipate additional users on the new system due to the increased functionality we are expecting. Roughly 80% of the county and municipal courts have 1-2 users each. The largest 4 courts (Cass, Burleigh, Grand Forks, Ward) have more than 25 users each. The remaining courts have 5-15 users each. For more information, review the 2007 Annual Report at: <http://www.ndcourts.com/court/news/ndcourts2007a.pdf>.

No amendment necessary.

15. **Question:** Can you provide a breakdown of case volume by division for the State?

Response: The information is available in the 2007 Annual Report at: <http://www.ndcourts.com/court/news/ndcourts2007a.pdf>.

No amendment necessary.

16. **Question:** Per section 2.03, does the State have a forecasted budget amount that they will request from the Legislature? If so, what is that amount?

Response: The project budget will be determined based on the responses to this RFP. The State anticipates seeking more than \$3,000,000.

No amendment necessary.

17. **Question:** Attachment 4, Requirement 759, states “Ability to be deployed on a modern N-tier, ESX/VMWARE blade architecture, utilizing web-based client access. (REQUIRED)”. Page 13, C, states “Although it is desirable to leverage much of the current technology in use, e.g., Citrix and Windows Server, the State is continually investigating new technologies that will provide value to the State and its stakeholders.” Is a client/server or browser application required? Is a client/server or browser application preferred?

Response: The solution must be browser-based at a minimum. However, the ability to deploy a client/server version in addition to the browser-based solution would be preferred.

No amendment necessary.

18. **Question:** Page 4, 1.01, states “...to replace the existing custom developed CMS – Unified Court Information System (UCIS).” Page 7, 2.01, states “However, all Juvenile delinquency cases are initiated and tracked through a separate case management system (JCMS) maintained within the juvenile court division of the district court. Will the new CMS replace JCMS?”

Response: No.

No amendment necessary.

19. **Question:** Page 7, 2.01, states “...consisting of one supreme court, a single level of trial courts called ‘district court’ and a single, limited jurisdiction court called ‘municipal court’. There is one district court in every county for a total of 53 locations... There are 78 municipal courts, however only 10 municipal courts currently use the court’s case management system.” How many concurrent users will be on the system? Does the State anticipate that all 78 municipal courts will use the new CMS? Can the State provide a detailed breakdown for the courts, including location (e.g. County), court (e.g. Supreme, District, Municipal), division (e.g. Civil, Criminal, Probate, etc), number of users and caseload.

Response: UCIS has about 400 users defined with about 250-300 of them concurrent users. The public data warehouse has an additional 450 users accessing the information with about 4500 hits per month. However, we anticipate additional users on the new system due to the increased functionality we are expecting. Only the current 10 municipal courts currently using UCIS are part of the project scope. Roughly 80% of the county and municipal courts have 1-2 users each. The largest 4 courts (Cass, Burleigh, Grand Forks, Ward) have more than 25 users each. The remaining courts have 5-15 users each. For more information, review the 2007 Annual Report at: <http://www.ndcourts.com/court/news/ndcourts2007a.pdf>.

No amendment necessary.

20. **Question:** Page 8, 2.02 and Page 13, E - Is the vendor expected to run on any of the State’s existing infrastructure? How many images per year are stored and the average number of pages per image? How many years storage do we need to provide in the configuration? How many cases per year and how many years is the State looking to keep on-line? Is this a 24 X 7 installation?

Response: Although the State would like to protect its investment in the current infrastructure, we understand the need to purchase additional hardware to support the new system. We have no image system installed. We expect to have the system available to all end users for a minimum of 18 hours per day, Monday through Friday.

No amendment necessary.

21. **Question:** Page 8, 2.02 - Does the State have a preference for any Web engine or database?

Response: The State has no preference regarding the Web engine or a database (other than needing to be a SQL-compliant relational database).

No amendment necessary.

22. **Question:** Page 12, 3.02, states "We anticipate the project will conclude by June 30, 2011." Attachment 4, Requirements, states "...become part of the base product within the next 18 months..." Does the State have a desired implementation schedule?

Response: The State desires a phased rollout of the solution beginning with one county and to be completed statewide by June 30, 2011.

No amendment necessary.

23. **Question:** Page 16, L - Can the State define how many systems require conversion? Can the State provide the number of records in those files?

Response: Only one system, UCIS, requires conversion. Please refer to the Number of Records document located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

24. **Question:** RFP page 5, subsection 1.04, paragraph 2, regarding the two electronic copies of the proposal - Does the State want the electronic copy to be in one large file, or can we submit it in separate files as separate sections/subsections on the CDs?

Response: The vendors may submit the electronic versions of their response as separate sections/subsections on the CDs.

No amendment necessary.

25. **Question:** RFP page 7, subsection 2.01, Background Information, paragraph 1 - states that only 10 of the 78 municipal courts currently utilize UCIS. Please indicate if there is any possibility that the remaining 68 municipal courts may desire to utilize the new case management system in the future. Also, please provide a list of the 10 municipal courts currently utilizing UCIS.

Response: It is unlikely the remaining 68 municipal courts will utilize the new CMS in the future. The current municipal courts using UCIS are: West Fargo, Bismarck, Mandan, Minot, Williston, Dickinson, Rolla, Jamestown, Wahpeton, and Devils Lake.

No amendment necessary.

26. **Question:** RFP page 7, subsection 2.01, Background Information, paragraph 3, and RFP page 15, subsection K, Interface Development Requirements - state the need to transfer cases between and to share information with the Supreme Court. Please clarify the Supreme Court's intended usage of and/or interaction with the new case management system.

Response: Limited amount of data is shared between the two case management systems. The State is expecting the Supreme Court Justices and staff to be defined as users in the new CMS and DMS and have access to retrieve the information they need, e.g., trial court case number, Judge, Case Title, Court papers. Some of the information would then be used to populate fields (manually or electronically) in the Supreme Court docketing system. Some information, e.g., Opinions, Mandates would be sent or keyed into the new CMS.

No amendment necessary.

27. **Question:** RFP page 7, subsection 2.01, Background Information, paragraph 5 - states that North Dakota has a "fully automated administrative traffic procedure". Please explain the nature of the State's "fully automated administrative traffic procedure".

Response: The State has set up a nightly transfer with the Highway Patrol and several local law enforcement agencies that allows them to post their traffic citations to an ftp server. Every night a batch job runs that downloads the citations and enters them into our case management system.

No amendment necessary.

28. **Question:** RFP page 8, subsection 2.02, Technical Overview, Network Services - states that network reliability is a challenge today, partly because the shared network bandwidth is not segregated by any software or hardware. Please indicate what actions, if any, the State plans to take in conjunction with the new system to resolve network reliability and/or shared bandwidth segregation.

Response: The State, in conjunction with ITD, is working on defining options to address the current network reliability/bandwidth issues. We understand the need to have adequate network resources prior to the rollout of this solution.

No amendment necessary.

29. **Question:** RFP page 9, subsection 2.02, Technical Overview, Server Platforms - states that current data warehouse is populated by automatic replication of relevant UCIS data in real time. Please define the type of data contained within the data warehouse, how the data warehouse is currently used, and if/how the State plans to use the data warehouse in connection with the new system.

Response: The State currently has two data warehouse applications. We have a private warehouse and a public warehouse. UCIS is hosted on an AS/400. Our private warehouse is hosted on a Windows server and our public warehouse is hosted on a separate Windows server.

Data is replicated from our CMS to the data warehouses via a third party application called DataMirror, an IBM product. DataMirror replicates table data in real-time from our AS/400 to two separate Windows servers running SQL Server. Virtually all of the table data from the CMS is transferred to our private warehouse. For the public warehouse, all restricted data is filtered out by DataMirror and only public data is transferred.

The private warehouse is in place to provide limited (secure) access to non-public data for non-court users (i.e., Sheriff, States Attorney, other State government workers). Our private data warehouse has varying levels of security based on user id to protect restricted case information. The private warehouse can only be accessed by users within the state firewall who have made requests to the Courts for access to the system. The warehouse is provided for information only. Changes to data cannot be executed via the warehouse. If the vendor provides a read-only access solution that provides multiple security levels within their CMS package then we do not need a separate private data warehouse application.

The public warehouse is a public facing website that allows anyone with internet access to look up public court data such as citations, judgments, court calendars and civil/criminal filings. We are also open to vendor solutions for a public facing warehouse, but this is not a requirement.

No amendment necessary.

30. **Question:** RFP page 9, subsection 2.02, Technical Overview, Server Platforms - If the State desires to continue utilizing the data warehouse moving forward, please indicate if the State is open to alternatives for using the data warehouse (such as using comparable functionality available within the proposed replacement system).

Response: Yes, the State is open to alternatives.

No amendment necessary.

31. **Question:** RFP page 9, subsection 2.02, Technical Overview, Data Backup - states that backups, which are performed over the WAN, can be challenging. Please clarify what data requires backup from the individual county locations. Also, please indicate if any UCIS data is maintained at the individual county locations, outside of the central UCIS database on the iSeries.

Response: The State is only backing up Digital Audio files across the WAN. No UCIS data is maintained outside the central UCIS system.

No amendment necessary.

32. **Question:** RFP page 9, subsection 2.02, Technical Overview, Desktop Environment - states that Windows 2000 and XP are the de facto desktop standard operating system. Page 9 further states that agencies are beginning to pilot Windows Vista. Please clarify if the State anticipates support of Windows Vista to be a mandatory requirement for the new system.

Response: Support for Vista is not a mandatory requirement.

No amendment necessary.

33. **Question:** RFP page 8, subsection 2.02, Technical Overview, Operating Systems, and RFP page 13, subsection 3.02, Solution Proposed, Technical Requirements - state that Citrix is currently used to support court clerks' thin client devices. Please clarify if the State requires the use of Citrix in connection with the new system, or if the State is open to replacing the current thin client devices with more robust client workstations. Also, please specify the current Citrix version utilized by the State.

Response: The State requires support for Citrix clients. The current Citrix version deployed is Presentation Server 4.5.

No amendment necessary.

34. **Question:** RFP page 10, subsection 2.02, Technical Overview, Web environment - states that load testing of web applications is required prior to production deployment. Please specify what role the State expects vendors to perform during application load testing, if any.

Response: The State will perform the load testing on its equipment. Some assistance from the Vendor may be needed.

No amendment necessary.

35. **Question:** RFP page 11, subsection 2.02, Technical Overview, EDMS Environment - states that many State agencies use FileNet P8, version 3.5, or Cardiff LiquidOffice and Teleform to satisfy document management requirements. Additionally, the State's previous RFI indicated that a project was underway to implement FileNet within the Courts. Please clarify what document management system, if any, the Courts currently use for document management.

Response: The State is no longer working on the FileNet implementation project within the Courts. No document management system is currently being used.

No amendment necessary.

36. **Question:** RFP page 11, subsection 2.02, Technical Overview, EDMS Environment - if a document management system is currently not in place with UCIS, please specify if the State prefers FileNet P8 and, if so, if vendors can assume the State has the necessary FileNet licenses to support this project.

Response: The State has no preference as to the EDMS solution. Vendors should not assume the Court will use the FileNet system within ITD. Vendor should not assume the necessary FileNet licenses are available to the Court.

No amendment necessary.

37. **Question:** RFP page 11, subsection 2.03, Budget - indicates that the State has a limited budget for the current biennium. Page 12 further states that the State expects to initially sign a Statement of Work with the selected vendor that covers the remainder of the current biennium (approximately 9 months), whereas that Statement of Work may include activities such as “pilot” installation, data cleansing, interface analysis, etc. However, the State’s pricing format does not provide a mechanism for vendors to break pricing down for the initial 9-month period and the subsequent biennium. Does the State desire for vendors to clearly state what activities are recommended during the first 9 months and to show such costs accordingly? If so, please clarify how vendors should demonstrate pricing accordingly.

Response: In order to compare total implementation costs and request an implementation budget, the State desires the vendors to provide the costs as defined in the RFP. Once the vendor is selected, the intent of the State is to work with that vendor, and based on their recommendations, funds available, etc., will negotiate a Statement of Work covering the remainder of this biennium that provides the best value to the State.

No amendment necessary.

38. **Question:** RFP page 12, subsection 3.02, Solution Proposed, B. Functional Requirements - states that the “majority of daily court users at the clerk level are highly satisfied with the functionality of the current CMS”. Given this fact, how does the State plan to address change management as part of this project in order to overcome potential issues that may arise from the user base that seems largely pleased with the current system? What role, if any, does the State expect vendors to perform in change management?

Response: The State understands that organizational change will occur and the management of that change will be paramount to the success of the project. The State has created a project governance model and a communication plan to assist in addressing change management. However, the State expects advice from the vendors and assistance in facilitating the changes required to implement the solution.

No amendment necessary.

39. **Question:** RFP page 12, subsection 3.02, Solution Proposed, B. Functional Requirements - states that one of the general features that should be available in the new system is “extensive data validation rules and error messages to maintain data quality”, implying data quality may potentially be an issue within UCIS. Please identify any known data quality or data integrity issues within UCIS that vendors should consider when providing an estimated conversion work effort.

Response: The biggest issue is likely to be the date fields, which are comprised of three separate 2-digit field, most entries have a single digit century field containing either a "0" or a "1". Another issue is related to the recording of "Events" in the case record. The case can contain multiple events using the same code. This is not an issue for case management but can be an issue for reports or system-generated notices as the system is not always able to recognize and pull the most recent occurrence.

Other known issues include:

Restricted Cases - use of a single case type designator "R" for all restricted-access cases such as adoptions, mental health, and juvenile cases

Empty fields - many cases have missing or unknown date of birth or social security numbers

Social security numbers - financial accounts are tracked via SSN - when unknown, the system is using a random systems-generated number
Restraining orders - up until mid-2007, this case type did not allow for the entry of business names as a party

No amendment necessary.

40. **Question:** RFP Page 14, Item J, Training Requirements – please describe the State’s available training facilities for vendor-provided “Train-the-Trainer” training, as well as the State’s available training facilities for end-user training. For each training facility available in support of this project, please indicate the location and student capacity.

Response: The State has no training facility available at this time. Options for training facilities are being developed. We expect to have a centralized training facility that supports 10-15 students.

No amendment necessary.

41. **Question:** RFP page 15, Item K, Interface Development Requirements - identifies a number of interfaces currently in place with UCIS today. Given the understanding that the State expects vendors to only provide an estimate for interfaces, please define the State’s current integration methodology and technical infrastructure so that vendors can better understand how the State’s current integration approach may be leveraged with the new system.

Response: Please refer to the Interface Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

42. **Question:** RFP pages 15 and 16, Item K, Interface Development Requirements - for each interface defined on RFP pages 15-16 (both required and desired), please indicate if the interface is utilized by both the District Courts and Municipal Courts, by the District Courts only, or by the Municipal Courts only.

Response: Please refer to the Interface Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

43. **Question:** RFP pages 15, Item K, Interface Development Requirements – provide an explanation of the Data Mirror (online case search) interface, and specify if/how this interface utilizes and/or differs from the State’s current data warehouse.

Response: The State currently has two data warehouse applications. We have a private warehouse and a public warehouse. UCIS is hosted on an AS/400. Our private warehouse is hosted on a Windows server and our public warehouse is hosted on a separate Windows server.

Data is replicated from our CMS to the data warehouses via a third party application called DataMirror, an IBM product. DataMirror replicates table data in real-time from our AS/400 to two separate Windows servers running SQL Server. Virtually all of the table data from the CMS is transferred to our private warehouse. For the public warehouse, all restricted data is filtered out by DataMirror and only public data is transferred.

The private warehouse is in place to provide limited (secure) access to non-public data for non-court users (i.e., Sheriff, States Attorney, other State government workers). Our private data warehouse has varying levels of security based on user id to protect restricted case information. The private warehouse can only be accessed by users within the state firewall who have made

requests to the Courts for access to the system. The warehouse is provided for information only. Changes to data cannot be executed via the warehouse. If the vendor provides a read-only access solution that provides multiple security levels within their CMS package then we do not need a separate private data warehouse application.

The public warehouse is a public facing website that allows anyone with internet access to look up public court data such as citations, judgments, court calendars and civil/criminal filings. We are also open to vendor solutions for a public facing warehouse, but this is not a requirement.

No amendment necessary.

44. **Question:** RFP page 15, Item K, Interface Development Requirements - indicates that the State currently exports information to a stand-alone Supreme Court docketing system and further states a desire to share information with a number of other entities including the Supreme Court. Please clarify the difference between the current Supreme Court docketing system interface/export and the desired interface/data sharing with the Supreme Court.

Response: Limited amount of data is shared between the two case management systems. The State is expecting the Supreme Court Justices and staff to be defined as users in the new CMS and DMS and have access to retrieve the information they need, e.g., trial court case number, Judge, Case Title, Court papers. Some of the information would then be used to populate fields (manually or electronically) in the Supreme Court docketing system. Some information, e.g., Opinions, Mandates would be sent or keyed into the new CMS.

No amendment necessary.

45. **Question:** RFP page 16, Item L, Data Conversion Requirements - please indicate if all courts share a common, centralized UCIS database and code set or if UCIS is deployed to multiple, remote locations. Also, please provide file layouts or entity relationship diagrams of the current UCIS system, if available, in order to assist vendors with the development of a realistic conversion cost estimate.

Response: All courts share a centralized UCIS database. Please refer to the Conversion Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

46. **Question:** RFP page 16, Item L, Data Conversion Requirements - please indicate the number and type of State resources available to assist vendors with conversion activities, along with anticipated roles and level of commitment for such resources.

Response: Three existing resources (Programmers), with UCIS experience, will be available about 75% of their time to assist in the data conversion activities.

No amendment necessary.

47. **Question:** RFP page 22, Section 5, Evaluation Criteria and Contractor Selection - describes the criteria to be used by the State in evaluating vendor proposals. Please clarify if/how the State intends to factor in the "estimated" cost items (conversion, integration, and travel) when computing the lowest cost proposal, as the ability to estimate costs in certain areas creates opportunities for extreme variances in pricing.

Response: The estimated cost items will not be used in computing the lowest cost proposal. The estimated cost items will be used to assist the State in determining the project budget they should seek.

No amendment necessary.

48. **Question:** The RFP does not specify the number of anticipated internal and external users for the new system, although estimated user numbers were provided in the State's previous RFI. Please define the number of anticipated internal and external users for the new system, or indicate if the user counts provided in the RFI are still correct.

Response: UCIS has about 400 users defined with about 250-300 of them concurrent users. The public data warehouse has an additional 450 users accessing the information with about 4500 hits per month. However, we anticipate additional users on the new system due to the increased functionality we are expecting. Roughly 80% of the county and municipal courts have 1-2 users each. The largest 4 courts (Cass, Burleigh, Grand Forks, Ward) have more than 25 users each. The remaining courts have 5-15 users each. For more information, review the 2007 Annual Report at: <http://www.ndcourts.com/court/news/ndcourts2007a.pdf>.

No amendment necessary.

49. **Question:** Please indicate the role the State expects vendors to play and the role the State expects to play in the initial (pilot) implementation of the new system, i.e., who does the State expect to be responsible for system configuration, end-user training and implementation/go-live support during the initial (pilot) implementation? Also, please indicate the number and type of State resources available to support initial (pilot) implementation activities.

Response: If a pilot implementation is approved, the Statement of Work will be negotiated with the selected vendor. It is anticipated the vendor would be responsible to deliver most/all of the above tasks with some knowledge transfer to the State resources (perhaps 5-8 resources, mix of technical and subject matter experts).

No amendment necessary.

50. **Question:** Please indicate the role the State expects vendors to play and the role the State expects to play in the statewide rollout of the new system, i.e., who does the State expect to be responsible for statewide end-user training, conversion testing and execution, and implementation/go-live support during the statewide rollout? Also, please indicate the number and type of State resources available to support statewide rollout activities.

Response: Refer to Section 3.02 H. Project Approach and Professional Services Requirements. The State is expecting the vendors to provide recommendations for tasks and resources during implementation rollout. The State will provide a minimum of 8 resources (combination of technical and subject matter experts) during the initial count rollout with more resources available as more counties are migrated to the new system.

No amendment necessary.

51. **Question:** Can you please clarify the scope, in terms of courts, that will be required for installation?

Response: 53 district courts and 10 municipal courts.

No amendment necessary.

52. **Question:** Is the replacement of JCMS (Juvenile System) included in the scope of this project?

Response: No.

No amendment necessary.

53. **Question:** How many court users will be using the system? How many non-court users will be using the system?

Response: UCIS has about 400 users defined with about 250-300 of them concurrent users. The public data warehouse has an additional 450 users accessing the information with about 4500 hits per month. However, we anticipate additional users on the new system due to the increased functionality we are expecting. Roughly 80% of the county and municipal courts have 1-2 users each. The largest 4 courts (Cass, Burleigh, Grand Forks, Ward) have more than 25 users each. The remaining courts have 5-15 users each. For more information, review the 2007 Annual Report at: <http://www.ndcourts.com/court/news/ndcourts2007a.pdf>.

No amendment necessary.

54. **Question:** Are all court's using the same UCIS database?

Response: Yes.

No amendment necessary.

55. **Question:** How many users per court?

Response: Roughly 80% of the county and municipal courts have 1-2 users each. The largest 4 courts (Cass, Burleigh, Grand Forks, Ward) have more than 25 users each. The remaining courts have 5-15 users each.

No amendment necessary.

56. **Question:** How many users will be updating and manipulating data within the system? (This does not include view only users).

Response: UCIS has about 400 users defined with about 250-300 of them concurrent users.

No amendment necessary.

57. **Question:** Currently on 10 municipal courts currently use the courts case management system. What is the plan to bring the other 68 up on the case management system? Is it part of this implementation or is only the current 10 going to use the new application as well?

Response: Only the current 10 municipal courts currently using UCIS are part of the project scope.

No amendment necessary.

58. **Question:** Does the state prefer train the trainer approach where the vendor trains a team of trainers and they will then train end users at each court or does the state prefer for the vendor to perform all training to all users?

Response: The States prefers a train the trainer approach but will consider any approach to training that vendors may propose.

No amendment necessary.

59. **Question:** In order to provide a cost proposal for conversion, will you please provide data as to file layouts such as the # of tables and their file format?

Response: All courts share a centralized UCIS database. Please refer to the Conversion Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

60. **Question:** Are there any requirements to interface with current software or systems?

Response: There will be limited interface requirements to UCIS during the new system rollout.

No amendment necessary.

61. **Question:** Do you intend the thin clients to have the ability to scan documents into the case management system?

- If yes, are you willing to upgrade these thin clients to utilize a terminal with WinXPe or a standard workstation?
- If you are unwilling (or unable) to upgrade the thin clients to this level, would a central scan station at each location be sufficient to add scanned documents to the case management system? In this scenario, the users would be able to manipulate case data from the thin client, then to add filings or other scanned documents to be included in the case, the end user would go to a designated scan station (Workstation with a scanner attached).
- Given a choice, which operating system/server platform does the IT staff prefer the solution to be installed on?

Response: The State does not intend to use thin client to scan documents into the CMS. We anticipate dedicated scan station(s) in each location. Although the State is currently familiar with Windows and OS/400 operating systems for server platforms, it will consider any operating system/server platform proposed.

No amendment necessary.

62. **Question:** Given the different interfaces and entities the CMS need to communicate and share data with, is there a preferred Data Sharing Data Model(s) that the approach to defining data mapping rules should utilize?

Response: The State currently uses different data sharing techniques and has no preferred Data Sharing Data Model.

No amendment necessary.

63. **Question:** Please confirm that multiple disparate data sources both internal and external to State of North Dakota Unified Judicial Branch will need to be queried. If yes, will there be a need for federated queries?

Response: No federated queries across multiple disparate data sources will be needed.

No amendment necessary.

64. **Question:** Are the query mechanisms expected to be real time or near real time?

Response: Most queries are expected to be real time.

No amendment necessary.

65. **Question:** The RFP did not specifically state what level of interaction (security or privacy) would be permitted by the data extraction process. Would a Web based Server query to the data source(s) be permitted?

Response: A Web based Server query to the data source(s) may be considered if adequate security is provided.

No amendment necessary.

66. **Question:** 2.01 - Does state intend to implement new CMS in all 78 muni-courts or only the current 10 active courts?

Response: Only the current 10 municipal courts currently using UCIS are part of the project scope.

No amendment necessary.

67. **Question:** 2.01 - May we obtain copies of the following reports referenced in the RFP: 1) 1997-1999 Information Technology Plan, 2) 1999 Justice Served Study Report, and 3) 2006 NCSC Study Report?

Response: The 1997-1999 Information Technology Plan is not available. However the other documents are located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

68. **Question:** 2.02 - Data Warehouse: What is the state's expectation of the establishment of the interface with the new CMS solution? Is it to perform all existing two-way exchanges or transfers of information? If so, please provide more information regarding the nature of the exchanges or transfers? More specifically, the nature of the business processes and workflows associated with both sides of the interfaces or exchanges.

Response: The State currently has two data warehouse applications. We have a private warehouse and a public warehouse. UCIS is hosted on an AS/400. Our private warehouse is hosted on a Windows server and our public warehouse is hosted on a separate Windows server.

Data is replicated from our CMS to the data warehouses via a third party application called DataMirror, an IBM product. DataMirror replicates table data in real-time from our AS/400 to two separate Windows servers running SQL Server. Virtually all of the table data from the CMS is transferred to our private warehouse. For the public warehouse, all restricted data is filtered out by DataMirror and only public data is transferred.

The private warehouse is in place to provide limited (secure) access to non-public data for non-court users (i.e., Sheriff, States Attorney, other State government workers). Our private data warehouse has varying levels of security based on user id to protect restricted case information. The private warehouse can only be accessed by users within the state firewall who have made requests to the Courts for access to the system. The warehouse is provided for information only. Changes to data cannot be executed via the warehouse. If the vendor provides a read-only access solution that provides multiple security levels within their CMS package then we do not need a separate private data warehouse application.

The public warehouse is a public facing website that allows anyone with internet access to look up public court data such as citations, judgments, court calendars and civil/criminal filings. We are also open to vendor solutions for a public facing warehouse, but this is not a requirement.

No amendment necessary.

69. **Question:** 2.02 - Please explain how security is currently enabled on the courts e-mail network, particularly with respect to highly confidential communications by and between judges? Does state intend to imbed e-mails as objects as part of electronic case records?

Response: The State has no additional security on its Exchange Server beyond the base offered by Microsoft. We will consider imbedding emails as objects as part of the electronic case record if security issues can be addressed.

No amendment necessary.

70. **Question:** 2.02 - Will vendor be expected to support multiple desktop environments as part of the deployed solution?

Response: Yes.

No amendment necessary.

71. **Question:** 3.01 - Has the state defined the baseline productivity improvement elements and associated measures as generally referenced in this paragraph? These are the workflow and other productivity elements and measures that we understand our CMS solution will be expected to improve. May we have access to information about these productivity elements and measurements so that we can assess and respond to them in our proposal?

Response: We have identified the following productivity improvement measurements:

- Reduced training time for new employees
- Greater accuracy and consistency in data entry
- Fewer employee calls to the Help Desk
- Enhanced ability to locate cases with limited search criteria
- Greater reliability in matching cases to litigants
- Expanded flexibility in viewing and modifying scheduled events
- Ability to track changes by user
- Ability to assign security at a granular level
- Expanded ability to assign user rights to non-court employees
- Ability to track changes by user
- Introduction of double-entry accounting feature
- Ability to generate multiple documents from a single template
- Ability to store electronically-generated documents within the electronic record
- Ability to generate ad hoc reports at the district level
- Ability to generate custom reports to gather and analyze statewide data
- Ability to tie documents in various medium to the electronic record
- Reduction of redundant data capturing or data storage systems
- Retention of current interfaces between the courts and other agencies
- Ability to add future data exchanges with non-court agencies
- Ability to capture electronic data from non-court agencies
- Greater ease in use of search features
- Easier access to and review of case records

No amendment necessary.

72. **Question:** 3.01 - The state refers to “interface and integration” in this text. Workflow management is generally one significant aspect of integration. Can the state provide further detail regarding expectations of the robustness and controls to be provided in conjunction with the workflow management?

Response: The State has no additional expectations regarding workflow management beyond what is describe in the Response to Question 71 above.

No amendment necessary.

Attachment 2 – Contract Form Questions

73. **Question:** Limitation of liability - Please clarify what the limitation of liability is on the vendor. Can we assume that the liability is limited to the total value of the contract?

Response: Based on the approval of the Attorney General and the OMB Director, a reasonable aggregate liability cap may be negotiated.

No amendment necessary.

74. **Question:** Section 30 Work Product (IP Rights) of the service contract - Per section of the service contract, can we assume that if the vendor provides a COTS solution that a non-exclusive, perpetual, cost-free license, and patent and copyright indemnity to the state is sufficient and that the vendor would retain rights to the software including any configuration/extensions/integrations to address the state's business requirements?

Response: That would be acceptable. The Contract language will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

75. **Question:** Indemnity - Please clarify whether this clause can be negotiated.

Response: Because the indemnification provision only requires the State to be indemnified for the State's vicarious liability, it cannot be negotiated.

No amendment necessary.

76. **Question:** Section 29, Payments of the service contract – Can we assume that this section can be negotiated per the state's comment in Section 23 of the services contract?

Response: Yes, that is correct. The Contract language will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

77. **Question:** Section 32 - Product conformity (of the service contract) for 12 months. – Can we assume that this is an as accepted, as implemented warranty?

Response: That would be acceptable. The Contract language will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

78. **Question:** Inclusion of the RFP, proposal. - We request that the services contract be limited to the services contract, the statement of work and attachment 4---business requirements, with the services contract taking precedence, so that the services contract is limited to what the vendor's contractual obligations are vs. items related to the proposal.

Response: Refer to RFP Section 4.05 Additional Terms and Conditions and Section 4.06 Supplemental Terms and Conditions. The State's procurements laws and rules allow some negotiation during the proposal process. However, proposed supplemental terms and conditions cannot be agreed to by the State if they conflict with state laws and agency rules.

No amendment necessary.

79. **Question:** RFP Attach A - Do you want the vendor to list and estimate all of the proposed deliverables for the project or will this be negotiated later?

Response: The list of deliverables is not needed in the vendor responses. The Contract language will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

80. **Question:** Paragraph 24, C & D - These paragraphs imply that state expects the successful vendor to provide weekly or other TIME REPORTS for all personnel working on the engagement. Time reporting by a contractor is not standard practice with regards to a "fixed price" contract. Please clarify the state's expectation on this point.

Response: The Contract language will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

81. **Question:** Paragraph 26 - Since the duration of this contract [due to need to acquire funding over years] is not known at this time, we would ask for state's consideration of a change in terminology here --- from "For the life of this contract" to "During the period of the warranty".

Response: That would be acceptable. The Contract language will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

82. **Question:** Paragraph 28, A.3 - Would state consider changing statement from "technical specifications/system design" to a more specific reference to "system design document"? These terms refer to entirely different documents with different purposes that are not completely common in their context, and can based on our experience become confusing over the life of the engagement,

Response: That would be acceptable. The Contract language will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

83. **Question:** Paragraph 24, K, L, & M - With respect to vendor personnel, we understand that these requirements are associated with our personnel to be assigned to work on-site during the period of the contract? It would not include personnel who may be involved in the work performed at our corporate headquarters site and development group. Please confirm or clarify.

Response: Yes, that is correct. The Contract language will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

84. **Question:** Paragraph 24, K, L, & M - It is our practice to identify "key" personnel to be involved with the execution of our contract and directly involved in the execution of our responsibilities on-site. These are the individuals that we understand state would be most concerned with as regards approval of replacements. Please confirm or clarify.

Response: That would be acceptable. The Contract language will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

85. **Question:** Paragraph 24, K, L, & M - It has been the practice of previous customers to conduct all background checks of our personnel (including criminal history, financials, DL, references, etc.) as they see fit, and for us to provide all required written and signed authorizations. The text

in this paragraph seems to deviate from that practice. We can of course provide all information regarding our pre-employment verification of immigration status of our employees in conformance with current federal regulations. Please clarify.

Response: That would be acceptable. The Contract language will be negotiated with the selected vendor.

No amendment necessary.

Attachment 3 – Cost Proposal Questions

86. **Question:** Cost Proposal - The earlier RFI issued by the Court focused on a ten year total cost of ownership, is the Court open to a financing solution that would provide implementation and support for a full ten year period?

Response: As long as you submitted the costs requested in the Cost Proposal, vendors may also submit a financing solution that would provide implementation and support for a ten year period.

No amendment necessary.

87. **Question:** Attachment 3, Cost Proposal - includes a line item for third-party products. Does the State expect vendors to include database management system software (such as SQL Server, Oracle, etc.) within this line item, or will the State determine the cost of and procure such software separately based upon the final hardware configuration?

Response: The intent of the State is to procure such software separately. However, vendors must identify all prerequisite hardware and software as described in Section 3.02 E, Hardware Configuration.

No amendment necessary.

88. **Question:** It is not possible to provide valid cost estimate for interface development and data conversion based on the information provided in the RFP. Can the state provide, at a minimum, the following to facilitate our preparation of cost estimates for our proposal?
- Sample data format for Person, Case, General Ledger, Receipts, Journal Voucher and Events.
 - Current Sample data exchange schema for the interfaces (whichever applicable) mentioned in requirements 707 and 708

Response: Please refer to the Interface Documentation and Conversion Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

Attachment 4 – Requirements List Questions

89. **Question:** 329 - What is meant by the requirement “system provides for forward migration of all court documents”?

Response: The documents must be associated with a defined workflow process.

No amendment necessary.

90. **Question:** 24 - Please provide further information on the desire to be able to designate a case as the master file for juvenile cases with an option for other case types.

Response: This refers to the ability to link all related files to the oldest case file as the master file.

No amendment necessary.

91. **Question:** 26 - Are you referring to the receipt of citations or complaint information electronically to reduce data entry redundancy?

Response: This refers to the ability to enter as much data possible on a single screen.

No amendment necessary.

92. **Question:** 30 - Can you please provide an example or instance where a citation or complaint would be entered where no offense exist?

Response: Example, an Officer files a citation with an invalid statute.

No amendment necessary.

93. **Question:** 39 - Is there currently an offender based tracking system in place?

Response: No.

No amendment necessary.

94. **Question:** 102 - Can you provide further clarification on the need to track any modification to a sentence, to distinguish between the imposition of additional sanctions and the execution of a sentence due to a revocation of a stay?

Response: We need the ability to retain the sentence conditions of the original order.

No amendment necessary.

95. **Question:** 115 - Please provide an explanation of your requirements for the programming staff to have the ability to modify docket currency times for various case types.

Response: Docket currency is the time to disposition standard. We need the ability to modify docket currency times by case types and would like to modify them rather than calling the vendor for assistance.

No amendment necessary.

96. **Question:** 131 - Please provide further explanation of the functionality that would support a person identifier based on positive identification of the participant.

Response: If a participant has been identified as someone based on the SSN they provided, and later a positive identification is made that indicates the participant is someone else, the State needs the ability to locate that person/case in the system by either person identifiers.

No amendment necessary.

97. **Question:** 143 - Can you provide a further explanation of the ability to support multiple consecutive roles for participants as roles may change over time?

Response: For example, a participant could have a role of a “proposed guardian” in the beginning and later assume the role of “guardian”.

No amendment necessary.

98. **Question:** 162 - Please describe the indicators currently used to identify the judicial officer’s role when a court occurrence was presided over by a judicial officer performing both functions.

Response: No indicators are currently being used.

No amendment necessary.

99. **Question:** 197 - What is the preferred method for identifying a case or multiple cases ready for scheduling?

Response: The State has no preferred method.

No amendment necessary.

100. **Question:** 210 - Can you describe the settings necessary to track for granting continuances and managing case? How do recommend tracking future settings?

Response: Settings include requestor, request, who granted reason, and count number of continuances per case.

No amendment necessary.

101. **Question:** 326 - Is the algorithm developed by North Dakota or does it use some other standard?

Response: We have no algorithm and are expecting the vendor to provide recommendations.

No amendment necessary.

102. **Question:** 559-560 - Are you seeking to have the credit feature integrated into the CMS application? How do you currently handle credit card processing?

Response: Yes, we desire the credit card feature integrated into the CMS, but will consider anything proposed. UCIS processes credit card transactions by batching up requests and sending them to a credit card processing application developed, supported, and hosted by ITD.

No amendment necessary.

103. **Question:** 584-588 - Are seeking a CMS application with a fully integrated financial accounting system? Would this financial accounting system be used for areas other than the Courts?

Response: Yes, we desire a fully integrated financial accounting system, but will consider anything proposed. It would not be used outside the Courts.

No amendment necessary.

104. **Question:** 688 - Please provide further details of the desire to recode variables in new categories and store those categories?

Response: For example, a variable today may be “Court Location” and we code it as Bismarck, Fargo, Grand Forks, etc. (City). In the future, we may wish to change that variable to “Court City”. We would need the ability to find the court location information by both variables.

No amendment necessary.

105. **Question:** 690 - Can you please provide a further description of ITV? This is an acronym we are not currently familiar with.

Response: Interactive Television.

No amendment necessary.

106. **Question:** 780 - Please provide a list of the toolsets you currently use or plan to use for the purposes of benchmark testing.

Response: We are using no tools today and will consider anything the vendors may recommend.

No amendment necessary.

107. **Question:** Attachment 4, Requirements - instructs vendors to respond to functional requirements that are not presently available but will be available within the next 18 months as customizations. Since there should typically not be costs associated with functionality planned for a future release, grouping such requirements with customizations seems potentially misleading. Is the State open to amending the requirements response matrix to include a "Future" response code for those items that will available within the next 18 months? If not, how does the State prefer that such items be indicated in order to assist the evaluation process?

Response: If the proposed solution has functionality that is not currently available in the base product but will be available within the next 18 months AND will become part of the base product, select "Customization" AND indicate the zero cost in the "Comment" field.

No amendment necessary.

108. **Question:** 82 - does the term "processing" refer to assessing surcharges and fees, or does it refer to distributing payment across those surcharges and fees?

Response: This refers to assessing surcharges and fees.

No amendment necessary.

109. **Question:** 86 - with regard to allocating bond to the appropriate bond organization based upon rules, does this refer to a posted bond that is being refunded to fees, a posted bond that is ordered forfeited to the government, or does it describe some other circumstance?

Response: Yes, all of the above. The "other circumstance" is when it is transferred to another case.

No amendment necessary.

110. **Question:** 121 (and 145) - ability to add, query, and report on all participation by persons in cases. What constitutes "participation"?

Response: Based on the role of the party.

No amendment necessary.

111. **Question:** 131 - does the method or act of "positive identification" affect the value of the person identifier?

Response: No.

No amendment necessary.

112. **Question:** 208 - what types of business rules are desired regarding continuances?

Response: The State desires the ability to set our own business rules to be defined later.

No amendment necessary.

113. **Question:** 216 - how does this item differ from item 202?

Response: Item 202 includes the ability to schedule related cases in addition to consolidated cases.

No amendment necessary.

114. **Question:** 342 - what action is taken to “authenticate” judicial officer actions? What is the desired result?

Response: The State requires the system to have a method of authenticating the users, including judicial officers, and allow them to only perform tasks and actions based on their role.

No amendment necessary.

115. **Question:** Accounting and Fiscal – describes a variety of accounting requirements. Please indicate if those requirements marked as “Current” are available directly within UCIS or if these requirements (or some subset thereof) are satisfied through integration with a third-party financial application.

Response: All accounting and fiscal requirements currently being met are contained within UCIS.

No amendment necessary.

116. **Question:** 557 – indicates the State currently possesses the ability to accept credit card payments via the Internet, IVR, and kiosk. Please define the State’s current credit card processing merchant and IVR vendor, and indicate if the State plans to continue using these vendors with the new system.

Response: We desire the credit card feature integrated into the CMS, but will consider anything proposed. UCIS processes credit card transactions by batching up requests and sending them to a credit card processing application developed, supported, and hosted by ITD. We do not accept credit card payments via the Internet, IVR or kiosk.

No amendment necessary.

117. **Question:** 627-631 – these requirements describe a variety of desired collection agency integration requirements. Please indicate if the State currently utilized a collection agency (or agencies) to collect outstanding court debt, even if direct integration of collection activities does not exist within UCIS.

Response: No direct integration of collection activities exists within UCIS today. We notify the Tax Department in regards to any collection issues and the record the information into their Tax Intercept program (withholds tax refunds). The State desires to improve the process and have it automated.

No amendment necessary.

118. **Question:** 690 - what is ITV?

Response: Interactive Television.

No amendment necessary.

119. **Question:** 701 - is the requirement referring to keeping a history of consolidations and changes of venue?

Response: Yes.

No amendment necessary.

120. **Question:** 742 - what parts of the case specifically need to be sealed?

Response: Any part or the entire file.

No amendment necessary.

121. **Question:** 773 - indicates the new system must be compatible with Altiris patch management software. Please explain how the State currently utilizes the Altiris patch management software with UCIS and indicate how the State envisions using the Altiris patch management software with the new system.

Response: Altiris is used to apply operating system patches and updates. We do not want the new solution to conflict with the ability for us to continue using Altiris for that purpose.

No amendment necessary.

122. **Question:** 774 - indicates the new system must be compatible with Altiris helpdesk management software. Please explain how the State currently utilizes the Altiris helpdesk management software with UCIS and indicate how the State envisions using the Altiris helpdesk management software with the new system.

Response: is used to apply operating system patches and updates. We do not want the new solution to conflict with the ability for us to continue using Altiris for that purpose.

No amendment necessary.

123. **Question:** 2 - specifies the need to initiate multiple cases and or counts from one complaint. Is this a manual process or electronic? Also please elaborate on the functionality required for this process.

Response: This is currently a manual process, requiring the clerk to reproduce the complaint and create separate file numbers and file jackets for each count.

No amendment necessary.

124. **Question:** 9 - specifies the desire to create a case from a document created by the court. Please explain the functionality necessary to meet this requirement.

Response: For example, the ability to create a case from a court generated petition.

No amendment necessary.

125. **Question:** 61 - refers to generating late fees and notices automatically. Please explain how this process works in your current system, including how the record is updated and how notices are printed.

Response: In UCIS, the clerk runs a program to generate a notice on demand.

No amendment necessary.

126. **Question:** 75 - refers to capturing data from the barcode on a driver's license. Please explain the workflow process where this technology is desired to be embedded.

Response: Case Initiation and Case Payment.

No amendment necessary.

127. **Question:** 77 - refers to notifying the appropriate agency when a warrant is recalled. What type of notification is required and by what means should it be "sent" to the appropriate agency?

Response: Any type of notification and means will be considered.

No amendment necessary.

128. **Question:** 80 - refers to automatically defaulting fine payments based on statute. Does this functionality refer to assessing a total fine amount or setting out a fine payment schedule?

Response: Assessing a total fine amount.

No amendment necessary.

129. **Question:** 81 - refers to adding surcharges. Are the surcharges added at the time all fees are assessed or a late date? When calculating percentages, how are the percentages determined?

Response: Surcharges may be added at the time all fees are assessed or a later date. Percentages are predetermined.

No amendment necessary.

130. **Question:** 86 - indicates the need to allocate payments to the appropriate bond agency. Please explain the requirements of this process.

Response: See Question/Response 109 above.

No amendment necessary.

131. **Question:** 106 - requires the ability to calculate balances in "time". Please explain how this current functionality is accomplished.

Response: We have the ability to calculate balances for jail time or community service time in lieu of money.

No amendment necessary.

132. **Question:** 113 - refers to the ability to "require" a pending activity in a case. Please explain how this desired functionality should work.

Response: All cases must have future pending activity, hearing date, review date, or archive date.

No amendment necessary.

133. **Question:** 115 - refers to the ability to modify the currency time frames. Please elaborate on the functionality necessary to meet this requirement.

Response: Docket currency is the time to disposition standard. We need the ability to modify docket currency times by case types and would like to modify them rather than calling the vendor for assistance.

No amendment necessary.

134. **Question:** 127 - refers to integrating participant information that is electronically generated from other systems. Please list the "other systems" that data will be received from and describe the interface that currently exists or how the desired interface should operate.

Response: Please refer to the Interface Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

135. **Question:** 183 and 197 - indicates the desire to identify cases that are ready for scheduling. What factors must be present to consider a case ready for scheduling?

Response: The clerk would make the determination and initiate the workflow.

No amendment necessary.

136. **Question:** 198 and 199 - refer to scheduling rules. Please indicate what these rules are and how they affect case scheduling.

Response: For example, some courts require child support contempt cases to be heard within seven days.

No amendment necessary.

137. **Question:** 208 - Please define the business rules for continuances.

Response: The State desires the ability to set our own business rules to be defined later.

No amendment necessary.

138. **Question:** 247 - requires conversion of currently used documents. Please specify what format these documents are currently in.

Response: Documents are stored on the AS/400 and were generated using a product called DTM. The State feels 90% of those documents can easily be converted to MS Word.

No amendment necessary.

139. **Question:** 252 - requires the functionality to prevent accepting duplicate documents. How are the documents being received and what method should be used to determine if it is a duplicate document?

Response: The State will consider any method proposed by the vendors, such as match of fields, word content, date and time stamp, etc.

No amendment necessary.

140. **Question:** 269 - Please explain this required functionality in more detail.

Response: For example, a criminal complaint and the individual counts that are included in the complaint or a motion and the attached affidavit and statement of fact.

No amendment necessary.

141. **Question:** In many of the reporting requirements, the terminology “on-line” is used. Please elaborate on the functionality required when using this terminology.

Response: This refers to interactively, on-demand, using live data as apposed to running a batch report overnight.

No amendment necessary.

142. **Question:** 482 - requires the complete functionality for entering and retrieving money judgments. Please elaborate on the functionality necessary to meet this requirement.

Response: Ability to record a money judgment as entered (i.e. the date the judgment was ordered);
Ability to record a money judgment as to the date and time of it was docketed (i.e. the creditor moved to have the judgment recorded as owed);
Ability to transcribe a judgment to another district court while retaining the original judgment in the originating county (currently done electronically through UCIS);
Ability to enter multiple, separate judgments per party;
Ability to calculate and add interest at a variable rate;
Ability to add costs and fees to the judgment without affecting the original principle;
Ability to record partial and full satisfactions of judgments;
Ability to capture new docketing information in daily report format;
Ability to record the issuance and return of writs;
Ability to issue writs to more than one entity (i.e. simultaneously as opposed to consecutively);
Ability to record renewal of judgment without losing original judgment information;
Ability to capture new creditor information due to transfer or sale of judgment to collection agency or other party without losing original creditor information;
Ability to flag expiration date of judgment to alert clerk to take action;
Ability to record expiration of judgment when money is still owed;
Ability to extend expiration date of judgment due to renewal;
Ability to record expiration of judgment when money is still owed;
Ability to record discharge of judgment due to bankruptcy;

No amendment necessary.

143. **Question:** 486 - Please explain the process involved to renew a money judgment by bringing forward the judgment.

Response: In North Dakota, an original judgment has a life of 10 years from the date of first docketing (NOTE: this is the docketing date, not the date of entry which is a much more common practice). To renew a judgment, the creditor files an Affidavit which has the effect of extending the life of the judgment for an additional 10 years. The new CMS must allow the court to record the renewal and extend the expiration of the judgment without losing the information related to the original judgment.

No amendment necessary.

144. **Question:** 493 - Please explain what is being referred to in the statement “by electronic means”.

Response: This refers to the ability for the system to process.

No amendment necessary.

145. **Question:** 507 - What data is necessary to populate a Juvenile Transport Order as specified?

Response: Case number, name, date of birth, address, hearing date, and location.

No amendment necessary.

146. **Question:** 688 - Please give several examples of what type of new categories are being referred to.

Response: For example, a variable today may be “Court Location” and we code it as Bismarck, Fargo, Grand Forks, etc. (City). In the future, we may wish to change that variable to “Court City”. We would need the ability to find the court location information by both variables.

No amendment necessary.

147. **Question:** 690 - What does ITV stand for? Please elaborate on the functionality necessary to meet this requirement.

Response: Interactive Television. We wish to be able to schedule resources such as ITV as an additional alternative to scheduling by judge or courtroom, as well as capturing when a party makes an appearance via ITV in lieu of being physically present in the courtroom.

No amendment necessary.

148. **Question:** 697 - What type of attorney information needs to be counted by case as specified?

Response: Continuance by case type, number of pending cases, cases assigned to an attorney.

No amendment necessary.

149. **Question:** 698 - Please define what “source data” is being referred to.

Response: This refers to the ability to drill down into the database tables.

No amendment necessary.

150. **Question:** 699 - refers to linking data with other justice systems. Please specify what data needs to be linked, what agencies the system should integrate with and whether or not this is a one way or bi-directional data exchange.

Response: Please refer to the Interface Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

151. **Question:** 702-708 - seem to reference the same interfaces that are explained earlier in the main RFP document. Would it be possible for us to address the topic of system interfaces one time, as opposed to both the main proposal and the functional requirements?

Response: Yes.

No amendment necessary.

152. **Question:** Is the e-filing solution intended as single vendor or multi-vendor (ie multiple E-Filing Service Providers filing into an E-Filing Manager)?

Response: A single vendor or service provider.

No amendment necessary.

153. **Question:** Is the e-filing solution intended to be transaction fee-based (ie user charge per submission) or licensed fee-based (ie paid for by the ND SCAO)?

Response: Licensed fee-based, paid for by the State.

No amendment necessary.

154. **Question:** What is the current filing volume by county/jurisdiction?

Response: The information is available in the 2007 Annual Report at:
<http://www.ndcourts.com/court/news/ndcourts2007a.pdf>.

No amendment necessary.

155. **Question:** Will e-filing be mandatory in any or all case types and/or jurisdictions?

Response: Initially, e-filing will not be mandatory. However, it is the intention of the State to encourage users to use e-filing and, eventually, require filings to occur electronically based on case type (likely Civil cases first).

No amendment necessary.

156. **Question:** Can you please describe these processes further, or provide a copy of the relating document? Items: 9, 10, 22, 24, 30, 31, 39, 46, 55, 76, 83, 86, 87, 101, 104, 108, 113, 133, 134, 154, 155, 162, 163, 165, 168, 170, 180, 191, 208, 214, 221, 247, 269, 270, 275, 279, 282, 298, 397, 402, 421, 434, 455, 458, 459, 469, 477, 478, 484, 486, 493, 494, 522, 523, 525, 528, 533, 548, 552, 611, 651, 667, 682, 687, 688, 693, 714, 723, 728, 738, 740, 745, 748, 773, 774, 775, 781, 782, 804.

Response: Absent specific questions related to the requirement, we are unable to provide additional information. Vendors are encouraged to provide any information that would allow the State to determine the capabilities of what they are proposing.

No amendment necessary.

157. **Question:** Item 55 – Please give example.

Response: More than one statute per count may be necessary to reflect a lesser-included charge or a penalty or enhancement statute which attaches to the original charge. We also need the ability to capture an amended or reduced charge without losing the original charge information.

No amendment necessary.

158. **Question:** 247 – What format are your documents stored now?

Response: Documents are stored on the AS/400 and were generated using a product called DTM. The State feels 90% of those documents can easily be converted to MS Word.

No amendment necessary.

159. **Question:** 402 – More information is needed to determine cost of modification.

Response: Refer to Item 405 in Attachment 4 for additional information.

No amendment necessary.

160. **Question:** 484 – Please provide format for cost.

Response: CSV format would be one acceptable format.

No amendment necessary.

161. **Question:** 29 - Does state envision the telecommuting option possible via Citrix or via an internet based interface?

Response: Likely the internet based interface only.

No amendment necessary.

162. **Question:** 75 - Is this functionality specific to North Dakota License format or nation-wide?

Response: The State is unsure. However, it is likely a nation-wide format.

No amendment necessary.

163. **Question:** 107 - What does term “docket currency standards” mean?

Response: Time to disposition standard.

No amendment necessary.

164. **Question:** 346 - Please provide the court’s policy on filing when the court’s accepting system is down?

Response: All documents received electronically are considered received prior to 11:59 p.m. CST are considered filed the date of receipt. In event of an electronic transmission failure at the court side, the document is considered filed as of the date and time of transmission.

No amendment necessary.

165. **Question:** 652 - Please provide more information about the ND Land department interface?

Response: The ND Land Department is the state entity responsible for handling unclaimed property. All outstanding checks or unclaimed funds more than 2 years old are paid over to the ND Land Department. There are actually two issues related to this. First, our current financial package doesn't recognize multiple payments to the same vendor, so the clerks need to issue a separate check for each case (rather than one check for multiple cases). Second, the process of finding unclaimed funds that are more than 2 years old is a manual process. We'd like to see the system flag these cases. Finally, we'd like to interface with the ND Land Department to automatically transmit the funds and the required reports which include name, address, case number, date funds were deposited with the clerk, and purpose of the funds. Any interface would

also need to include the payee's name and address, as well as parcel number if the case involved eminent domain issues.

No amendment necessary.

166. **Question:** 688 - Please provide more information about the "variables"?

Response: For example, a variable today may be "Court Location" and we code it as Bismarck, Fargo, Grand Forks, etc. (City). In the future, we may wish to change that variable to "Court City". We would need the ability to find the court location information by both variables.

No amendment necessary.

167. **Question:** 707 - Please provide more detailed interface specifications to support development of pricing estimates?

Response: Please refer to the Interface Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

168. **Question:** 708 - Please provide more detailed interface specifications to support development of pricing estimates?

Response: Please refer to the Interface Documentation located on the RFP Web site, <http://www.ndcourts.gov/rfp>.

No amendment necessary.

169. **Question:** Does the state expect CMS to be integrated with FileNet P8 environment or would an out-of-the-box EDMS solution with CMS be accepted?

Response: An out-of-the-box EDMS solution with CMS is acceptable.

No amendment necessary.

Vendors are instructed to acknowledge receipt of and compliance with this amendment by signing below and returning this acknowledgement with your bid or proposal.

Any questions regarding this amendment must be submitted in writing to the undersigned Procurement Officer.

PROCUREMENT OFFICER: Sally Holewa

PHONE: (701) 328-4216

FAX: (701) 328-1041

TTY Users call: 7-1-1

E-MAIL: sholewa@ndcourts.gov

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) AMENDMENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

RFP NUMBER AND TITLE: 180-08-01, Case Management System Replacement

AMENDMENT NUMBER: 1

By my signature below, I hereby acknowledge receipt of and compliance with this amendment to the above referenced RFP.

NAME OF BIDDER OR VENDOR

MAILING ADDRESS

PRINTED NAME

SIGNATURE

TITLE

DATE