JUSTICE CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
ADDENDUM
08/03/2017

This Addendum supplements the Request for Proposal for the Justice Case Management System dated July 18, 2017.

Several vendors asked specific questions. The responses given are for guidance but depend on our interpretation of the question. While believed to be accurate, they do not change the RFP specifications. Vendors are encouraged to use their experience from previous installations of CMS in other Illinois counties to prepare a solution for Vermilion County. Finalists will be asked to give a demonstration. As stated in the RFP, that may delay the award of the bid. Some vendors asked about the number of case filings. Any solution should have a capacity to grow. All bids as stated in an earlier addendum should have one bid with, and one bid without the judicial module.

1) **What is the desired timeframe to go live with the new system?**
   As soon as practical but no longer than 6 months to a year to complete.

2) **Do you have a preference on the release strategy? Big Bang or phased approach based on department?**
   The County will listen to each vendor's suggestion and decide on the best strategy, cost and efficient installation.

3) **Is there any desire to leverage existing assets like Onbase or is your preference to replace all components?**
   The County does not own Onbase. Onbase will need to continue to function as a means of accessing information from the records department of the Danville Police and Sheriff's Department who own the system and allow access to it by the State's Attorney's office.
   We are looking for an integrated case management system as described in the bid. It is up to the vendor to provide options for the best solution to that goal.

4) **What are the business drivers as to why the County wants to migrate off the existing case management systems?**
   Eliminate repetitive or duplicate information entry, efficiency for each office, and attempt to achieve a paperless process to the extent possible. Ideally once a court date is entered into the system by the clerk's office it should auto-populate to the other departments. We are also looking for the possibility of adapting to an e-filing system.

5) **What is considered by the County as the most critical missing functionality in the existing systems being used by the Court, SAO, and PD?**

Each office has their needs. Identifying the most critical element is not possible. However, elimination of duplicate data entry and the need to adapt to e-filing are important. The ability to see images of pleadings and motions that have been filed.

6) **Could you give the number of records that need to be converted for each system?**
   Please review the bid specifications to give you an idea of the number of files.

7) **Could you give the number of images that need to be converted for each system?**
   Please review the bid specifications to give you an idea of the number of files.

8) **What technology are the data sources for the systems to be converted? SQL database? Flat file?**
   Most likely SQL database but there may be some flat files.

9) **How do you prefer to handle multiple defendants for case management? Do you create a case for each defendant and then track the case relationships or do you create one case that have multiple defendant records associated with that one case?**
   For the Public Defender, each attorney may need to be excluded from seeing certain files to avoid a conflict of interest. The Public Defender handles co-defendants similarly to the State's Attorney in that each is a separate file. In that office, co-defendants are assigned to different attorneys, so they absolutely need to be separate from each other. For the State's Attorney: All codefendant charges are separate case numbers and separate files although on the information they are all listed. They have been placing the physical pleadings in one file in case of co-defendants, namely the defendant's whose case the information goes to in bold.

10) **SA and PD systems call for data to be imported. Can you give examples of what data needs to be imported for each system?**
   The current case management systems for each office are listed in the bid specifications. All data entered in each system should be converted to the new system.

11) **For SA Office what is the approximate volume of the Miscellaneous Remedies cases per year?**
   Miscellaneous Remedies in the State's Attorney's office could be approximately 500 in number. Search warrants, asset forfeiture proceedings are classified as Miscellaneous Remedies.

12) **Can any ASA or APD be assigned to any case type?**
   Yes

13) **How many document templates will be required for the SA and PD?**
   Typical criminal pleading templates should be anticipated. Arrest warrants are critical for the State's Attorney's office. Indictments, complaints, notice of hearing, motions, are most common.

14) **Can you give some examples of the document templates for SA and PD?**
   See above.

15) **Does Vermilion County have immediate access to data for all departments JIMS data or will the winning vendor have to work with the current vendor for access to this data?**
The Circuit Clerk would have to work with the current vendor to access this data. We believe some level of cooperation would be needed by the vendors serving the Public Defender and State's Attorney's Office as well to ensure a successful conversion. We rely upon the expertise of the vendor responding to this bid to be familiar with the different programs and recommend appropriate conversion of data.

16) **What software is the Probation Department using in Vermilion County? Should an integration between the clerk system and the probation system be included?**
The Probation Department is not part of this RFP. However, the software used is Tracker. Any vendor may choose to address integration.

17) **What software does Vermilion county use for Jury management systems? Is this being considered as a part of this RFP?**
Jury Systems Management is currently used. Replacing that program is not part of the RFP.

18) **Can you clarify the representation of case management software for the judiciary? Should all vendors submit 2 bids, one with Judges module, and one without?**
Yes, as stated in an addendum posted and emailed, each vendor should submit one bid with a judicial module and one without.

19) **How many total end-users will be accessing the systems? For individual pricing purposes, can you break the number of users down by office type? (Clerk, Prosecutor, Public Defender, etc.)**
See page 10 and 11 of the RFP for the State's Attorney's Office and Public Defender. The Judicial would be approximately 9 and the Circuit Clerk is approximately 30.

20) **Is a vendor hosted cloud solution desirable?**
We would consider a cloud hosted solution. Considerations of cost, efficiency, and security are factors in consideration.

21) **Are you looking for a client based system, web based system, or a combination of both?**
We would consider both. Considerations of cost, efficiency, and security are factors in consideration. The Circuit Clerk's office currently has an AS400 which can be used. However, options other than the AS400 are welcome.

22) **Under the addition Clerk function #8 states that the software should have established, integrated functioning statewide reporting, By this do you mean that the system must have all the Illinois statewide reporting requirements already in place?**
The bid specifications are as stated. When operational it must serve all State of Illinois reporting requirements, including those of the AOIC.