WINNEBAGO COUNTY
— ILLINOIS —

July 22, 2024

ADDENDUM ONE

CIRCUIT CLERK CMS, ATTORNEY CMS, COURT SERVICES MANAGEMENT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #24P-2331

1. Please review the attached document providing all addendum clarifications. If you have additional questions, please reach out via purchasing@purchasing.wincoil.gov.
2. Per your request, see attached word document provided on the scope of work.
3. Reminder all RFP responses are due Friday, August 9, 2024 at 11:00 AM. Please ensure these proposal responses arrive on-time prior to 11:00 AM to be considered.
4. Please see attached Vendor Questions Attachment for all questions and answered submitted.
5. See below for revised insurance requirements:

INSURANCE	MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE LIMITS OF LIABILITY
1. Workers' Compensation	Statutory
2. Employers Liability	
A. Each Accident	$ 1,000,000
B. Each Employee-disease	$ 1,000,000
C. Policy Aggregate-disease	$ 1,000,000
3. Commercial Liability	
A. Per Occurrence	$ 1,000,000
B. General Aggregate	$ 1,000,000
1. General Aggregate - Per Project	$ 1,000,000
2. General Aggregate - Products/Completed	$ 1,000,000
4. Business Auto Liability	$ 1,000,000
5. General Umbrella Excess Liability	$ 5,000,000
6. Professional Errors and Omissions	$ 2,000,000
7. Environmental Impairment Liability	

END OF ADDENDUM ONE

WINNEBAGO COUNTY
— ILLINOIS —

County Administration Building	**Purchasing Department**
404 Elm Street	**Phone: 815-319-4380**
Rockford, Illinois 61101	**Fax: 815-319-4381**

July 22, 2024

ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS – REFERENCE ONE

CIRCUIT CLERK CMS, ATTORNEY CMS, COURT SERVICES MANAGEMENT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #24P-2331

Contents: Microsoft Word versions of Pricing, References, and Proposal Signature Form

PRICING:

Please copy this section for each of the proposed applications, and add any additional feature pricing or additional costs being proposed.

Application: [Choose one] Circuit Clerk CMS, Court Services CMS, Attorney CMS

	One-Time Cost	Annual Re-occurring Costs	Annual Increases
Core System			
Other Feature			
Other Feature			
Hosting Costs(*)			
Annual Support			
Professional Deployment Services			
Data Migration			
Other cost			

Subtotal:	**Deployment Cost**	**Year 1 Annual Cost**	
	$	$	

(*) Hosting costs must include Test and Production environments, full integration capabilities, production environment disaster recovery costs, production backups, and server maintenance and monitoring services.

Complete this section to summarize the entire proposal cost pricing for deployment costs, and the total of five (5) year of annual re-occurring costs.

Total:	**Deployment Cost**	**5 Years Sum of Annual Costs**
	$	$

Please list any other costs associated with fulfilling this project not listed above in your Proposal.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

END OF SECTION FIVE: RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS & EVALUATION CRITERIA

SECTION SIX: REFERENCES

List below a minimum of four (4) references, including governmental entities, to whom you have provided similar services. (All references will be contacted)

1.   Business: _____

     Address: _____

     City, State, Zip: _____

     Telephone and Email:_____

     Contact Person: _____

     Date and scope of Project: _____

     _____

2.   Business: _____

     Address: _____

     City, State, Zip: _____

     Telephone and Email:_____

     Contact Person: _____

     Date and scope of Project: _____

     _____

3.   Business: _____

       Address: _____

       City, State, Zip: _____

       Telephone and Email: _____

       Contact Person: _____

       Date and scope of Project: _____

       _____

4.   Business _____

       Address: _____

       City, State, Zip: _____

       Telephone and Email: _____

       Contact Person: _____

       Date and scope of Project: _____

       _____

END OF SECTION SIX: REFERENCES

SECTION SEVEN: PROPOSAL SIGNATURE FORM

Name of Proposer	
Contact Person	
Address	
City, State, ZIP	
Telephone	**FEIN No.**
Email(s)	

TO: Winnebago County Purchasing Department

The undersigned, being duly sworn, certifies they are an:

☐ OWNER/SOLE PROPRIETOR   ☐ MEMBER OF PARTNERSHIP   ☐ AN OFFICER OF CORPORATION   ☐ MEMBER OF JOINT VENTURE

Further, as the Proposer, declares that the only person or parties interested in this Proposal as principals are those named herein; that this Proposal is made without collusion with any other person, firm or corporation; that he/she has fully examined the proposed forms of agreement and the scope of services or work specifications for the above designated service, and all other documents referred to or mentioned in the solicitation documents, specifications and attached exhibits, including Addenda.

(Proposer must list below any and all Addenda or your offer will be rejected, as non-responsive)

No(s):_____and_____and _____issued thereto;

Further, the undersigned certifies and warrants that he/she is duly authorized to execute this certification/affidavit on behalf of the Proposer and in accordance with the Partnership Agreement or By-laws of the Corporation, and the laws of the State of Illinois and that this Certification is binding upon the Proposer and is true and accurate. The Affiant deposes and says that he/she has examined and carefully prepared this Proposal and has checked the same in detail before submitting this Proposal, and that the statements contained herein are true and correct.

Further, the Proposer certifies that he/she has provided equipment; supplies or services comparable to the items specified in this solicitation to the parties listed in the Business Reference Form and authorizes the County to verify references of business and credit at its option. Finally, the Proposer, if awarded a contract, agrees to do all other things required by the solicitation documents, and that he/she will take in full payment therefore the sums set forth in any resulting contract award.

SIGNATURE OF PROPOSER

SIGNATURE _____

Name and Title of Signer _____

Dated this _____ day of _____ 2024

AUTHORIZED PROPOSER NEGOTIATOR

Name and Title_____

Phone and Email_____

END OF SECTION SEVEN: PROPOSAL SIGNATURE FORM

ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS – REFERENCE ONE

CMS Vendor Conference Questions and Answers

7/19/2024

1	**Confirming method of submitting the RFP response?**	Paper version is required, TWO COPIES, along with a version on a USB drive. The Purchasing Department does not accept responses through email.
2	**Please confirm if the proposals have to be postmarked by August 9th, or received by August 9th?** **With the question responses anticipated from Winnebago on July 22nd and a hard copy response be delivered two weeks later, can you extend the deadline by one week to provide vendors the opportunity to incorporate your responses into their RFP response?**	The proposals must be received by **August 9th**, at the Winnebago County Purchasing Department, 404 Elm Street - Room 202 Rockford, IL 61101. Regarding the request to extend the August 9th deadline for responses to this RFP, Winnebago County cannot accommodate this request.
3	**Will we publish a list of participants?**	Yes, we will publish it on our website.
4	**Will we publish this list of questions and answers?**	Yes, we will publish this list of questions and answers on our website.
5	**Can the County clarify in which section of the proposal outline should be included? Can the County clarify if they would like the SOW divided between the required proposal sections or submitted as is? For example, page 53 of the RFP includes the Corporate Health, Background and Project Management section as part of the SOW, and states it should be completed in addition to Sections 4.2 and 5.1 of the proposal. Does the county want this section of the SOW inserted into those sections or submitted separately?**	The Corporate Health, Background and Project Management section should remain part of the SOW. If the section is in the SOW, please submit it as part of the SOW. If you are not responding to offer one of the CMS applications, you may indicate that and leave those questions unanswered.

6	**Cannot find the vendor registration form and the suspension and debarment certification form?** **The RFP references a Vendor Registration Form and a Suspension and Disbarment Certification Form. Failure to provide may result in Proposer not being fully responsive to the RFP. Where can we find these forms?**	Please disregard the reference to these forms. Our process has been revised. Vendor Registration now occurs upon awarding the proposal.
7	**Regarding the forms mentioned in the back of the RFP (e.g. the pricing template), can we get those in Word format?** **Can the County please provide the Pricing Form, References Form, and Proposal Signature Form in Word format?** **Can the County provide Section 4: Scope of Work in Word format?**	Yes. The County has published the Scope of Work in Word format with the RFP, but will redistribute it with the addendum.
8	**What will happen to competitive responses once they are submitted?**	Through our RFP process, we will analyze and compare the responses against our system needs. We have convened an evaluation committee that will participate in this process to conduct evaluations on all responses. Our project committee will also look to finalize the next steps with proposers regarding demos, customer interviews and questions and answers. If upon receiving these proposals additional questions arise, we will seek clarifications consistently among proposers.
9	**Does the county have a preferred contract vehicle?**	No, we do not at this time.
10	**Where does Section 8 – Proposal Signature Form go in the response?**	The Proposal Signature Form can be the last page of the response.
11	**Are there any special circumstances or state contracting requirements vendors should be aware of?**	Regarding integrations for Automated Disposition Reporting and the integration with the Statewide EFiling platform, certifications from those respective vendors will be required before production deployment.

12	**Is the county flexible on the performance bond requirement?** **The insurance requirements are quite significant. Will the County consider lowering these requirements to more reasonable levels?**	We will adjust the insurance requirements to align with Professional Services. See revised attachment for Addendum One.
13	**Would the county be amenable to striking the performance bond requirement?** **If no, would the County be agreeable to enter into a definitive statement of work with known deliverables and requirements within 30 days of award?** **NOTE: Due to surety coverage limitations, the County and vendors will be precluded from modifying statements of work or deliverables once a bond is set.** **Based on previous experience, the flexibility to collaborate with clients on their tailored needs and to address any requirements that are often uncovered during discovery meetings and implementation offer greater assurances.**	Yes, we will remove the performance bond. Please provide a sample definitive statement of work as part of the deliverables. We will finalize a statement of work as we enter the contract negotiations.
14	**Could you outline the key stakeholders/decision makers involved in this initiative, along with their roles, and responsibilities?** **Who will be reading/evaluating the Response to this RFP - what roles/responsibilities? What level of technical expertise / familiarity?** **Can you provide a list of the Titles for the individuals that will make up the Evaluation Committee for this RFP?**	The RFP stakeholders are identified in the Statement of Work, on page 15 of the PDF version of the document. Specific primary stakeholders are the Winnebago Clerk of the Circuit Court, the Chief Judge of the 17th Judicial Circuit, the Winnebago County State's Attorney, the Winnebago County Public Defender and the Director of the 17th Circuit Court Services. Other contributors include trial court administration, County IT professionals, the judiciary, etc.

15	**Is there a change management team or plan that the vendor needs to collaborate with?** **How will the project be governed and who will be responsible for decision-making throughout its lifecycle?**	The change management team consists of the head of each stakeholder department, as well as the Chief Judge of the 17th Judicial Circuit, and the project manager dedicated to the project. The vendor will collaborate with this team at a high level, and each individual set of subject matter experts for individual application design and configuration.
16	**Could you let us know the Minimum Mandatory Requirements (MMR) that are required to be considered in the initial phase versus later phases of development?**	Once the stakeholders have finished the evaluation process, at a minimum, we will invite the top three proposal scores to the demo phase.
17	**Have we seen any demos to date?**	Yes, we have seen a few. Winnebago County attended the CTC Conference in Phoenix, AZ. We saw several vendor demos at that conference and followed up with more demonstrations after the conference to explore feature sets, but we are not tied to any particular vendor.
18	**What other case and/or court management software is deployed in other municipalities across the state? Is there a preference to any other systems? Are there any must have capabilities from those systems that Winnebago County is looking for?**	Winnebago County does not have a comprehensive list of the vendors for the CMS applications deployed across the state of Illinois. Winnebago County does not have a preference for any of the applications.
19	**Can we share our budget?** **Could you share the range of the budget allocated for this project?** **What is the County's budget for this project and ongoing SaaS?**	No, not at this time. We have applied for federal and state grants to offset some of the budget demand on the county. All of the stakeholders will be making their own budget contributions to the project.

20	**Since we are still seeking funding approval, if partial funding is approved is there are priority of solutions that will be funded?**	We believe that we have secured funding to implement and integrate these three stakeholder CMS systems. The grants that we have applied for will be used to offset the costs to the county and/or individual departments. If we do have funding limitations above that, we will address features that we consider to be optional, such as the digital evidence management, etc.
21	**Were the grants that we applied for specific to one particular part of the project?**	At this time, the grant opportunities are not specific to a single stakeholder, but the use of the funds depends on the terms of the individual grants.
22	**Are ARPA funds available?**	Possibly, it is one of our options through the County.
23	**Any minority- or women-owned business requirements?**	Please provide any affiliations or certifications within your qualifications and references. There are no minority or business requirements, but specific business demographics will be handled during the vendor set-up phase upon awarding the contract for County information tracking.
24	**Can a combination of onshore and offshore development resources be used in the implementation of the solution and training?** **Would the County approve the use of offshore to build out/build upon current assets/accelerators that the vendor has met and/or exceeds RFP scope requirement(s) and hand that off prior build to an onshore team for refinement/continued development as well as use for ALL data testing?**	Yes, offshore resources may be used in the scope of this effort as long as data security measures are in place. However, the physical data centers for a hosted solution and the Winnebago County data must be located onshore. Please note the RFP states: "As part of their duties, Proposer personnel may come in contact with confidential information, and are required to hold confidential any such information. The Proposer must attest that team members have not been convicted of a felony offense and a background check has been performed. Proposer is responsible for background check." Please detail the offshore resources and their expected scope of work in Section I: Corporate Health, Background and Project Management.
25	**Is Winnebago County open to the vendor partnering with a 3rd party vendor to provide certain services within their own system to meet requirements?**	Yes, the County is open to subcontractors and 3rd party vendor cooperation. Please disclose third party dependencies and/or subcontractors when answering the requirements.

26	**What is our planned or anticipated project start date?** **When is the desired go-live date for each system?** **When is anticipated go-live?**	We don't have a fixed project start date, as the State's Attorney will be responsible for negotiating the final contract(s) but we will be available to start immediately. Realistically, starting work in December or January 2025 is likely.
27	**What strategies or plans does the County have in place for managing change and ensuring user adoption of the new system?**	We have widespread support for the deployment of these three stakeholder applications. The head of each stakeholder department is very invested in both the project and the deployment of all these applications, as well as the adjacent justice partner agencies who would appreciate better tools that an integrated justice environment can offer.
28	**What is our demo process going to look like?**	We are very flexible on how we structure the demos. We have tentatively reserved the month of September for vendor demos. You can be on-site or on Zoom, at your discretion. We will balance the availability of our stakeholders with the vendor personnel. We will accommodate everyone the best we can, even if we extend the demos into October.
29	**Is the idea that there would be one big demo or would it be broken up into demos for each stakeholder?**	Each county stakeholder would have their own dedicated demo period, i.e. the Circuit Clerk would like to see the Clerk CMS application. If there is availability, we could do back-to-back demos or all the demos on one day, etc. Again, we are flexible in our scheduling to accommodate your resources as well as ours.
30	**Are there any goals or problems that the county is trying to solve that would be helpful to the responder narratives?**	There are goals and strategic concerns for the integrated justice platform, as we are very interested in a high level of integration among the stakeholder applications. We're trying to eliminate keep shared spreadsheets or printing off paper to exchange with other departments, as well as reduce manual entry. There are sections in the Statement of Work, on page 17 of the PDF version of the RFP that describe our strategic goals.

31	**Winnebago would like to have an integrated solution and has said they will consider a best-of-breed integrated model with multiple vendors. If a set of vendor(s) may have multiple "best of breed" integrated solutions (with different sets of vendors integrated together), how would the county like to receive these bids? Either a) all vendors submit separately only for their "module" but discuss integration within their bid, or b) multiple "integrated" bids where the same vendor may appear more than once across multiple bids?**	Winnebago County expects that several vendors will be able to respond with multiple solutions, and the Statement of Work is divided so that vendors should respond to the generalized sections as well as the specialized sections that are relevant to the bid. For smaller feature-specific vendors, or third-party vendors that offer a more specialized product, the answer will depend on your relationships with the more generalized vendors. To use electronic citations as an example – note that electronic citations are not part of this RFP – if an electronic citations vendor can interface with multiple circuit clerk case management systems, the electronic citations vendor could bid independently and describe their integration capabilities with all the CMS applications. Alternatively, if the electronic citation vendor has a substantive existing relationship with a responding vendor, the responding vendor may incorporate the two sets of responses together. However, Winnebago County will not be cherry-picking products or features from one vendor's response to incorporate into another vendor's response in this RFP.
32	**The county has listed cloud/hosted as preferred. Outside of this preference, does the county have a preferred IT environment or a preferred cloud provider? Would the county consider any On-Premise solution? If a vendor can accommodate multiple models or multiple cloud hosting vendors, should the vendor include cloud hosting with multiple pricing and IT options?**	Winnebago County prefers a cloud/hosted solution, with no specific preference for any provider. Winnebago County desires to reduce the demands on our county IT Department. If a vendor can accommodate multiple cloud-hosting vendors, please provide your best solution, which ideally is the best value for our needs. If you believe that a hybrid on-premises solution and/or managed services is the best, or some part of your platform performs best on-premises, please propose this solution in Section A.
33	**Does the County have a preference for cloud-based solutions built on the Microsoft Power Platform, Salesforce Platform or Amazon Web Services Platform?**	Winnebago County has no preference for these cloud providers.
34	**Does the county have a preferred or defined integration solution?** **Does the county have a preferred middleware solution?**	No, we do not. Please propose your best recommendations in R4 if it is applicable to your response.

35	**On page 18 of the RFP, the vendors outline the role of eAppeal and Order of Protection capabilities from a vendor named Concysis. Is the County looking to integrate with these tools or to replace them as part of a new integrated solution?**	Winnebago County expects to integrate with those existing third party solutions for the deployment of these applications. Any changes to replace our existing third party relationships will be considered once all applications have completed deployment.
36	**What is the county using for virtual court today? Does this software need to be replaced and included in the RFP response or should we recommend software in the RFP?**	The County uses Zoom for virtual court, and assumes we will continue to use this software in the future. We would like to publish Zoom links in the public access and protected access portals for court participants to have access to the Zoom links, while taking steps to minimize Zoom bombing issues.
37	**Will the County consider a proposal for just the Circuit Court CMS?** **Will the County consider a proposal for just the Court Services CMS?**	The County is seeking an integrated justice environment platform. If this platform provides for discrete applications, we are open to that approach as long as a high level of integration functionality is offered.
38	**Is the Circuit Court system required to integrate with the State Attorney's CMS?** **Is the Circuit Court system required to integrate with the Court Services CMS?**	The County is seeking an integrated justice environment platform. Yes, a high level of integration among all three core applications is required. Court Services is largely driven by court ordered activity, therefore integration is a must.
39	**Does the county have a middleware/integration platform deployed? If so, please describe? If not, is there an API architecture in place for data sharing?**	There is not an API architecture in place. Integration features in our current environment are somewhat limited and executed using a shared database.

40	**What integration methods or protocols does the County prefer (e.g., APIs, file-based, real-time)?**	Communication between core stakeholder applications must be real-time. Examples include the creation of a criminal case in the Circuit Clerk CMS should be immediately available to the State's Attorney, or an order for a pretrial or presentence report added to the Circuit Clerk CMS should be immediately available to Court Services. Communication via integrations to third party applications will be determined on a case-by-case basis. In some cases, web services are provided by third party vendors while others provide flat file imports. Some integrations may be scheduled, for example checking for traffic citation imports on a four hour window, but importing felony cases in near real-time. In general, the County prefers API integrations and (SOAP) web services since they usually afford the most flexibility, but other techniques can be implemented to achieve the goals. The Integration Architecture is Section C.
41	**What is the strategy for migrating existing data from legacy systems to the new solution?**	Data migration [R37] from the legacy systems is a requirement of this bid. The CMS data is stored primarily in an Oracle database, with some small supplemental data in Access databases. Some cases have been scanned from historical records that should be imported into the CMS, which are images stored in a file system.
42	**Should the vendor consider owning the data cleaning and de-duplication as part of the proposed solution and scope effort?**	Not to a large extent. The Winnebago County stakeholders conduct ongoing data cleanup and de-duplication efforts. Additionally, our oldest legacy datasets were converted in 2010, and if not truly clean, at least they are predictable. If a data cleanup issue is uncovered, we expect to have the resources to address the issue, or we will address the scope of the issue at that time. If a vendor has a solution for data analysis on possible party matching, or an AI feature to facilitate party matching, Winnebago County would be interested in that feature.

43	**Do we have an existing document management system that can be leveraged or are we looking for a new document management system?** **Does the County have an Enterprise Document Management System? If not, is the County seeking an Enterprise DMS as part of the solution? Will the County seek an Enterprise DMS separate from the Circuit Clerk CMS, Attorney CMS, and /Court Services solutions?**	We have Apache Jackrabbit for some applications in our current environment at this time, but we are open to new document management systems for enterprise-wide support. Document and/or image management can be addressed in Section B. The County does not have a preference for a separate Enterprise DMS, and we do not have a preference for one that is integrated within a platform or not. We are looking for the best technology solution. Currently, the Circuit Clerk and Court Services uses Apache Jackrabbit, but this data must be migrated off this legacy system to the new platform. The Attorney applications store document images to a file system.
44	**Please expand on the Document Management needs related to scanning, bate numbering, barcodes or QR codes, redaction, etc.**	1. Scanning is required because litigants and court parties may still file or provide paper documents in any of the stakeholder departments. Scanned documents need to be added to case files in all three applications. 2. Bates numbering is used by the State's Attorney or Public Defender to number documents for exchange of discovery, among other reasons. 3. QR codes and barcodes may be used to scan batches of documents, identify case files, or identify ticket or complaint numbers. 4. Redaction is used to redact sensitive information from documents prior to making them publicly available.
45	**In order to provide the SOC report [Req7] – can we send you an NDA?**	Yes, please send the NDA to Hope Edwards at purchasing@purchasing.wincoil.gov

46	**Is the county looking for a big bang or an incremental approach?** **Does the County plan to roll out the three systems concurrently? Which system does the County plan to go-live first?**	We are willing to consider either approach, and we would like you to recommend what has been successful in the past. Winnebago County has concerns regarding additional data entry demands in an incremental approach. The prior deployment of the case management systems was successfully deployed all at once. You may also propose different options for deployment and provide some alternative timelines. Please provide a recommendation for a deployment plan in R117. The County does not have a priority for one application over the other. The time to deploy the application(s) and necessary integrations will be scored as part of an RFP. Please provide a recommendation for a deployment timeline in R117.
47	**On page 24 [R16], there is a requirement about AI features - do we have any use cases defined?** **Do any AI capabilities exist today within the dept/state/county/County or broader in the State/County that could be leveraged?**	No, we do not have any specific use cases defined. One example we have seen is an AI-assisted chat feature to provide some customer support, but this requirement is information-gathering to explore any features your platform might provide. No, we currently do not have any AI capabilities to leverage.
48	**How is redaction done today [R50]?**	Today, redaction is done manually with Adobe Acrobat. We download the document, manually redact it, and re-upload the document. The un-redacted version is maintained, but not publicly available. The redacted version is normally made publicly available. We would like to hear your thoughts on how to best accomplish this in your platform.
49	**Does the county have a preferred e-signature solution?**	No, we do not. To address an issue that we have previously experienced, we are not using digital signatures such as the one provided by Adobe or VeriSign because the clerk needs to be able to apply a filestamp after the document has been signed, and the digital signature technology locks the document, which prevents us from doing that.

50	**What is the preferred training approach? Vendor-provided training or train the trainer?** **How does the County handle training? Is there a group that would get trained and conduct Train the Trainer sessions in readiness for production GoLive? Or will the vendor need to own ALL training, for internal and external users?**	Winnebago is comfortable with and has the resources for a Train the Trainer approach. We do not have a preferred approach; however, even if vendor-provided training is proposed, someone from the stakeholder office will be participating to ensure proper procedures are being followed. You can explain training approaches in R36 for on-boarding a new customer and in the Pricing section if applicable.
51	**Does the County have any standard SLAs in place for IT system problem resolution/trouble tickets? If so, can this be shared with vendors for scoping appropriate level of support?**	We do not have standard SLAs in place at this time.
52	**Is Jury Management a requirement?** **It's been indicated that jury management is out of scope, what system is in place today to manage jury notification and selection.**	No, it is not. Genesis Jury. No integration is required.
53	**The RFP does not include prisoner management or transportation, is there a system in place today to handle this? Does it need to be integrated with the CCMS?**	No, this is not part of the RFP and we do not need an integration for these purposes. We will need an integration or an electronic process with SallyPort by Black Creek to notify Court Services CMS (Pretrial Services) and the Circuit Clerk CMS of a defendant waiting for a detention hearing, exchange of demographic data, and the ability to exchange pretrial release or detention orders. The integration also needs to check custody status. Please see R27(h).
54	**Will the county be willing to publish an architecture diagram outlining the systems mentioned?**	We do not have an architecture diagram of what this integrated justice system should look like. This is something that we are asking vendors to provide in their response. See Requirements Sections A, B, C for specifics.

55	**What are the specific data security and privacy requirements or regulations that the solution must comply with?**	Meeting the confidentiality and accessibility requirements are critical to success in a justice environment. Court records contain sensitive or private information regarding mental health, financial records, and other information protected by statute or direct judicial action. Confidentiality and accessibility requirements are defined in R45 and R46. Access should be determined by the subject matter of the document type, case docket entry type and/or case-specific parameters. User roles, user groups, and auditing can be addressed in R14, and password control can be addressed in R35. Certain subsystems require access controlled by a user group, such as the financial/accounting subsystem, or certain divisions require special access such as juvenile detention or mental health, state's attorneys require controlled access for special investigations or criminal history files, etc. Meeting CJIS (Criminal Justice Information Services) compliance requirements [R5] and/or NIST compliance requirements will be highly regarded.
56	**Are there any encryption standards or protocols that need to be adhered to for data transmission and storage?**	At the network level, data must be secured during transport to and from the cloud solution and at-rest, end-to-end including any access from mobile devices, but no specific protocol is required. As a hosted platform, please provide information regarding how your entire platform is secured and monitored from intrusion or malware, and the security risk management policies you have in place to mitigate those risks. This includes tunnels, routers, gateways, and firewalls, etc. These requirements should be addressed in Section A and/or D. Meeting CJIS (Criminal Justice Information Services) compliance requirements [R5] and/or NIST compliance requirements will be highly regarded.

57	**How is citizen outreach handled?**	Currently, the stakeholders contact litigants, attorneys, victims, probationers, etc. through one or more avenues. Paper notices are generated from templates and mailed via USPS, email and text message options are required as well. There are various requirements to opt in/out of these services, and various rules and statutes that govern what can be delivered electronically and what cannot. There are also situations where phone calls are made. We would be interested in options for automated outbound calls, such as for weather-related closures, or interactive voice response systems for appointment scheduling, etc. however, these features are not required. The other way we communicate with the public is through two different websites. One is a public-facing website where people can look up basic case information, like future court dates or payment balances, the public can plead guilty and request supervision for traffic violations, pay fines, etc. and a protected-access portal commonly used by attorneys and other justice-related departments like the Department of Children and Family Services etc. where users must register and be approved for access. More information is available on the protected access portal to attorneys of record. Court Services also has a website where if someone was on probation or assigned to other programs, they would be able to look up future appointments, etc.
58	**Is there are requirement to send physical mail?**	Absolutely, paper notices or certified mailings are used very frequently by all the stakeholder departments.
59	**What are the current systems in place that the CMS systems will have to work with, like current database management or other software?**	This integrated justice system is really going to implement a whole new level of service. We are really not tied to any current system or databases with respect to the CMS applications. SQL Server is preferred but IT has experience with Oracle as well. Please address this in R10. With respect to other software, the RFP does identify many examples of integration with third-party applications that are required, such as integration with our credit collection vendor, search warrant application, the order of protection application, etc.

60	**Will individuals processing payments need consoles/registers as part of this response? Or will existing hardware be used?**	Payment processing is required both at the counter in the Circuit Clerk's office and online through either public access or protected access websites. Existing hardware and the existing credit card vendor will not be used (currently CitePay). Court Services does not perform any payment processing; all payments are handled through the Circuit Clerk. The Circuit Clerk assumes payment processing will be handled within the same system as the Circuit Clerk CMS and that separate consoles will not be required; however you can elaborate in R66 and R75.
61	**Among the total anticipated users, could you specify how many users will access the application/system, distinguishing between IT and non-IT users, external and internal Users?** **How many users will need access to the Circuit Court CMS?**	As indicated in R2: Clerk users - 100 users, 7 days/week, 8am-5pm Court users – 20 users Judges – 25 users Court Services users - 91 (24 juvenile officers, 38 adult, 12 pretrial, 6 RIC, 11 support staff) Juvenile Detention - 40 officers, 48 beds State's Attorney users- 86 (40 are attorneys) Public Defender users – 40 (30 are attorneys) (external) Active private attorneys - 600 WCBA (external) Law enforcement users - 400 (external) Public Access - potentially thousands To provide more information, IT and administrator users are approximately 15 across County IT and stakeholder administrators. Of the public access users, no login will be required for the public access portal. The private attorneys from the bar association would register as protected-access users.
62	**Does the county use ActiveDirectory or another means for external authentication?** **Does the County have a preference for an MS Active Director environment or a Google environment? How should vendors think about the environment of single sign-on or MFA? The RFP mentions "word" and "excel," but does the county court also use Google applications ("Docs" and "sheets"?)**	Active Directory LDAP as well as ADFS is currently used for internal (county employees) users, but we are migrating to Azure AD and we expect to be in production with Azure by the time we deploy the new platform. External users must have password-protected access as well. Please address R35. We do not use Google applications within any CMS. We do not have a county wide MFA solution at this time.

63	**Is there a Help Desk for Level 1 trouble ticket and if so, does the agent at Level 1 have any responsibility for support, does the County want to have any role in break/fix, problem resolution while the system is in Production? If so, at what level will County/Agency SMEs handle trouble tickets?**	Winnebago County has a trouble ticket system for IT related issues, but with a hosted solution, we would like to significantly reduce the demands on County IT for resolving performance, hardware, or infrastructure issues. It is expected that County IT will be handling both network level and help-desk related issues at the individual user level. County IT will likely be the department that creates trouble tickets for vendor support. Stakeholder SMEs will be responsible for procedural issues, compliance with local and state rules, testing and configuration changes. County personnel must be kept informed of problem resolution.
64	**Who will support the system after go-live? Do this person/do these people already work for the County and will they be available during the build?**	This RFP is requiring a hosted solution. Please see Section A. We require network, performance, integration, disaster recovery, etc. issues be supported by the vendor(s). County IT will be available for initial configuration and procurement of the hosted solution and any troubleshooting that requires. Subject matter experts from the various stakeholder offices will be available for procedural and workflow support during deployment, configuration and training. Support options are covered in section D.
65	**What are the County's expectations regarding ongoing support and maintenance after the solution goes live, should it include enhancements?**	The County expects defects to be fixed at no charge. Please address the requirements in Section D, and what your company offers.
66	**Is there a preferred approach to handling software updates, patches, and upgrades?**	There is no preferred approach. Please describe your process in Section D. Winnebago County generally requires the updates to be tested in a test staging environment to ensure acceptance testing, and the timing of such updates are so that any impact on business procedures are eliminated.

67	**Page 21, number 45 - Please explain the business process as to what portions of a case confidential indicators would apply in addition to documents, whole case or docket entry.**	The confidentiality indicators are defined by the Illinois Manual on Recordkeeping, Part 1 Section L. Here are some examples. Some entire case types are impounded, like MH (Mental Health), some cases are impounded due to certain rules, such as OV (ordinance) cases against minors, some documents are impounded by the nature of their contents (medical reports), etc. Some cases are sealed by court order. Some counts may be sealed by court order which includes sealing the documents associated with the count as well as docket entries specifically related to the count, such as an order for a DUI evaluation that must be sealed if the DUI count is sealed.

68	**Could you please describe the lifecycle of a docket? Is this created by the Clerk? Today it seems like both the Court Services and Clerks use a single system - FullCourt. This system is the source of truth for certain critical pieces of information like Docket/Case Numbers. What is the business driver for separating these functions into different systems rather than having distinct functional roles in the same system?**	This is a good question to clarify the terminology. To a judge, the docket is the list of cases on their court call, or generally assigned to their courtroom. To a clerk in their CMS, a docket entry is an entry into the case record. In this RFP, you can assume the usage of the term "docket entry" to be synonymous with a record in the CMS for the State's Attorney/Public Defender or with a record in the Court Services CMS. In general, it is a single, atomic entry into the case record. A court case would be created by the Clerk in the Clerk CMS. An investigation case number would be created by the State's Attorney in the Attorney CMS, which may or may not be linked to a court case. A Court Services case number may or may not be linked to a court case. Regarding the question **"What is the business driver for separating these functions into different systems rather than having distinct functional roles in the same system?",** the answer is that there is no business driver that separates these functions into different applications in an integrated justice system. These functions (at the presentation layer) can absolutely co-exist in the same platform, with security roles controlling access to different functional cases. A criminal felony (CF) court case can exist in the same platform with a State's Attorney Criminal Investigation case file (SAC) and a Court Services Juvenile Detention case file (JVDET), as long as the security configuration strictly controls user access to the case information. This can be addressed in Sections B and C in your bid. In this RFP, the County is willing to consider an integrated justice platform that is either a fully integrated suite of functional roles for clerk, attorney and court services, a platform with a more segregated suite of applications that are integrated, or single applications with exceptional integration features that would allow us to integrate the single application into the larger environment.

69	**Do judges interact with the sentencing functionality directly in the high-volume courts such as traffic court, small claims and eviction courts? What kind of document management capabilities do these case types require?**	Separating the terminology into "sentencing" for criminal cases (including traffic and ordinance) and "judgments" for civil cases – yes, sometimes the judges create their own sentencing orders, and sometimes the sentence orders are prepared by the prosecutors. In high volume traffic courts, we would like the ability for a judge to directly handle the most frequent dispositions, i.e. to dismiss a case, to adjudicate court supervision 6mo, order an ex-parte guilty, etc. In high volume civil courts, we would also like the judge to issue frequent judgments, i.e. dismiss for want of prosecution, dismiss a party, issue a judgment for costs, issue a satisfaction of judgment order, etc. Use [R70] for this. Regarding document management capabilities, we would like the ability to draft an order template [R48], exchange or edit the draft order [R70], and enter a signed order into the record [111].
70	**Page 29, number 42 – Does your current CMS have the functionality to merge party records?**	Yes.
71	**Page 30, number 43 – Does your current system have functionality to add custom data fields?**	Yes, but the custom fields must be added by the vendor which has limited our ability to quickly adapt to changes in data reporting.
72	**Page 32, number 66 - The public access portal must display the court calendar that is maintained by the Circuit Clerk CMS, for the purposes of identifying date availability on a courtroom and judge level. Can you please explain what you are referring to by identifying date availability?**	The court calendar will be used to identify date availability by indicating such things as court holidays and scheduled courtroom closures, but also when the limits for placing cases on the calendar for that date/time have been reached, i.e. the timeslot is maxed out at 20 cases already on the session, which would then indicate an unavailable date/time. Currently court sessions in Winnebago are AM/PM.
73	**Will marshals or other law enforcement agencies need access to the system? If so, how do you envision their use of the system?**	Law enforcement accesses the platform either by directly accessing the applications with a login according to their security role, or through the protected-access portal where they can run reports, access case information, etc.

74	**Page 33, number 67 - This portal must not contain replicated data, and must not be a separate login configured exclusively for the Protected Access Portal. Is this saying the same application must support regular and protected access?**	The protected access portal must not contain replicated data means that when a user is accessing a case or a document through the portal, it must be the information from the case management system and adhere to the same security features and restrictions as the case management system user, using the same login and security roles. The protected access portal can be used by clerks, judges, state's attorneys under their same login, and external users will also request CMS login access. Case information cannot be replicated or archived for use by the protected access portal.
75	**Page 35, number 54 - The Clerk requires the ability to create a future year case number in order to reserve a small set of case numbers that are re-used year-over-year for the same purpose, i.e. 2020TX1, 2021TX1, 2022TX1 are always created in advance and reserved every year. Can you please elaborate more as to the business process and reason for future cases in advance?**	Reserved case numbers are required by the Illinois Manual on Recordkeeping, which maintains these case number year-over-year. For example, the Annual Tax Sale for delinquent properties is always filed as YYYYTX000001. In prior years, there were two reserved MR case numbers for filing statewide expungements of cannabis cases. The business reason is to facilitate filing into the same case numbers in all 102 counties for the same purpose.
76	**Are there any requirements for multi-lingual or bi-lingual capabilities?**	There is a requirement that addresses that, but these requirements are not as demanding as you might think. Spanish is our county's most frequent interpreter request. Many of our forms and notices are already translated into Spanish, which we would treat as simply as another document template if needed. We do not require dynamic translation of any existing materials. Our websites usually rely on using a feature like Google Chrome Translate for the webpages. If you have any translation features, we would be interested in learning more about them in R66, however Google Translate works well for most language support.
77	**Are there any specific digital evidence requirements?**	We are interested in digital evidence management but it is not a required feature. See R18. It would be a-nice-to-have, but if we do not obtain that solution as part of this RFP, we have that planned for a future integration in our long-term plans. Currently, our physical evidence locations are managed on a spreadsheet, and digital evidence is copied to a drive or a disc and treated as a physical item.

78	**For the State's Attorney, how is body camera footage currently handled?**	The State's Attorney currently uses Axon body cameras and Evidence.com.
79	**Will the Public Defender's Office case management functionality mirror that of the Prosecutor's Office? Will the Public Defender's Office utilize similar processes and workflows?**	The high level functionality is the same considering both departments are providing legal representation in court, however the processes and workflows are somewhat different in that Public Defenders are appointed to represent defendants, while the State's Attorney is the default prosecutor for all criminal charges, and many quasi-criminal charges. The State's Attorney also has a substantial civil division which does not exist in the Public Defender's office.
80	**Can you briefly describe the case flow from arrest to court of record? (arrest, arraignment, hearing, etc.)**	There are many flowcharts available at: https://www.illinoiscourts.gov/pretrial-resources/additional-pretrial-resources

These workflows describe arrests by citation and release, as well as workflows for bringing a defendant to first appearance court. Criminal arraignment occurs after first appearance court, as defendants do not enter pleas at first appearance court or detention hearings. For major traffic and ordinance cases, charges may be settled with one court appearance. For minor traffic cases, many are pre-payable without a required court appearance. |
| 81 | **Do probation and parole utilize the same workflow as prosecutors, or do they require different case management workflows?** | The probation and court services workflows are substantially different from prosecutors. |
| 82 | **Court Services provides a number of services to different types of cases and defendants. It looks like some of these services are initiated by the judge in various hearings or docket review settings. Are there other triggers for services as well? Are certain services mandated by offender status?** | Yes, some Court Services services are initiated by the judge, but there are many other triggers, Pretrial Services are initiated upon an arrest event, or an event triggered by something in the State's Attorney's application, or by an action of Court Services staff evaluation. Some services are mandated by adult offender or juvenile offender incarceration status, but usually required by judicial order. |

83	**Will the primary Docket records reflect all Court Services activities or just certain milestones and/or documents from Court Service engagement?**	The "primary docket" in the Circuit Clerk CMS will reflect some, but not all, Court Services activities according to what information is deemed necessary to be shared, and different rules will apply to what Court Services documents are shared with the Attorney CMS systems. However, the Court Services CMS should reflect all Court Services records and milestones. In platforms that do not offer discrete applications to the different stakeholders, the "docket view" must be controlled by user access roles in order to display the appropriate information each stakeholders' users.
84	**Page 25, section 27 g – Approximately how many more historical case files are planned to be imaged.** **How many paper files will need to be digitized?**	Approximately 10K cases remain to be imaged. The RFP does not cover digitization of the County's paper files.
85	**Page 25, section 27 a – What file type is used to import electronic citations to the current CMS via digiTICKET? Do the citations go to a queue for staff to review and accept? What data elements are provided on the file?**	The raw ticket data from digiTicket is an XML schema with named fields, e.g DefLastName, DefFirstName, etc. which also includes a PDF image of the citation. The specific file interface will be provided upon award, but the data elements reflect the fields on the state-approved citations here: https://www.illinoiscourts.gov/eservices/uniform-citation-forms Currently, citation raw data files are downloaded manually from a digiTicket dashboard, and a process imports them into our current CMS. This practice is not our ideal solution, as we would prefer the citation import to be an automated scheduled process. It does not need to be real-time filing of citations, but scheduled at regular intervals.
86	**Page 25, section 27 f – What other data elements are being reported to Harris and Harris in addition to a list of cases?**	Case number, relevant dates, balances owed, fee detail breakdowns, party information such as names, addresses, contact information if available, etc.

87	**Are all listed integrations necessary for day 1? Should the budget include building all integrations or are you willing to consider a phased approach?**	Winnebago County will consider a phased approach for some of the integrations; however some will be required on day 1. The required third party integrations on day 1 will be: • digiTicket electronic citations • Automated Disposition Reporting • Statewide Efiling integration • Harris and Harris collections • PositivePay • Cordant HL7 drug testing • E-Appeals • Some elements of integration with SallyPort Integrations that must be available within a short period of time after deployment: • Tyler Data and Insights (Socrata) Online Reporting • Online orders of protection • Online search warrants
88	**Is there any preferred data standardization practices to ensure consistent data collection across reporting entities?**	Unfortunately, no. The reporting entities are very diverse. The State of Illinois has defined some data definitions for the automated disposition reporting (Appendix L) and the Data and Insights Schema definitions (Appendix E). Please see the Appendices on page 54 of the PDF for many resources.
89	**Any 3rd party agencies outside of the county that would require access to reports/dashboards? If so, how does data sharing happen today?**	Yes, we will make reports available to our justice partners either through the protected-access portal, where they can log in and download them, or through a direct login to the CMS application with restricted security access. Today, we use a combination of that, as well as email distribution.

90	**Can you supply us with examples of report(s) and dashboard(s) at various levels of associated user types?**	Current dashboards are predominately for task-based work queues, for example, when a task has been assigned to a user work queue, or a court date is approaching that requires completion of a task, or a reminder of an upcoming event. Other examples are when documents are transferred to data entry staff, or when documents of a certain type are filed.

For example, law enforcement users would log in to the CMS or the protected-access portal to run warrant reports, attorneys would run reports for their cases or for outstanding balances owed, judges run reports for cases assigned to their courtrooms, interpreter agencies run reports for cases that need interpreters, 3rd party court services providers run reports for class attendance, etc.

We currently have over 1,000 reports. |
| 91 | **QUESTION: Are the time standard metrics desired as part of the Dashboard described in question 63, desired to be defined by each individual judge or is it a standard metric defined by the state? An example of what a "target" vs. actual would be appreciated. Are these dashboards also desired to be used by other administrators? If so could you please provide an example of what you would like to measure?** | Time standards is a standard metric defined by the State of Illinois. The reports that counties are submitting to the state are reports M and N, as defined by the Manual on Recordkeeping pages 122 and 124. The data in these reports would be "actual" time standards measuring the case time to closure. The target time standards can be found in Supreme Court Order M.R. 21228, or at this link: https://ilcourtsaudio.blob.core.windows.net/antilles-resources/resources/f5cdd7d7-49b1-409e-b556-56c1f55060c3/M.R.%2031228%20-%20Time%20Standards%20for%20Case%20Closure%20in%20the%20Illinois%20Trial%20Courts%20-%2003-25-22.pdf
Winnebago County would like to be able to measure what case categories, case types and/or judges are meeting time standards. Trial Court Administration and the Judiciary would be the stakeholders for this dashboard. |

92	**What is the current data volume and user base, and what changes in data volume and user base are expected over the next 3-5 years?**
	
	Page 9, number 37 – Can you provide the total document storage size required?
		The current caseload and user base is listed in R2 and <u>not</u> expected to change over the next 3-5 years. Current case loads by stakeholder application are listed in the Current Environment section beginning on page 17 of the RFP PDF.
		
		Total caseload in 2022 – 45,525 cases, includes 3,881 cases classified as "Other"
		      Civil caseload filed in 2022 – 10,306 cases
		      Criminal caseload filed in 2022 - 6,804 cases
		      Juvenile caseload filed in 2022 – 950 cases
		      Traffic caseload filed in 2022 - 17,738 cases
		
		For the Circuit Clerk and Court Services combined, there are 2.7 million cases (375 Gb) and 10.6 million document images (3.2 Tb). The Attorney platform has documents stored on a file system, and those numbers are ~1.5m documents and video (4 Tb), data files are 52 Gb, for the State's Attorney, and ~136k documents (9 Gb) for the Public Defender, and another 9 Gb for PD data.

93	**How many cases or images are on the network drive that we should import?**	There are ~785k of those documents.
94	*We received a very detailed request for estimates regarding sizing and caseloads for the digital evidence system.*	Current case annual loads by stakeholder application are listed in the Current Environment section beginning on page 17 of the RFP PDF. We do not have synchronized and reliable data for open/closed cases across all stakeholder applications as it pertains to digital evidence collection. While the Illinois Manual on Recordkeeping specifies retention requirements, Appendix D, Winnebago County does not routinely archive cases anymore, and prefers to keep 100% of their modern caseload in the case management systems. Any historical cases will be added to the CMS system, and are not expected to be archived.

95	6	Regarding your stated needs for Data Conversion. The RFP includes how many documents, but is there more specific information on the size of the data?	Question #92 has the answer regarding the size of data that needs to be converted from the current system.
		a. How much data/what is the size of data that will need to be converted from your current provider?	
		b. Do you need Legacy Portal, Legacy Portal + Advanced Search, or Full Data Conversion?	Winnebago requires full data conversion.
		c. Do you need all your current data converted? If not, how many years of data need to be converted to the new system?	Winnebago requires full data conversion.
		d. How much data did you generate this year? Last year?	Winnebago does not have the ability to calculate the data required from a single year of operations across all platforms and external databases. The caseloads are expected to remain steady for the next five years.
		e. How much data have you stored this year? How much data do you expect to store next year?	
	Are there any specific key performance indicators (KPIs) that the County will use to assess the effectiveness of the solution?		Winnebago County does not have predefined performance indicators, but will assess the effectiveness of the solution according to expectations set by the contract.