

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q1.** The RFP references a transition from the current Judicial Systems Incorporated (JSI) Juror Management System. It also references a house-built program. Can you clarify what the current system is in place? **The current system is an in-house build program.**
- Q2.** Can the Court provide a data dictionary or schema of the existing JMS database to facilitate planning for data migration and field mapping? **Yes, a field mapping will be available.**
- Q3.** How many total active juror records are currently stored in the JMS system, and what is the approximate total volume of historical records that would need to be migrated?
- **As of 2025 there are 1 million active juror records in the JMS**
 - **Approximately 20 GB of data and 270 GB of documents.**
- Q4.** The SOW references six (6) court locations. Can the Court provide a list of all current and anticipated court locations, including any planned expansions during the five-year contract term? **Yes, all 6 courthouse addresses will be provided and these will be the courthouses through the contract term.**
- Q5.** What IVR vendor does the Court currently use, and will the Court expect the new JMS vendor to integrate with that existing IVR provider or replace it? **Yes, the current IVR vendor is Aumtech. Their VOIP solution connects to the existing house-built system via an API call to determine the correct information to provide.**
- Q6.** The SOW requires integration with Microsoft Entra ID for SSO and MFA. Can the Court confirm which Microsoft Entra ID tenant configuration is in use (e.g., hybrid, cloud-only) and whether any conditional access policies are in place that vendors should account for? **We use hybrid configuration and we do have conditional access policies managed by the security team which currently blocks out-of-country access and known problematic IP addresses.**
- Q7.** The SOW references the Court's Document Management System for paperless processing. What Document Management System platform does the Court use, and are APIs or integration documentation available for vendors to review? **Court uses LaserFiche and Case Management System Tyler EJ.**
- Q8.** Regarding the requirement to export data to Snowflake or Power BI: does the Court have an existing Snowflake or Power BI environment in place, or will the vendor be expected to provision and configure these services? **We currently use both environments.**
- Q9.** The SOW requires the JMS to interface with the State's Phoenix/SAP financial system for jury payment extracts. Will the Court provide detailed file format specifications and a test environment for Phoenix/SAP integration? Is a specific file layout already defined? **The court will provide the detailed file format specifications, yes the layout is already defined.**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q10.** Can the Court confirm whether geolocation-based mobile check-in (requiring jurors to be within a specified distance of the courthouse) is a firm requirement or can it be option to the core functionality? **No, it is not a strict requirement for geolocation.**
- Q11.** The SOW requires support for both Azure and AWS cloud hosting. Is the Court open to a vendor that supports one of these platforms exclusively, provided all other requirements are met? **The Court prefers Azure.**
- Q12.** The SOW references compliance with the Judicial Branch Information Systems Controls Framework and California Rules of Court rule 10.405. Will the Court provide its specific security compliance checklist or assessment questionnaire that vendors must complete as part of the proposal or contract process? **The Court will provide a security compliance checklist as part of our vendor risk assessment process after potential vendors are selected.**
- Q13.** Does the Court consider juror or case-related data to qualify as Criminal Justice Information (CJI) subject to FBI CJIS Security Policy requirements? If so, will the Court require vendors to obtain and maintain a CJIS Security Addendum? **There are no CJIS compliance requirements for our JMS.**
- Q14.** What are the Court's minimum uptime/availability SLA expectations for the SaaS solution during peak jury operations? Is there a defined acceptable maintenance window? **During peak jury operations, the expected minimum availability is 99.99%.**
- Q15.** Upon contract expiration or termination, what is the Court's expected timeline for data return, and in what format(s) should the data be delivered? **The expected timeline for data return is within 30 days of contract expiration or termination. The format is dependent on the Court's needs at the time of contract expiration or termination.**
- Q16.** The SOW requires disaster recovery testing results to be made available to the Court upon request. Will the Court also require vendors to conduct a joint DR test prior to go-live, or is independent vendor testing sufficient? **An independent attestation of disaster recovery testing and subsequent results is sufficient prior to go-live.**
- Q17.** The SOW states jurors do not receive fees or mileage for the first day of service. Are there any other business rule exceptions (e.g., case type, juror category) that the system must be configured to support? **The system must allow for payment to be optional and to change throughout a trial.**
- Q18.** Regarding the requirement that the system 'automatically send IRS Form 1099' for trials of 30+ days, could the Court describe the expected division of responsibility across the full 1099 lifecycle — SSN/TIN/W-9 collection, threshold tracking, form generation, recipient (juror) delivery, IRS filing, and any backup withholding — between the JMS, the Court's Finance/Auditor-Controller office, and any third-party payroll or print-and-mail vendor the Court currently uses? **Current Process: The Court collects W-9 forms**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

from jurors once it is anticipated that juror fees will reach or exceed \$600. The jury check system then generates a report identifying jurors who have met this threshold within the calendar year. This report is run at the beginning of the following year. Accounts Payable subsequently generates and issues 1099 forms to the jurors, the IRS, and the state by January 31.

Updated Process:

With the transition to SAP for check issuance, the JCC will assume responsibility for issuing 1099 forms. However, the Court will continue to collect and retain W-9 forms from jurors.

- Q19.** Beyond the Civil Collections Report and standard canned reports described in Exhibit A, are there additional custom or ad hoc reports that current Court staff rely on that should be replicated in the new system? **Ad Hoc includes a custom report for all sitting jurors for a specified time frame, i.e. list of jurors to invite to ABOTA event.**
- Q20.** Will the Court score vendors on the number and variety of canned reports included out of the box, or primarily on the ability to produce the specific reports enumerated in the SOW? **Both variety and ability to produce ad hoc reports will be evaluated.**
- Q21.** **Given the anticipated contract start date of September 2, 2026, does the Court have a target go-live date for the new JMS?** The target go-live date will be determined in conjunction with the selected vendor.
- Q22.** To inform our training plan and pricing, could the Court describe its expectations for: (a) the preferred mix of in-person, remote, and self-paced training; (b) whether initial training is expected to be delivered centrally at one location or onsite at each jury reporting location; (c) the approximate number of staff to be trained. **The court would prefer a combination of in-person, self-paced, and virtual training. On-site trainings could be centralized and we could expect the initial team to be about 40-50 staff, including administrators, management, and operations**
- Q23.** Section 'Court Responsibilities' assigns development of the UAT Plan to the Court, while the Phase 2 deliverables list 'a plan for UAT, including test scenarios and acceptance criteria' as a vendor-produced artifact. To resolve this and inform our proposal: (a) which party does the Court envision developing the UAT Plan, or is joint development expected; (b) does the Court anticipate adopting standard defect severity definitions for UAT (Critical/High/Medium/Low) with go-live thresholds? **The court anticipates that UAT will be jointly developed and anticipates adopting standard defect severity definitions for UAT.**
- Q24.** "Exhibit A commits the Court to 'designate court staff resources... for the duration of the project' in Jury Administration, IT, Finance, and Operations. To inform our project plan, resource model, and pricing, could the Court describe: (a) the anticipated availability — by role and percentage of working time — of designated personnel during the

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

implementation period; (b) whether designated staff are expected to be partially or fully dedicated to the project, or maintaining current operational duties concurrently; and (c) the anticipated UAT testing effort the Court is prepared to commit, in FTE-days or working-day equivalents?" **The court anticipates assigning dedicated project resources to the implementation to the extent feasible, and specific timelines required for UAT will be negotiated with the selected vendor.**

- Q25.** The RFP includes a cooperative agreement (piggybacking) provision. Will volume pricing or other commercial considerations apply if additional California government agencies elect to use the contract? **Not at this time.**
- Q26.** The SOW requires that all patches, updates, and maintenance be included in the base cost. Can the Court clarify whether this also includes major version upgrades or platform migrations that may occur during the contract term? **The court would expect that any major version upgrades or platform migrations that may occur during the contract term be included in the maintenance costs.**
- Q27.** Section 10 identifies ten scoring categories with point allocations totaling 100 points but does not specify the sub-criteria evaluators will use within each category. Will the Court publish the detailed evaluation criteria, scoring rubric, or sub-factors for each category? Alternatively, can the Court confirm that the corresponding requirements in the Statement of Work (Exhibit A) constitute the evaluation basis for each scoring category? Relatedly, to ensure proposals are organized for efficient evaluation, does the Court have a preferred proposal structure or table-of-contents format — for example, mapping responses to the ten Section 10 categories, to the SOW requirements in Exhibit A, or both? **All of the evaluation criteria are derived from the SOW and the sub criteria for Functional Coverage & Operational Fit are detailed in section 10.**
- Q28.** Section 10 allocates 30 points to Cost. Can the Court provide the specific formula or methodology that will be used to score the Cost portion of the proposal (for example, "lowest responsive cost receives full points; other proposals are scored proportionally")? **The Court will use the Judicial Council of California's method for assigning cost points. The lowest proposed cost receives the maximum cost points. Other proposals are scored by taking the lowest cost, dividing it by the proposer's cost, and multiplying by the maximum points available.**
- Q29.** Annual Summons Volume - The RFP references a Master Pool drawn from DMV, ROV, and FTB sources serving a county population of approximately 2.2 million residents. Bidders experienced with similarly sized counties typically see annual summons volumes in the range of 200,000–400,000. Could the Court confirm the approximate number of summons/mailers issued annually? This figure is critical for accurately sizing infrastructure, storage, and mail vendor integration costs in our proposal.
Summons mailed:
2023 - 912,634
2024 - 919,793

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

2025 - 966,715

Q30. Annual Jurors Seated - Could the Court provide the approximate number of jurors actually seated (empaneled) on juries annually across all six court locations? This will help us accurately scope payment processing volumes, IRS Form 1099 tracking thresholds, and financial reporting requirements.

Sworn jurors:

2023 - 4647

2024 - 4664

2025 - 4029

Q31. Current Master Pool / Active Record Count - Could the Court provide the approximate number of active records currently in the Master Pool (i.e., the combined de-duplicated DMV/ROV/FTB source file)? This will directly inform our data conversion planning and scoping, particularly as we map the existing JSI system schema to the proposed replacement system. 2025- 1,038,066

Q32. Data Conversion Scope and Format - The RFP requires data conversion from the Court's existing JSI-based Jury Management System. Could the Court confirm: (a) the approximate number of juror records to be migrated, (b) the data format(s) in which the existing data will be made available to the selected vendor (e.g., SQL database export, flat files, CSV), and (c) whether historical juror service records (beyond current active records) are also in scope for migration?

a) A minimum of 3 years of data will need to be migrated (Approximately 4.5 GB)

b) Documents: Total size is 270 GB

c) SQL export but would also do CSV files

d) Yes, historical records should be moved, however, in our current system each year the jurors get a new number.

Q33. Can the Court confirm the source systems must be converted to the new Jury Management system? The source system is a SQL database application built in-house known as WEJ.

Q34. Can the Court provide the approximate size of each database to be converted, including database type, total record count, total storage size, number of years of historical data, and number of associated documents/images?

- Jury DB = 20GB, Jury Checks DB = 105MB
- The database is MS SQL
- Total record count for 2 main tables
 - Juror = 11,583,687
 - Juror Impanelment Group= 16,189,820
- At least 3 years of historical data which is approximately 4.5GB
- The document repository containing all images is 270GB

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q35.** Will the Court provide database backups? **The court can provide a local DB backup.**
- Q36.** Does the Court expect all historical juror records, case records, attendance records, payment records, notes, documents, and audit trails to be converted, or only a defined subset? The court will provide all juror records as a table as well as all payments. **Currently, all images are in a different system source system (Laserfiche) and not integrated.**
- Q37.** Can the Court provide the applicable retention schedules from the Trial Court Records Manual that should govern converted jury records, archived records, and documents? **Juror records are generally required to be kept 10 years but for capital cases it is infinitely retained.**
- Q38.** Does the Court expect the awarded vendor to migrate scanned or generated documents and link them to juror records, pool records, case records, or all applicable record types? **No.**
- Q39.** Please clarify whether the requirement to automate DMV,ROV, and FTB data into a single source file annually means the vendor will receive source files from the Court for import or whether the vendor is expected to directly integrate with DMV, ROV, and FTB systems. **The court receives records from those 3 sources and must combine them, deduplicate them, and then import and validate them against the juror pool. We do not expect to integrate into those systems, but rather have a process for importing records annually.**
- Q40.** Can the Court provide sample layouts or specifications for the DMV, ROV, and FTB source files, including required deduplication, merge, validation, and exclusion rules? **Yes**
- Q41.** Does the Court require the awarded system to preserve source-of-record indicators for each juror, such as DMV, ROV, FTB, or merged-source status? **Yes**
- Q42.** Does a common, unique juror identifier, such as a voter ID, exist in all source list source files? If so, what is the unique identifier? **No. The name & address is the only shared fields.**
- Q43.** Can the Court provide additional detail regarding the Tyler Enterprise Justice integration, including the specific data elements, direction of data flow, frequency, and whether the Court expects real-time, scheduled, or file-based exchange? **The integration does not exist today, but Tyler does provide integration tools.**
- Q44.** For Tyler Enterprise Justice, should the JMS receive case data only, or should it also return jury-related data, panel status, juror costs, courtroom activity, and financial data back to Tyler? **The specific details for a potential integration are not yet defined.**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q45.** Can the Court provide the Enterprise Justice Integration Toolkit specifications, available APIs, test environment access expectations, and any Tyler licensing or vendor coordination requirements? **Yes.**
- Q46.** Can the Court clarify the required integration with Phoenix/SAP, including whether the awarded vendor must produce a file for manual upload or provide a direct interface? **Yes, the Court will provide details on how the integration will work.**
- Q47.** Can the Court provide the current Phoenix/SAP jury payment extract file layout, sample files, validation rules, rejection/error handling requirements, and reconciliation report expectations? **Yes, the Court will provide the requested information.**
- Q48.** Can the Court identify the Court's current Document Management System and clarify whether the JMS must directly integrate with it, export documents to it, or support a workflow where Court staff manually upload documents? **The court currently uses LaserFiche and we do not expect integration.**
- Q49.** For the outside mail vendor interface, can the Court provide current file layouts, barcode requirements, summons/questionnaire templates, postcard templates, return-file specifications, transmission method requirements, and interface process workflows and rules? **Yes.**
- Q50.** Does the Court currently use an IVR provider, telephone system, SMS provider, or notification platform that the new JMS must integrate with, or may bidders propose their own IVR/IWR/SMS solution? **Yes, the court currently uses Aumtech for the VOIP system and SMS/IVR functionality. The vendor just needs an API to access juror information for reporting purposes and requests for deferment.**
- Q51.** For SaaS solutions, please clarify the requirement to "provide access to the database." Is the Court expecting direct database access, read-only reporting access, secure replicated reporting database access, API access, scheduled exports, or another method? **We will need API access for the VOIP IVR vendor as well as read-only access to perform queries that may arise.**
- Q52.** If the Court requires database access for SaaS, should that access be limited to read-only access, and should it be restricted to a reporting replica or non-production environment? **Either method will work.**
- Q53.** For SaaS, please confirm whether production, staging/testing, and development environments must all be included in the base subscription cost. **Yes, the additional environments need to be included in the cost.**
- Q54.** Does the Court have specific recovery time objective (RTO), recovery point objective (RPO), backup retention, and disaster recovery testing requirements? **Backups must be**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

retained for 90 days. Our RTO is to recover as quickly as possible. We perform nightly backups, so our RPO is the time of the most recent backup. We require attestation of disaster recovery testing and subsequent results of recent tests.

- Q55.** Should bidders include costs for disaster recovery testing, security assessment support, and annual compliance documentation in the base cost? **Yes, bidders should include these costs for the assessment of security posture and disaster recovery readiness.**
- Q56.** Can the Court clarify whether juror data, case-related data, or any portion of the JMS data is expected to be treated as Criminal Justice Information requiring CJIS compliance? **There are no CJIS compliance requirements for our JMS.**
- Q57.** Does the Court require MFA for all internal Court users, or all users including jurors? **The Court only requires MFA for all internal Court users. Jurors are not required to authenticate with multiple factors.**
- Q58.** Does the Court require audit logs to be exportable to a SIEM or other Court security monitoring platform? **Yes.**
- Q59.** Can the Court define the minimum audit log retention period for user access, juror record changes, payment activity, case activity, and administrative actions? **The minimum retention period of audit logs must be at least 90 days within the jury system if log export to a SIEM is possible. If not, then minimum log retention must be at least 1 year.**
- Q60.** Can the Court provide the required format, data fields, and calculation rules for the Annual Jury Survey Report required by the Judicial Council of California? **Please see document titled- Question and Answer Supplemental information -1**
- Q61.** Can the Court provide a sample Civil Collections Report or define the required layout, grouping, totals, reconciliation rules, and export format? **Please see document titled- Question and Answer Supplemental information - 2**
- Q62.** Should data warehouse exports be real-time, scheduled, file-based, API-based, or database-replication-based? **Order of preference is real-time, Scheduled, DB replication, API Bases and file-based**
- Q63.** For mobile juror check-in within a specified distance from the courthouse, what method does the Court prefer for location validation? **The Court does not have a preference and is open to vendor recommendations.**
- Q64.** Should mobile check-in be available only to summoned jurors, or also to empaneled jurors, jurors in trial, and jurors reporting for continued service? **Summoned jurors.**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q65.** Should jurors be able to request excusals, deferrals, postponements, work verification, and fee/mileage waiver through the juror portal? **Yes.**
- Q66.** Does the Court have approved SMS/email message templates, opt-in/opt-out language, quiet-hour rules, language requirements, or communication retention requirements? **Yes, but this is currently handled by our VOIP provider with the IVR. Currently in English and Spanish.**
- Q67.** Does the Court require multilingual juror-facing functionality? If yes, which languages should be included at launch? **Yes, but this is currently handled by our VOIP provider with the IVR. Currently in English and Spanish.**
- Q68.** The SaaS requirements reference WCAG 2.1 AA for juror-facing components. Does the Court require the same standard for internal Court user screens, generated notices, PDFs, and reports? **For internal Court users, it is good to have, but not must.**
- Q69.** For mileage reimbursement using jurors' mileage actually traveled, should the JMS calculate mileage automatically from address to court location, allow juror-entered mileage, allow staff-entered mileage, or support all of these options? **It should allow calculated mileage from address, staff entry or public transportation options.**
- Q70.** Can the Court provide the rules for mileage calculation, rounding, override permissions, audit logging, and address correction handling? **We currently calculate using zip codes and we would need override capabilities**
- Q71.** For IRS Form 1099 requirements, does the Court expect the JMS to generate the 1099 form itself, generate a report/export for another system, or trigger a workflow for Court staff? **We currently just use a query to produce them.**
- Q72.** Should the JMS support electronic juror payments, debit cards, ACH, or other payment methods, or only the Phoenix/SAP extract process? **Only the Phoenix/SAP process.**
- Q73.** Does the Court have a target go-live date? **The target go-live date will be determined in conjunction with the selected vendor**
- Q74.** Can the Court define its expected acceptance testing process, including test scripts, performance testing, security review, data conversion validation, report validation, and sign-off criteria? **The Court will collaboratively define acceptance testing with the selected vendor based on current and future-state processes. Acceptance will require resolution of all critical defects, with agreed timelines for non-critical issues and readiness for production use.**
- Q75.** Does the Court expect the vendor to provide on-site train-the-trainer sessions, remote training, recorded training, user manuals, system administration guides, or all of these? **The court would prefer a combination of in-person, self-paced, and virtual training. On-**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- site trainings could be centralized and we could expect the initial team to be about 40-50 staff, including administrators, management, and operations
- Q76.** The RFP lists mandatory demos via Teams for all responsive bids. Can the Court provide the expected demo duration, required demo scenarios, participants, scoring criteria, and whether vendors may use a live environment or recorded demonstration materials?
1. **Duration: 1 hour (Minimum)**
 2. **Scenarios: Include all core jury system functionality as described in Jury RFP evaluation criteria in section 10 and SOW**
 3. **Participants: Jury, Finance, IT and Procurement**
 4. **Scoring Criteria: Refer to Jury RFP evaluation criteria in section 10 and SOW**
 5. **Environment: Live environment preferred to illustrate system features**
- Q77.** Will the Court provide demo scripts or required scenarios tied to the evaluation criteria, such as core jury operations, configuration, reporting, payments, security, and integrations? **No.**
- Q78.** Can the Court confirm whether Exhibit C Cost Worksheet must be the sole pricing format, or whether bidders may also include a supplemental pricing narrative explaining assumptions, optional services, and included items? **Please see section 8.2 of the RFP Document.**
- Q79.** Should optional services such as printing/ mailing, SMS/MMS/voice usage, payment processing options, enhanced data warehouse exports, and additional on-site training be included in Exhibit C or provided separately as optional pricing? **Please see section 8.2 of the RFP Document – The Cost Worksheet has lines for additional costs and a section for notes.**
- Q80.** For the five-year firm fixed price term, should bidders include annual increases, or is the Court expecting the same annual price for all five years? **Please see section 8.2.2 – Please include annual increases.**
- Q81.** Can the Court confirm whether digital signatures are acceptable for all required attachments, provided they are legally sufficient and verifiable? **Please see section 8.1.8.**
- Q82.** Can the Court clarify whether Attachment 8 Small Business Declaration is correctly referenced in Section 14.0, where the RFP states the bidder must submit the Small Business Declaration “Attachment 5”? **Section 14.0 of the RFP should reference attachment 8 – Small Business Declaration.**
- Q83.** What are the specific reasons the Court did not proceed with the previously selected vendor? **Please see Administrative Rules – Section 2.A. – Questions should pertain to the current solicitation.**
- Q84.** Were there issues related to:
1. Contract negotiations

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

2. Cost or budget?
3. A protest

Please see Administrative Rules – Section 2.A. – Questions should pertain to the current solicitation.

- Q85.** In the prior solicitation, why did the Court issue a new RFP instead of moving forward with the next highest-scoring vendor? Was there a determination that there were insufficient responsive vendors? Please see Administrative Rules – Section 2.A. – Questions should pertain to the current solicitation.
- Q86.** What lessons learned from the prior procurement have been incorporated into this RFP? Please see Administrative Rules – Section 2.A. – Questions should pertain to the current solicitation.
- Q87.** Has the Statement of Work changed materially since the prior solicitation? If so, which sections were revised? The following sections were added/updated in the new SOW: 1.3, 6.0, 7.0, 12.0, 13.0, 14.0 and 15.0
- Q88.** Section 10.1- Evaluation of Criterion has changed from the prior solicitation. What gaps in the prior evaluation process are these changes intended to address? The following sections were added/updated in the new SOW: 1.3, 6.0, 7.0, 12.0, 13.0, 14.0 and 15.0
- What are the specific limitations of the current in-house jury system driving this procurement? The aging platform limits our ability to implement enhancements
 - Unable to integrate with current technologies
- Q89.** What functional gaps are most urgent (top 3–5 pain points)?
- Limitations of an aging platform
 - Limited ability to enhance the system
 - Limited ability to provide modern access and services to the public
- Q90.** Which requirements in Exhibit A are considered mandatory vs “nice to have”?
- Below is a list of the mandatory requirements from Exhibit A:
 - Supports **high-volume, multi-location jury operations**, including concurrent processing, mobile access, and IVR/VOIP/web services.
 - Maintains **complete juror, case, payment, and audit records** throughout the juror lifecycle.
 - Provides **required reporting, data conversion, and import/reconciliation capabilities** from existing systems.
 - Includes **mobile-responsive juror services**, including mobile check-in and online status/interaction features.
 - If delivered as **SaaS**, must meet strict **U.S. data residency, security, compliance, accessibility, disaster recovery, and change management requirements**.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Provides **separate test and production environments** for implementation, validation, and ongoing support.
- Q91.** Can the Court please provide the number of required forms? **The SOW identifies 7 required forms**
- Q92.** Can the Court please provide the number of required reports? **The SOW identifies 16 required reports.**
- Q93.** In the 2025 RFP, the County stated there were 250 users that would utilize the new system. Can you confirm if this number is still correct? **250 is correct.**
Please provide a breakdown of users by role.
- **Support staff**
 - **Management staff**
 - **System administration staff**
- Q94.** Does the Court want a juror-facing virtual assistant/chatbot as part of this solution, and if so, which channels (web chat, SMS, IVR/voice) and priority use cases should it support, what content/source of truth should it use (Court-provided FAQs/policies), and are there any restrictions or preferences regarding scripted vs generative AI responses? **Good to have but not required in our SOW.**
- Q95.** What are the top call drivers today (status, reporting instructions, deferrals, excusals, payment), and which must be handled via IVR vs web? **You identified all of the drivers in your question with the exception of being payments.**
- Q96.** Do you want jurors to reply to texts/emails (and have responses routed into workflows), or is outbound-only acceptable? **No, we just want Jurors to be able to respond.**
- Q97.** Core Jury Operations (20 Points):
1. What specific workflows define “core jury operations” for scoring purposes? **Summons, panels, attendance, excusals**
 2. How are evaluators scoring this? Completeness, usability, automation level, other? **The evaluators will score each product on how well the solution achieves each of the core jury operations**
 3. If a solution meets Core Jury Operations, will the vendor receive maximum points? **It depends on how well the solution accommodates each dimension.**
- Q98.** Configuration and Rule Flexibility (8 Points)
1. What level of configuration is required? **The Court is looking for as much configuration as possible to avoid additional development.**
 2. What rules must be configurable by the Court vs vendor-supported changes? **All of the rules surrounding processes that are routinely changed as dictated by the Jury business processes.**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

3. Can the Court provide examples of rule flexibility that is required? **An example would be the modification of the juror compensation rates.**

Q99. Reporting, Analytics, and Audit (4 Points)

1. Can the Court provide a list of mandatory reports? **Yes, they are defined in the SOW**
2. Is Ad Hoc reporting required? **Yes**
3. What audit capabilities are required?
 - 1.1 Fully auditable financial management/payment processing, including audit reports.
 - 2.1.8 Juror history must capture the reason, date, and authorized Court user for excuses, disqualifications, transfers, and deferrals.
 - 2.1.18 Historical documentation must identify the authorized Court user for each transaction.
 - 4.5.6 Changes must be trackable for auditing based on access security level.
 - 5.1.4 All payment adjustments must be recorded in juror history.
 - 5.1.8 Supplemental payment requests/adjustments must be added to juror history as part of an audit trail.
 - 5.9.4 Audit Logs / User Reports must capture payment activity, adjustments/overrides, affected juror, employee name, and transaction date.
 - 6.1.4 System must support an audit feature for tracking Court user activity.
 - 9.1.4 System must provide activity logs of all Court user activities.
 - 14.1.7 SaaS solution must maintain audit logs of user access and actions involving juror records, payments, and case-related data.
 - 15.4 System must provide a report showing an audit trail for user activity.

Q100. Juror Payments and Financial Controls (4 Points)

1. How will this criteria be scored? Ability to integrate with finance system? Ability to cut checks directly out of the system? **Criteria will be scored against but not limited to the ability to integrate with the state system and produce paper checks.**
2. What payment methods are required (check, ACH, debit cards)? **Required payment methods are not specified in the SOW but the diversity of options will be incorporated into the evaluation**

Q101. Embedded Security & Access Controls (4 pts)

1. What role types must be supported (clerks, judges, admins, finance, IT)? **The ability to assign clear and separate roles or permissions to court users is a requirement.**
2. Is multi-factor authentication required or preferred? **Single Sign-ON using credentials from EntraID or on-prem Active Directory is the preferred authentication method. Otherwise multi-factor authentication support directly within the system is required.**
3. How granular must permissions be (screen-level, field-level, function-level)? **The permission levels must provide a level of granularity that allows for segregation of duties between user roles**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q102. Security, Privacy & Judicial Compliance (10 pts)

1. Which compliance frameworks are required? **NIST Cyber Security Framework (CSF 2.0)**

Q103. Technical Architecture & Delivery Model (5 pts)

1. What Technical Architecture does the Court prefer? **SaaS is preferred but the court is open to on prem solutions as well**
2. Is SaaS architecture preferred? Will SaaS solutions be scored higher than on prem? **Vendors that provide SaaS option will be awarded points for providing that option.**

Q104. Implementation, Support & Vendor Capability & References (5 pts)

1. Are staffing models (dedicated PM, dedicated account manager, support team size,) part of this scoring? **Specific roles are not defined in the SOW but the plan will be scored on how well the resources addresses the needs of the implementation.**
2. Is the project plan and timeline to deliver the system part of this scoring? **Yes.**

Q105. Acceptance of Court Terms & Conditions (10 pts)

1. Which contract terms are considered non-negotiable vs open to revision? **Please see Attachment 3- Acceptance of Terms and Conditions.**
2. Are vendors penalized for redlines or just evaluated on extent of changes? **Please see the RFP for Evaluation Criteria – Bidders Changes are evaluated and scored.**
3. Does partial acceptance impact scoring or only full acceptance? **Please see the RFP for Evaluation Criteria – Bidders Changes are evaluated and scored.**
4. Is there any flexibility post-award for contract negotiation if further discussion is needed? **After a Notice of Intent to Award is posted, the Court and Contractor will begin negotiations based on what is provided in the red-line version. Please note that this response is no guarantee that all items will be agreeable. Additional costs cannot be negotiated and vendors will be held to their proposal.**

Q106. Cost (30 pts)

1. How will Cost be evaluated? **Cost points are calculated using the Judicial Council of California's method for assigning cost points. Total 5-year cost? Yes – Costs provided in Exhibit C: Cost worksheet.**
2. Are implementation costs weighted separately from recurring annual costs? **No.**
3. Are escalation caps (year-over-year increases) a scoring factor? **Yes – All provided costs will be used as a scoring factor.**
4. How are optional modules and services treated in scoring (included vs excluded)? **The entire proposal will be scored.**
5. Will the lowest price vendor receive maximum points? How will the remaining vendors be scored? **Cost points are calculated using the Judicial Council of California's methodology for assigning cost points. The lowest proposed cost receives the maximum cost points. Other Proposals are scored by taking the lowest cost, dividing it by the proposer's cost, and multiplying by the maximum points available.**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q107.** Attachment 1 confirms the Court may withhold 10% of each invoice until receipt and acceptance of the final deliverable. Does this 10% withhold apply to the annual SaaS subscription invoices, or only to milestone-based implementation deliverables? **Yes.**
- Q108.** In the event of a tied score after cost and non-cost evaluation, Attachment 1 states the contract is awarded to the lowest responsive bid among tied proposals. Can the Court clarify how "lowest bid" is defined in this context — is it total five-year cost, Year 1 cost, or implementation cost only? **The lowest bid will be determined based on the combined cost.**
- Q109.** Attachment 1 states the Court will make reasonable effort to execute the contract within 45 days of posting the Notice of Intent to Award. Given the anticipated award date of August 5 and contract start of September 2, 2026, is the 45-day execution window expected to be shortened, and what happens to the contract start date if execution is delayed? **Please note the dates listed in the timeline are an estimate if estimate only is indicated.**
- Q110.** Attachment 1 prohibits a vendor that provided consulting recommendations to the Court from submitting a proposal for those same goods/services (follow-on contracting rule). Has any vendor performed market research, needs assessment, or requirements development for this JMS procurement that would trigger this restriction? **No.**
- Q111.** Attachment 1 states the Court may correct arithmetic or transposition errors in cost proposals. If the Court identifies and corrects such an error, will the vendor be notified before the correction is used in scoring, and will the vendor have the opportunity to withdraw rather than accept the corrected amount? **In most instances, the Court will notify if they intend to make a correction; submitting a new cost worksheet will not be permitted.**
- Q112.** Attachment 1 confirms vendors must not contact any Court personnel or consultants between solicitation release and contract award. Does this prohibition extend to existing Court relationships where a vendor already has an active unrelated contract with the Court? **This pertains to the current solicitation.**
- Q113.** Attachment 1 states the Court may enter into a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) process or establish a competitive range after initial scoring. Should vendors price their initial proposal competitively assuming a BAFO round may follow, and will all responsive vendors be invited to BAFO or only top-ranked ones? **The Court may or may not request a best and final.**
- Q114.** What are the Court's minimum requirements regarding insurance coverage — including general liability, cyber liability, and errors and omissions? What are the minimum coverage amounts required under Attachment 2? **Please see Attachment 2: Section 8.2**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q115.** Exhibit B explicitly states the Court is not responsible for travel expenses unless expressly set forth in the agreement. Given that on-site implementation and training at 6+ court locations is required by the SOW, will the Court include a travel expense provision in the executed contract, or must vendors absorb all travel costs within their fixed price? **It is not the Court's intent to provide for Travel.**
- Q116.** Exhibit B requires the vendor to invoice monthly beginning 30 days from the start of each term. For a SaaS subscription priced annually in Exhibit C, does the Court expect monthly invoicing at 1/12 of the annual rate, or is annual invoicing acceptable? **No.**
- Q117.** Exhibit B requires invoices to be submitted to AP@sb-court.org. Must invoices also be submitted to the Court Project Manager simultaneously, or only when an electronic detail file is required? **Yes.** What format is required for the electronic detail file accompanying SaaS subscription invoices? **Itemized PDF is preferred.**
- Q118.** Exhibit B states the Court endeavors to remit payment within 30 days of approving a correct invoice. Is there a late payment interest provision in Attachment 2 or the standard terms if the Court exceeds this 30-day target, and at what rate? **No.**
- Q119.** Exhibit B requires submission of a Contractor's Release form with the June invoice every July 10th and with the final invoice within 15 days of term expiration. For multi-year SaaS contracts, does signing the annual Contractor's Release waive any outstanding claims or disputes the vendor may have for that fiscal year, including unresolved change order requests or disputed invoices? **No – Please review Exhibit B.**
- Q120.** For Exhibit C "Additional Fees/Recurring Services" — how many rows does the Court expect vendors to populate, and is leaving rows blank acceptable? **Leaving rows blank is acceptable if the vendor has no additional fees or costs associated with recurring services.**
- Q121.** Should the Implementation fee in Exhibit C reflect the total all-in implementation cost, or only vendor labor excluding travel, training, and hardware? **Please include any fees associated with implementing the requested services.**
- Q122.** Exhibit C currently contains only line items for subscription fees, implementation, and additional recurring services. If a vendor is proposing a custom-developed solution, where should software development costs — including design, development, testing, and deployment labor — be captured in the cost proposal? **Please see Section 8.2 of the RFP document – Utilize the additional fees/recurring services section.**
- Q123.** May vendors modify Exhibit C to add additional rows, categories, or line items to accurately reflect their cost structure, or must the worksheet be submitted strictly as provided with no structural alterations? **Please see Section 8.2 of the RFP document**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q124.** Are travel, lodging, and per diem for on-site implementation and training expected to be included in Exhibit C or billed as pass-through actuals? **It is not the Court's intent to provide for Travel.**
- Q125.** What specifically failed or frustrated staff most about the current JSI system? **The current system is antiquated, running on a legacy system in need of replacement with a modern user interface and expanded functionality.**
- Q126.** Has the Court already had vendor demonstrations or market research conversations prior to issuing this RFP? **Yes, the court has issued previous RFP's.**
- Q127.** IS there an incumbent vendor currently providing jury management services to the Court, and if so, who are they? **No, the current system is an in-house developed solution.**
- Q128.** Does the Court have a preference for a Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) solution versus a custom-developed or heavily configured platform? **The court prefers COTS as long as it meets the business requirements**
- Q129.** Please confirm whether the Court will accept a pricing structure separating a one-time implementation fee from an annual SaaS subscription fee, consistent with Exhibit C, or whether a single blended annual price is required. **Please see Section 8.2 of the RFP document.**
- Q130.** Is this project funded in whole or in part by federal funds? If so, which federal funding source, and are there any FAR or grant-specific compliance requirements that apply to the vendor? **No, this project is not funded by federal funds**
- Q131.** What is the total budget allocated for this project, including implementation, licensing, and ongoing support over the five-year term? **There is no set budget for this project**
- Q132.** Does the Court have a preferred pricing model — e.g., per-user/seat licensing, per-juror-processed, flat annual subscription, or transaction-based — beyond what is reflected in Exhibit C? **No – Please see Section 8.2 of the RFP document.**
- Q133.** The RFP allocates 20 points to "Core Jury Operations." Can the Court provide a more detailed breakdown of the sub-criteria within this category so vendors can adequately address each element in their proposal? **Per section 10, summonses, panels, attendance and excusals are the core functional sub-criteria elements included for Core Jury Operations.**
- Q134.** Will cost scores be normalized (e.g., lowest bid receives full 30 points with others scored proportionally), or is there a different methodology used for scoring the cost portion? **Cost points are calculated using the Judicial Council of California's methodology for assigning cost points. The lowest proposed cost receives the maximum cost points.**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Other Proposals are scored by taking the lowest cost, dividing it by the proposer's cost, and multiplying by the maximum points available.

- Q135.** Who are the voting members of the evaluation committee and what are their roles? **The eval team is comprised of a cross functional group of SME's**
- Q136.** Will the evaluation panel score each criterion independently, or will a single evaluator score the entire proposal? **Evaluators will score independently**
- Q137.** Under the 10-point "Acceptance of Terms and Conditions" criterion — is scoring binary (accept = 10, redline = 0) or a sliding scale based on number and nature of redlines? **The redlines and exceptions taken are evaluated and scored by the Court's legal department.**
- Q138.** For the "Core Jury Operations" 20-point category, what are the specific sub-criteria and their individual point weights? **Per section 10, summonses, panels, attendance and excusals are the core functional sub-criteria elements included for Core Jury Operations.**
- Q139.** Are references evaluated on a pass/fail basis or scored as part of the "Implementation, Support & Vendor Capability" 5-point criterion? **Yes**
- Q140.** Under "Acceptance of the Court's Terms and Conditions" (10 points), will proposals that propose redlines or modifications to the standard terms receive a reduced score, or will the Court consider reasonable proposed modifications without penalty? **The redlines and exceptions taken are evaluated and scored by the Court's legal department.**
- Q141.** Will evaluators have access to the full proposal during the demo, or only the demo itself? **They will have access to the full proposals during the demo**
- Q142.** The RFP offers a DVBE incentive of up to 3 points for qualified bidders. Is there a separate DVBE subcontracting participation goal expressed as a percentage of contract value that all vendors — including non-DVBE primes — are expected to meet or address in their proposals? **No.**
- Q143.** Does the Court intend to exercise the piggybacking clause actively, and if so, how many other California courts are anticipated to participate? **This provision is available for other California Governmental Entities to participate if they wish. There is no expectation of participants expressed or implied.**
- Q144.** Regarding the Generative AI disclosure requirement (RFP §17.0): if a vendor's platform uses AI only for analytics or reporting features but not for core jury management operations, is disclosure still required? What specific level of GenAI usage triggers the disclosure obligation? **Vendors should disclose any use of Generative AI where it may materially impact system functionality, risk, or contractual performance; if GenAI is limited to analytics/reporting and has no such impact, disclosure is encouraged for transparency but may not be strictly required.**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q145.** Does the Court's own IT security policy currently permit SaaS vendors to process juror PII in cloud AI/ML pipelines for any purpose including anomaly detection or deduplication? **This is not currently defined in Court's Security Policies, however, SaaS vendors would need to provide a comprehensive list of use cases that include anomaly detection and duplication.**
- Q146.** Does the Court anticipate any renewal options beyond the initial five-year term (contract end September 1, 2031), and if so, under what conditions and pricing mechanisms would renewal be offered? **The Court may entertain options to extend and negotiate rates.**
- Q147.** The RFP lists a contract start date of September 2, 2026. Does "contract start" mean the date implementation activities begin, or the date by which the system must be fully operational and live? **Contract start indicates the date the contract is executed that would be followed by the project plan/implementation activities.**
- Q148.** Does the Court have a hard go-live deadline by which the new JMS must be fully operational and the legacy JSI system decommissioned? If so, what is that date? **No**
- Q149.** Is the Court open to a phased rollout — for example, deploying the new system at select court locations first before a full county-wide deployment? **No, the system is utilized by all locations**
- Q150.** What does "contract start date" of September 2, 2026 mean operationally — contract signing date or system go-live date? **Contract signing date**
- Q151.** For the mandatory demo week of June 22, will there be a standardized script or do vendors design their own flow? **Vendors will provide their own flow.**
- Q152.** Should Year 1 subscription pricing reflect a partial year given contract start of approximately September 2, or a full annual rate? **Full Year Rate**
- Q153.** For the mandatory demonstration (week of June 22, 2026), will the Court provide a standardized demonstration script or scenario set so all vendors are evaluated on a consistent, comparable basis? **No.**
- Q154.** What is the Court's payment schedule — milestone-based or calendar-based? **The court pays as the jurors' assignment ends.**
- Q155.** What is the Court's payment schedule — milestone-based or calendar-based? **The court pays as the jurors' assignment ends.**
- Q156.** How long are proposals expected to be, and is there a page limit? **There is no page limit.**
- Q157.** Are there any formatting requirements for the proposal — including font type, font size, margin width, or line spacing — that vendors must follow? **No**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q158.** For the USB flash drive submissions — must files follow a specific folder structure or naming convention, and are encrypted drives acceptable? **No – Do not include COST in the Non-Cost USB. Please only include COST in the Cost USB.**
- Q159.** Are vendors expected to respond to each SOW section sequentially, or organize the proposal around the evaluation criteria table? **Vendor can choose their format.**
- Q160.** Is a California seller's permit required even if the vendor is delivering a pure SaaS solution with no physical goods sold in California? **No.**
- Q161.** For the five client references requirement — must all five be California courts, or are references from other state court systems acceptable? **Other state court systems are acceptable**
- Q162.** Are resumes required for non-key personnel proposed for this engagement, or only for designated key staff? **Designated key staff**
- Q163.** If resumes are required for non-key personnel, may vendors submit representative or sample resumes rather than resumes of specific named individuals? **N/A**
- Q164.** May a vendor use a subcontractor's past performance and project experience to satisfy some or all of the five client reference requirements, and if so, must those references be clearly attributed to the subcontractor rather than the prime vendor? **Please see section 8.1.3 of the RFP document – References should be for whom the Bidder has provided similar goods and/or services for.**
- Q165.** Will the Court contact all five references or only those it selects, and during which evaluation week will reference checks occur? **Yes**
- Q166.** Must reference contacts be confirmed as available during the evaluation period, and should the proposal note they have been pre-notified? **References may be contacted via phone or email**
- Q167.** Must each of Attachments 3–11 be completed even if the vendor is not claiming DVBE or Small Business status? **Please review section 8.0 of the RFP document.**
- Q168.** Do any of the required forms or attachments (Attachments 3–11) require notarization, or is an authorized wet or digital signature sufficient for all forms? **Notarization is not required - Please see section 8.1.8 regarding questions for attachments 3-11.**
- Q169.** Must the architecture diagram and database schema be included in the main proposal body, or can they be submitted as appendices? **It can be submitted as appendices**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q170.** Can the Court provide sample data or template specifications for the Civil Collections Report, Canned Report Templates, and Annual Jury Survey Report to guide vendor proposal responses? – **Yes**
- Q171.** Please describe in general terms how the proposed system maps metadata from the current JSI database schema to the new schema, including juror ID, pool records, payment history, and case data. **This will be part of the data conversion discussions**
- Q172.** Please confirm which recurring services the Court expects vendors to price separately (e.g., SMS/text notifications, printing and mailing of summons, IVR hosting, data warehouse connectors), and whether there is a maximum number of additional line items permitted. **We prefer that the services be itemized.**
- Q173.** Are there liquidated damages, service credits, or penalty provisions in Attachment 2 for delayed go-live or missed SLAs? **Please refer to Attachment 2 – General Terms and Conditions for all penalty provisions.**
- Q174.** Are there liquidated damages provisions in Attachment 2 for missed SLAs or delayed go-live? **Please refer to Attachment 2 – General Terms and Conditions for all penalty provisions**
- Q175.** What is the Court's single busiest day on record for juror attendance, to validate the 600-jurors-in-45-minutes benchmark? **The busiest day for all 4 districts is approximately 800 jurors in a 90 minute time span.**
- Q176.** Are any of the 6 court locations geographically or network-isolated with limited bandwidth? **All locations have adequate & similiar bandwidth.**
- Q177.** Is the system capable of collecting and securely storing juror email addresses and cell phone numbers for electronic notifications (SMS/email)? What notification gateway or provider is used? **Yes. Outgoing messaging is handled by our IVR vendor Aumtech.**
- Q178.** In what file format does the Court currently receive data from the DMV, Registrar of Voters (ROV), and Franchise Tax Board (FTB)? Does the Court have existing data-sharing agreements with these agencies, or would the vendor need to establish new ones? **We have a data agreement and we receive an annual CSV file around October of each year.**
- Q179.** The SOW requires the system to automatically process DMV, ROV, and FTB data into a single source file annually at no cost. Does the Court currently use a specific data merge or deduplication tool, and are there known data quality challenges with the FTB source list? **Currently, a developer does it for us in SQL.**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q180.** What browsers and operating systems are supported for both the court staff interface and the juror-facing web portal? Is support for Windows 11 and Microsoft Edge confirmed?
Yes, and it should also support Chrome browser
- Q181.** For the SaaS offering, which cloud infrastructure provider(s) host the platform (e.g., AWS, Azure, GCP), and in which geographic region(s) are data centers located? Is all data stored and processed exclusively within the United States?
Yes
- Q182.** What uptime/availability SLA does the vendor guarantee for the SaaS solution? What is the advance notice period for planned maintenance windows? **During peak jury operations, the expected minimum availability is 99.99%. Planned maintenance windows are scheduled at least one week in advance.**
- Q183.** The SOW (§14.7.3) states that where juror or case-related information qualifies as CJI, the solution must comply with FBI CJIS Security Policy. Does the Court currently classify any juror data as CJI? If so, which data categories? **There are no CJIS compliance requirements for our JMS.**
- Q184.** Does the Court require the vendor to maintain all data in an exportable, non-proprietary format throughout the contract term to enable migration to another system at contract end? What specific data portability provisions are included in Attachment 2? **Yes**
- Q185.** Can the Court provide the current Annual Jury Survey report template or the Judicial Council of California's data submission format so vendors can confirm their system's compatibility with this mandatory report? **Created a 'Vendor Questions Attachments' folder and added the data points from the JCC.**
- Q186.** The SOW (§15.6) requires the ability to export jury data to Snowflake, Power BI, or other data warehouses. Does the Court already have a Snowflake instance or Power BI environment in place, or will the vendor need to configure connectors and pipelines from scratch?
Court already has a Snowflake instance in place. We will need guidance from the vendor regarding developing a pipeline.
- Q187.** What is the Court's current IVR vendor/platform if any, and what is its contract term?
Aumtech does the IVR setup as well as the VOIP configuration. It is an annual contract.
- Q188.** The IVR API must be securable via IP address and require at least two configurable pieces of information to verify the caller. Please confirm this is supported and describe the configuration options **The 2 pieces of information currently being used is the juror id and last name or last name and date of birth.**
- Q189.** How does the system handle IVR/IWR failures or outages — is there automatic fallback to manual processing, and how are jurors notified of system unavailability?
Currently we just use our staff in the assembly room if this happens.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q190.** Does the vendor provide a proprietary IVR/IWR system as part of the proposed solution, or does the system integrate with third-party IVR/IWR platforms? If third-party, which vendors are currently supported? **Aumtech is our IVR vendor and they use an API to connect to the current system to rely to the customer jury appearance information as well as prerecorded informational messages.**
- Q191.** Please describe the integration architecture between the JMS and the IVR/IWR system — is it real-time API-based, batch file exchange, or another method? What protocols are used (REST, SOAP, webhooks)? **Real time API.**
- Q192.** Does the IVR system support multilingual prompts? Given San Bernardino County's demographics, is Spanish-language support available out of the box? **Currently we have English & Spanish.**
- Q193.** Can jurors update their availability, request postponements, complete questionnaires, and retrieve verification forms via the IWR portal? What self-service functions are available online? **Yes, all of the drivers you identified above**
- Q194.** Does the Court require a formal Implementation Plan as a post-award contract deliverable with Court approval rights, or is the plan submitted in the proposal considered sufficient? **– Yes, provide a formal implementation plan**
- Q195.** What percentage of jurors currently complete questionnaires and check-in via the existing web portal vs. paper/phone? **85/90% of jurors complete questionnaires online. We do not currently have the capability to check-in online.**
- Q196.** What is the current summons print/mail vendor, and does the Court intend to re-bid that contract separately or bundle it with the JMS? **We currently use Infosend**
- Q197.** Will the Court provide dedicated IT and operational staff to support implementation activities (e.g., data extraction, UAT, training coordination), or is the vendor expected to manage implementation with minimal Court involvement? **IT Staff will be available as needed**
- Q198.** What is the current juror no-show / FTA rate, and how aggressively does the Court pursue FTA enforcement? **We have around 2,500 FTA per week and the court does NOT aggressively pursue enforcement.**
- Q199.** Can the Court provide the complete accounting string and General Ledger (GL) account code structure currently used for jury payments, so vendors can confirm compatibility with the Phoenix/SAP payment extract file format? **Yes**
- Q200.** Does the Phoenix/SAP payment extract interface have a published file layout specification the vendor can reference? **Yes**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q201.** The SOW (§5.1.6) requires the Jury Payment Extract file to conform to existing Court formatting for interfacing with Phoenix/SAP. Can the Court provide the current interface specification document or file layout requirements so vendors can confirm compatibility before finalizing their cost proposal? **Ultimately, the court simply needs a .csv file with the following columns:**
- Juror Name
 - Address
 - City
 - State
 - Zip
 - Fee type (which should include criminal fees, criminal mileage, civil fees, and civil mileage. There should be customizable parameters in case of other new or updated programs and fee types)
 - G/L (which will coincide with the fee type)
 - Amount
 - Jury End Date
- Q202.** How many distinct user accounts are currently active in the JSI system, broken down by role (clerks, jury administration, IT, management)? **250, Support Staff, Management Staff, System Administrator Staff**
- Q203.** Are all software updates, new feature releases, patches, and security remediations included in the SaaS subscription cost with no additional licensing or fees? Please confirm this also extends to mandated legislative changes per SOW §4.1.12. **Yes, and should include enhancements for legislative mandates**
- Q204.** What is the Court's current total number of court staff users requiring system access, and how many distinct court locations are in scope for the new JMS? **250, 5 locations**
- Q205.** Does the proposed solution support Role-Based Access Control (RBAC) mapped to the Court's three defined user roles (support staff, management staff, system administration)? Can additional custom roles be configured by the Court? **Not in our current system. The 3 roles should be sufficient for our needs.**
- Q206.** The SOW (§6.1.8) requires enterprise SSO using SAML 2.0 and/or OpenID Connect (OIDC), integrated with Microsoft Entra ID. Can the Court confirm the current Entra ID configuration, and whether any conditional access policies apply to third-party SaaS applications? **We have a conditional policy that doesn't allow access from out-of-country networks.**
- Q207.** What is the Court's current Microsoft Entra ID tenant configuration — federated or cloud-only — and are conditional access policies applied to third-party SaaS apps? **Hybrid. We sync our AD accounts & passwords to Azure. We have a conditional policy that doesn't allow access from out-of-country networks.**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q208.** Does the system support Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) for all user roles including court staff, system administrators, and any juror-facing portals? **Currently only system administrators must use MFA but we can enable Microsoft MFA for any necessary users**
- Q209.** For cloud hosting, does the Court require vendor-managed hosting, Court-managed hosting on a Court-owned cloud tenant, or is either acceptable? **Either is acceptable**
- Q210.** What are the minimum and maximum supported concurrent user thresholds for the proposed JMS, and how does the system scale (horizontally/vertically) to handle peak juror summons periods? **Minimum = 8, Maximum = 100**
- Q211.** What is the Court's current annual summons volume, total active juror records in the JSI system, and peak daily processing volume? **In 2025 we sent 966,715**
- Q212.** How does the vendor handle data validation and reconciliation post-migration? What audit tools or reports are provided to confirm data integrity after cutover? - **This will negotiate with the chosen vendor**
- Q213.** In what condition is the current JSI database — is it normalized SQL, or has it accumulated schema drift, orphaned records, and data quality issues over 20 years? – **Normalized MS SQL**
- Q214.** What is the approximate volume of historical records by category — juror records, summons records, payment records, and case records — that must be migrated from the JSI system? **Three years of records for each of the identified categories.**
- Q215.** What is the approximate total juror master pool size in records currently in the JSI system? **As of 2025 we have 1,038,066 active juror master pool records.**
- Q216.** Does the Court have a data retention policy that would allow purging of pre-cutoff records before migration, or must all 20 years of juror history be migrated? – **please see the following rules Records retention law (Gov Code §68152) ; Judicial Council policy (TCRM via Rule 10.854) ; Rules defining juror records as official court records (Rule 8.610) ; Confidentiality statutes (CCP §237)**
- Q217.** What is the typical timeline for a full data migration of this scope, and will a parallel run period be supported during which both the legacy and new systems operate simultaneously? - **This will negotiate with the chosen vendor**
- Q218.** Will the Court permit a "soft cutover" where new summons pools are created in the new system while legacy records remain accessible in JSI read-only during a defined transition window? - **This will negotiate with the chosen vendor**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q219.** Has the vendor previously performed a data migration from the Judicial Systems Incorporated (JSI) Juror Management System? If so, please describe the scope, timeline, and any known field-mapping challenges. – **No**
- Q220.** What is the vendor's standard data migration methodology? Please describe the process for data extraction, cleansing, transformation, validation, and cutover from the existing JSI system. – **The legacy system is a homegrown application that uses MS SQL. This will negotiate with the chosen vendor.**
- Q221.** What historical data types and record types does the migration cover? Are there any data types the system cannot ingest from a legacy JSI export? **Legacy system is MS SQL, which support standard datatypes.**
- Q222.** What data formats are accepted for migration import (e.g., CSV, XML, SQL dump)? Will the vendor require direct database access to the Court's current JSI system, or is a flat-file export sufficient? – **Legacy system is MS SQL, we can provide the SQL backup or CSV format**
- Q223.** What Document Management System (DMS) platform does the Court currently use (e.g., Laserfiche, OnBase, OpenText)? **We currently use LaserFiche.**
- Q224.** The SOW (§7.2) references support for Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD) terminals. Does the Court currently operate TDD terminals, and if so, at how many locations? - **The court does not currently operate TDD systems.**
- Q225.** Can the Court receive direct read-only access to the underlying database for its own ad hoc reporting and analytics needs, as referenced in the SaaS requirements? **Yes**
- Q226.** Regarding the geofenced mobile juror check-in capability, what geofence radius does the Court envision (e.g., within 100 meters, within the courthouse building)? Will the Court provide GPS coordinates or building boundary data to the vendor? **Yes**
- Q227.** What geofence radius does the Court envision for mobile juror check-in — building perimeter, parking lot, or city block? **Building perimeter**
- Q228.** Does the Court have a preference between AWS and Azure as the cloud hosting platform, given that the SOW references both as acceptable options? **We are more familiar with Azure**
- Q229.** Which version of the Tyler Enterprise Justice Case Management System is the Court currently running? **Enterprise Justice 2022.0.23** Does the Court already hold active API/Integration Toolkit licenses, or would the vendor need to obtain or facilitate this access? **The court has the license and will provide the Tyler Integration Toolkit**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- Q230.** The SOW (§8.1) requires initial training to be delivered within 60 days of contract execution. Is this a firm requirement, and does it apply to all court locations simultaneously or can it be phased by location? **The court is flexible on the approach but firm on the delivery timeline**
- Q231.** What training format does the Court prefer — on-site instructor-led, virtual/remote, self-paced e-learning, or a hybrid approach? Please also indicate the approximate number of staff users requiring training and the number of court locations. **The court would prefer a combination of in person, self-paced and virtual trainings. Onsite trainings could be centralized, and we could expect the initial team to be about 40-50 staff members including administrators, management and operations.**