**Questions and answers on the Jury Management System RFP (RFP #: 2023-003)**

1. How many summonses/questionnaires does the State (each court combined) mail annually?

*About 400,000*

1. Is the State acquiring a jury platform on its own and offering it to the local counties/jurisdictions or is each court responsible for paying for their own use?

*The AOC is acquiring the solution and will pay for at least the first few years. If there is a usage fee beyond the first few years, it will be subsidized at some level.*

1. How would the State handle paying for recurring services that each court uses like summons production and text messaging?

*This will be a combination of local and state funding. The electronic notifications will likely be done through the AOC service, eCourtDate, while the printed summons and notifications will be handled by the local courts.*

1. Is that State interested in self-service functions like phone and portal?

*Yes, the AOC is very interested in all self-service functions. It may be beneficial to price them separately, or at least clearly identify those functions.*

1. How is the State currently involved with each court in providing jury management software/services?

*Currently the AOC provides potential juror lists. The AOC is in the process of hiring a jury management expert who will provide guidance to local courts on how to effectively and efficiently manage the jury process.*

1. Is the State changing the way it is involved with courts regarding jury? Is the goal to get all the courts on the same software, managed by the State?

*There is not a plan by the AOC to replace any of the existing Jury Management Systems. If a court chooses to move to the new system, we will help them with that process.*

1. Will the State post the required Master Services Agreement – Attachment 1 for this opportunity to the Procurement Website?

*The MSA has been posted.*

1. To ensure that vendor responses are of the quality expected by the NV AOC, would the AOC be willing to extend the due date of final proposals by at least 2 weeks? This timeframe takes into consideration the Memorial Day holiday and the allotted time between questions due (5/26) and final due date (6/1) requiring any addenda items that may be identified from vendor questions.

*The schedule has been adjusted.*

1. The Cost Workbook Instruction tab makes mention of an eFiling system. Is there a different Cost Workbook specific for this Jury Management System RFP, or should eFiling system be replaced with Jury Management System and then the Cost Workbook applies?

*The AOC is using the same cost template as the eFiling system. We have corrected the typo, but will accept either that accompanies the RFP response.*

1. How many Courts should be assumed to be included in the overall project to properly provide pricing as requested?

*There are 70+ courts in Nevada. All will use the jury list service. Over half will use the full jury management solution that is implemented as part of this proposal.*

1. How many users will utilize the new Jury Management System?

*Approximately 150 users.*

1. Can the AOC provide how many summons are produced annually throughout all of the Courts?

*See question #1, about 400,000*

1. Does each court have to manage the summons printing and mailing process on their own currently?

*Correct*

1. Would the AOC prefer summons printing and mailing services to be mailed from within the United States?

*Yes, within the United States.*

1. Does the AOC prefer vendors to include functionality for document scanning/attachment?

*Please price as an option.*

1. Does the AOC have an approval process for the juror selection randomization algorithm?

*The AOC does not. We rely on NCSC to advise us in this area.*

1. Should vendors assume pricing submitted in the cost workbook should be for all courts within the state implemented as one project?

*Yes*

a) If yes - can the AOC provide the list of all of the courts that will need to be included in the implementation and also:

*See the answer to Question #18.*

-How many users will require log-ins to the JMS for each Court?

*It will average about 3-4 for each court. Some will be 2, with a few who require 10 users with log-ins.*

-How many potential jurors each of the Courts summons on an annual bases?

*We have numbers that vary from 100 to 12,500 to 310,000, depending on the court.*

-How often does each court pull jurors for jury duty?

*It varies based upon the jurisdiction, how many jury trials they do in a year, what sources of juror lists they have. The state refreshes our list once a year.*

-How many days of system pre-go-live training each court would like?

*Based upon your experiences with other installations, we would like to see your recommendations.*

-How many days of system post-go-live training each court would like?

*Based upon your experiences with other installations, we would like to see your recommendations.*

b) If no to question 2: What specific courts would the AOC prefer vendors to provide pricing for in response to this RFP?

-How many users will require log-ins to the JMS for each Court?

-How many potential jurors each of the Courts summons on an annual bases?

-How often does each court pull jurors for jury duty?

-How many days of system pre-go-live training each court would like?

-How many days of system post-go-live training each court would like?

1. If there is not a specific list of Courts, can the AOC commit to a minimum number of Courts to allow the vendors to recognize economies of scale and price appropriately?

*There are 70+ courts in Nevada. All will use the jury list service. Over half of the courts (35+) will use the full jury management solution included in the proposal.*

1. Does the AOC prefer a single system for all courts or would the preference be for each location have its own instance?

*Each court should have their own instance, either virtual or physical. Cloud solutions are preferred.*

1. Are the instances of jury consistent from one setup/county to another?  In other words, are we designing the system once and doing a copy/paste?  Or, is each system customized/configured individually?

*It is recommended we use the same configuration, so design once and deploy in multiple instances.*

1. What level of connection, if any, is needed between locations?

*There is not a connection requirement between courts.*

1. Will the Jury management system need to integrate with all 6 CMS management systems listed on page 2 of the RFP?

*Where appropriate, some level of integration is preferred. This can be part of the negotiation process.*

1. Can the AOC further define what specifically is expected for the configuration settings on page 2 of the RFP?

*While the AOC would like to have a single configuration that is common across the state, we also need to allow for individual court configurations on selective items. The preference is to have a system where most/all of it can be configured/updated/changed centrally while preserving select localizations.*

1. Has the AOC seen demonstrations of Jury Management Systems from any vendor prior to this RFP?

*Some of the AOC staff have seen Jury Management Systems in prior jobs.*

1. Can the AOC clarify what is needed for Requirement: 300 Notify/Sanction FTA Jurors "See Summons & Qualify Jurors # 12"

*Thank you for noticing. It should read “See Summons & Qualify Jurors # 130”*

1. Who are the current Jury System Management providers?

*The AOC does not have that information.*

1. Do any databases need to be converted into the new Jury Management system?

*None at this point. If a jurisdiction with an existing system decides to utilize the state sponsored JMS, we’ll work with that jurisdiction and the vendor to convert the data.*

27a) If so- please provide a list of each database and the associated size.

27b) If so- how many images are in the databases that need to be converted?

1. Does the AOC prefer the pricing for implementation include travel costs?

*Pricing must include all required components. If travel is required, then that must be included. If optional, it should be included as an optional item.*

1. Does the AOC prefer the pricing for implementation be on-site or remote?

*The AOC has adopted a cloud first strategy, so our preference is a cloud based solution. The AOC will consider an on-site solution that is housed at the AOC (either Las Vegas or Carson City).*

1. Does the AOC prefer the pricing for training be on-site or remote?

*Remote training usually works best although the AOC has on-site training facilities as well.*

1. Can the AOC provide a list of all necessary integrations?

*The AOC does not envision tight integration with the CMSs, but also recognizes there may be integrations we have not considered beyond loose connections between case numbers and the jurors and some potential financial ties (juror payments). The AOC is interested in what other integrations are suggested and welcomes those as options in subsequent phases.*

1. Does the AOC allow for any system development, support or data conversion to be completed outside of the United States?

*Everything should be done within the United States.*

1. If a vendor has optional pricing for the AOC to consider, how would that be best presented, in the cost workbook or throughout the RFP PDF portfolio response?

*Optional pricing can be included in a separate tab on the workbook.*

1. Does the AOC need the juror portal to be multi-lingual?

*Not at this point.*

1. If Courts/jurisdictions are allowed to maintain their current vendor, will company awarded be responsible for their jury list revisions?

*The jury lists supplied by the AOC will be cleansed and standardized by the company awarded with this contract.*

1. Can the AOC provide further details/explanation on the definition of a “waived off” juror? Is this a summonsed juror that was ultimately not needed for that day?

*These are potential jurors who are excused from duty or deferred to another date.*

1. How often will Jury list revisions need to occur?

*Jury lists supplied by the AOC are refreshed annually. Lists that are supplied locally are on varied schedules.*

**Questions and answers on the Jury Management System RFP (RFP #: 2023-003)**

1. Is the AOC envisioning a Countywide installation meaning one database per county, where the court locations within the specific county would use the county-wide database (for example, Washoe and Lyon County)? Or are you looking for 70+ database installations?

A: Without dictating the solution, we envision courts being able to work from a single data source, while maintaining local autonomy. All jury management will happen from a county perspective.

1. Does the AOC have any thoughts of centralizing/consolidating to a single statewide database? This would require standardizing business practices to facilitate jury process but would still allow for some variations in the way business is done per court location.

A: See answer #38

1. Will the Courts only using the "jury list service" be providing an exclusion file for jurors who are not eligible due to excusal or other instances? If yes, will the file be in a format specified by the vendor, or will the vendor be required to convert the file?

A: If the court uses such a list, it will be in the format specified by the vendor with input from the AOC.

1. If vendor has to convert the file, will it be a single standardized format, or will each location have its own format that the vendor would have to convert?

A: Not sure what file this references, The AOC will work with the vendor to standardize file formats wherever possible.

1. A summons from court A is the Same as court B but with court information as the only difference. (Standardized)

A: Correct.

1. 31 - answers doc refers to "subsequent phases" Can you explain that in more detail?

31. Can the AOC provide a list of all necessary integrations?

*The AOC does not envision tight integration with the CMSs, but also recognizes there may be integrations we have not considered beyond loose connections between case numbers and the jurors and some potential financial ties (juror payments). The AOC is interested in what other integrations are suggested and welcomes those as options in subsequent phases.*

A: As integrations are identified during contract negotiations, some may be deferred to subsequent phases of the project depending upon maturity of the integration, readiness and willingness of other vendors, etc.

1. Is AOC considering a phased-in implementation, or that all participating courts will go live at the same time?

A: This will be determined in great degree by the solution offered by the vendor, and will be part of the contract negotiations.

1. Can you share the list of attendees at the Bidder’s Conference and their company affiliations?

A:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Attendees | Company Affiliations |
| Goddard, Phillip | Tyler Technology  |
| Dean Goddette | Sonant |
| Maddie Flowers | Catalis |
| Ryan Crowley | Catalis |
| Arntsen, John | Tyler Technology |
| Naomi Skopec | Catalis |
| Thomas, Sophia | Tyler Technology |
| Nasution, Bona | Tyler Technology |
| Layne Dunn | Avenu insights |
| Farr, Sarah | Tyler Technology |
| Patrick Dalton | Judicial Systems |
| Rachelle Arizmendi | Avenu Insights |

1. How many data sources will need to be merged to create a statewide database?

A: Currently there is one data source from the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation (DETR). There are other sources in recently passed legislation that may be included at some point (the sources may have federal requirements that prohibit their inclusion, so that needs to be worked out first).

1. How should we price the variability of courts signing up? Should we price for half of the summons and then provide a per summons price for additional members? Or should we price per summons regardless of number of sites.

A: This is really up to the vendors to determine the best way to implement as well as the pricing. It is anticipated that some of these details will be worked through in contract negotiations.

1. How is the Implementation cost being handled? Will this be allocated to the member courts or will the State assume responsibility for this? Or is there a hybrid model being contemplated?

A: See answer #2.

1. What’s the expectation of Training and Go Live support as it pertains to the courts; should we plan to provide on-site support at all courts or regional centers or remote?
A: See answer #30. We have the capability to do training at our training center, to do remote, or to do hybrid.
2. Will we conduct train-the-trainer for AOC staff, and they will train end users? (Q & A references remote training)

A: If this is the best approach we can accommodate this.

1. Is AOC anticipating a need for a 2nd-generation training later in the project?

A: The vendors would know better what is most effective. The AOC looks forward to your response.

1. Can the AOC provide “Exhibit 2 – State Information Security Program Policy”, mentioned in the Attachment 1 MSA document?

A: If you search for Nevada State Information Security Program Policy it is likely the first result that will appear in the list.

https://it.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/itnewnvgov/content/Governance/Security/FINAL\_100\_State\_Security\_Program\_Policy.pdf