

***First Judicial District of Pennsylvania’s (“FJD”)
Request for Proposal (“RFP”)***

For

***Case Management System User Interface Design,
Application Logic, and Database Enhancement
Services***

February 23, 2024

VENDOR’S QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (“Q&A”)
<https://courts.phila.gov>

Q1. Can companies from Outside U.S.A. apply for this (e.g., from India or Canada)?

A1: Yes. However, please note Section 6(h) within the RFP, *Prohibition on Foreign Corporations*, which states that “[a]ny Vendor, being a foreign, non-US corporation or operating under a fictitious or assumed name, will not receive a contract award, unless the Vendor has complied or has agreed to comply with the regulations governing proper registration under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and as otherwise required by the FJD. Vendors incorporated in another state shall provide registration documentation to establish that the corporation can conduct business in Pennsylvania.”

Q2. Will companies need to come over there for meetings?

A2: While many tasks relating to the RFP are anticipated to be accomplishable remotely, FJD reserves the right to require a vendor to arrive onsite, where appropriate, to provide services.

Q3. Can we perform the tasks (related to the RFP) outside U.S.A. (e.g., from India or Canada)?

A3: Yes, but please understand that All FJD data is required to be maintained, always, within the U.S.A. and the access of the FJD’s network will be limited (see Section 2(a)(i) of the RFP, which states that the Case Management System (“CMS”) is “[c]urrently not web-based, so is inaccessible outside of the FJD’s network”).

Q4. Can we submit the proposals via email?

A4: No. All proposals must be submitted in a sealed envelope to *Case Management System User Interface Design, Application Logic, and Database Enhancement Services RFP*, First Judicial District of Pennsylvania, Procurement Unit, 368 City Hall, Philadelphia,

Pennsylvania 19107, no later than 3:00 P.M., Friday, March 8, 2024. Late proposals will not be considered regardless of the reason.

Q5. Will you consider a proposal where we replace your Oracle based CMS with a cloud-based CMS based on Microsoft technology?

A5: Yes. Deviation from the RFP scope is permissible, where recommended as a better solution by the vendor, but reasoning for deviating must be specified within vendor's proposal.

Q6. What was the FJD's reasoning for moving away from the previous RFP for a Commercial of the Shelf ("COTS") CMS?

A6: For information relating to a previously issued and closed RFP, please complete the appropriate request form, which may be found, along with policies and fee schedules, at <https://www.courts.phila.gov/publicaccess/>.

Q7. Are companies permitted to respond to the current RFP with a COTS CMS, and if so, will the FJD consider a COTS CMS?

A7: Yes. Deviation from the RFP scope is permissible, where recommended as a better solution by the vendor, but reasoning for deviating must be specified within vendor's proposal.

Q8. Would the FJD consider a proposal for a stand-alone electronic filing ("e-Filing") system that can integrate with the existing Banner CMS?

A8: Yes.

Q9. Would you be open to consider an all-in-one solution that caters specifically to the public sector?

A9: Yes.

Q10. What is the FJD's strategy/plan for multilingual users?

A10: While not a primary focus, the FJD remains open to considering solutions with multilingual capabilities.

Q11. How many cases does each division handle per week, month, and year?

A11: Court of Common Pleas, Civil Division handles thirty thousand plus (30,000+) active cases in inventory, with approximately four thousand (4,000) new cases filed monthly, as well as nine thousand plus (9,000+) electronic filings weekly.

In 2023, Court of Common Pleas, Family Division had nine thousand thirty-nine (9,039) domestic violence filings with twenty-six thousand two hundred eighty (26,280) orders, twenty-one thousand five hundred five (21,505) custody filings with thirty-one thousand four hundred seventy-nine (31,479) orders, and seventeen thousand seven hundred forty-seven (17,747) divorce filings with three thousand eight hundred sixty-one (3,861) orders.

Municipal Court averages approximately fifty-four thousand (54,000) new case filings annually, or four thousand five hundred (4,500) monthly, and one thousand forty (1,040) weekly.

The Civil Mental Health Program handles approximately one hundred fifty (150) weekly, six hundred sixty (660) monthly, and seven thousand nine hundred fifty (7,950) per year.

Q12. Does FJD have an internal, appointed product owner?

A12: No, but FJD does have internal FJD Information Technology (“IT”) and business super user staff that can fill such a role during the project.

Q13. Does FJD have an internal, appointed user experience (“UX”) designer?

A13: No.

Q14. What percentage of users are internal versus external?

A14: FJD Banner has about five hundred (500) internal users, with online searches being conducted by an undetermined number of public users. CLAIMS has approximately eighty-five percent (85%) external and fifteen percent (15%) internal. The Civil Mental Health Program has three-hundred forty-five (345) active users, with nine (9) of those being internal.

Q15. How many different types of users will be using the platform?

A15: Judges, judicial staff, administrators, legal clerks, outside attorneys, self-represented litigants, and special users such as justice partners, writ service companies, and municipal agencies.

For the Civil Mental Health Program System, there are currently eight different types of users:

- **Administration – full access.**
- **Court Clerk – limited access so to accept incoming petitions.**
- **FJD Administrator – full access.**
- **Hearing Officer – access limited to their assigned lists and ability to enter orders.**
- **Patient Attorney (e.g., public defender or Court appointed counsel) – read only access to whole platform.**
- **Petitioner Attorney (e.g., City of Philadelphia Solicitors) read only access to whole platform.**
- **DBHA – read access limited to their filings.**

Q16. How many different levels of permission will be needed?

A16: FJD Banner currently requires several, and within levels, specific functionality permissions. Document Management System will need nine (9). CLAIMS has seventeen (17) main user roles but there are a total of forty (40) user roles. Civil Mental Health Program will need the appropriate amount of permission levels to accommodate the eight (8) user types described in A15.

Q17. *In watching the FJD demonstration, several different user paths / workflows were observed. Can FJD provide an estimate of how many total workflows would need to be audited and accounted for within the redesign?*

A17: FJD is unable to provide an estimate currently. Regarding the Civil Mental Health Program System, there is a primary workflow, where petitioners file one (1) of five (5) available petitions, which are then assigned to a hearing list and subsequently disposed of by a Hearing Officer.

Q18. *Can an estimate be provided as to how many workflows are internal versus external?*

A18: While an estimate cannot be provided by FJD at this time, it is believed there are significantly less external electronic filing workflows as compared to internal Case Management System workflows.

Q19. *Has a vendor helped FJD draft the RFP? If so, are they allowed to bid on this RFP?*

A19: Two (2) independent contractors who assist the FJD IT staff with maintaining the current FJD Banner CMS and e-Filing environments helped develop Attachments A & D of the RFP. Neither will bid on this RFP.

Q20. *Has FJD seen any demonstrations of solutions? If so, which ones?*

A20: FJD has not seen any solution demonstrations for this RFP. FJD has seen various COTS CMS demonstrations as part of a different, previously issued, and closed RFP. For historical information, please complete the appropriate request form, which may be found, along with policies and fee schedules, at <https://www.courts.phila.gov/publicaccess/>.

Q21. *What are the risks FJD is concerned about with this project?*

A21: FJD is concerned it will not be able to identify every detail within the Case Management System, which has been modified over a couple of decades in which it has been in use, to where currently available functionality will become lost.

Q22. *Does FJD have any budget for this project?*

A22: Yes.

Q23. *What is the timeline for this project?*

A23: Upon completion of the procurement process, FJD desires to contract with the awarded vendor and proceed as soon as possible. The overall project implementation timeline will be dependent on the proposed solution.

Q24. *What is the technology used by (a) Case Management System, (b) FJD Banner (Oracle Forms), (c) e-Filing System (portal), (d) CLAIMS (web), (e) Civil Docket (web)?*

A24: FJD Banner, e-Filing, and the Civil Docket use PL/SQL, PHP, .NET, WebLogic, and Oracle DB. CLAIMS is a third-party hosted product.

Q25. *Can vendors have access to the source code for the Oracle Forms and CLAIMS applications so to use an assessment tool which evaluates the code for more accurate project estimation?*

A25: No.

Q26. *Does the FJD IT team have experience with Oracle APEX?*

A26: No.

Q27. *Is FJD expecting to unify all applications in one database? If so, would it be Oracle DB 19c?*

A27: Unifying into one database is ideal. If staying with Oracle, it should at least be Oracle DB 19c. However, FJD is open to reviewing all proposed recommendations.

Q28. *For the user interface design, are there any specific user personas or accessibility guidelines (e.g., Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (“WCAG”) 2.1, Section 508 Amendment to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973) that vendor’s solution should prioritize to ensure inclusivity and compliance?*

A28: Nothing specific required by FJD, but please propose user interface designs which align with industry standard accessibility guidelines as they are understood by vendor.

Q29. *Can FJD provide details on the specific Application Programming Interfaces (“APIs”) (e.g., RESTful, SOAP) and data exchange formats (e.g., JSON, XML) preferred by the FJD for the purpose of integrating the new CMS with existing infrastructure? Any preferences for the purpose of integrating existing CMS with one another?*

A29: FJD is without identified preferences currently but are open to reviewing those identified as recommended with reasoning within vendor’s proposed solutions.

Q30. *Could FJD provide details on the expected scalability requirements for the database post-enhancement, such as projected increases in transaction volumes and concurrent user support, to ensure vendor’s enhancements are precisely tailored to accommodate anticipated growth and evolving usage scenarios?*

A30: FJD does not project increases in transaction volumes or concurrent users from what is identified within the current environment.

Q31. *Are there particular programming languages or frameworks that the project mandates or prefers, reflecting the current technological ecosystem and future direction?*

A31: FJD is open to reviewing vendor’s proposed industry standard recommendations and options which can be effectively maintained while remaining cost effective.

Q32. *Could FJD provide clarity on any regulations, such as Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (“HIPAA”), Criminal Justice Information Services (“CJIS”), or other pertinent data protection laws that the system must comply with?*

A32: FJD is not a HIPAA covered entity and this RFP generally involves civil case information. However, certain data within the overall platform will be part of sealed court records and should be handled with strict confidentiality. Relevant laws can be found

within the *Case Records Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania* at <https://www.pacourts.us/public-records>.

Q33. *Could vendors get into specifics regarding the databases presently utilized, like SQL Server, Oracle, or any NoSQL variants, and discuss the anticipated complexities in migrating or interfacing with the new system?*

A33: Yes.

Q34. *Does the preference lean towards a declarative setup, utilizing tools for visual workflows and configuration, or is there an inclination for direct custom coding for more complex or unique workflow requirements?*

A34: FJD is currently without an identified preference as both would be useful for different types of workflows. FJD is open to reviewing vendor's proposed industry standard recommendations and options which can be effectively maintained while remaining cost effective.

Q35. *Can FJD clarify on the required security protocols for user access? Specifically, are advanced authentication methods, such as multi-factor authentication ("MFA") or biometric verification, and integration with existing identity management systems like Active Directory or OAuth providers, envisaged to ensure secure and controlled access?*

A35: The Case Management System uses Active Directory Security Groups and homegrown authentication, while CLAIMS and the Civil Mental Health Program System use Active Directory Security Groups. Initial user access in the Civil Mental Health Program occurs through a new user providing a written request for access and court staff verify identity via a telephone interview to determine requestor is authorized to file.

Q36. *Can FJD specify the critical data points and reporting formats, such as case duration metrics, case outcome analyses, or workload distributions, that are vital for FJD operations? What is FJD's preference between real-time analytics for immediate insight and batch processing for comprehensive data analysis?*

A36: FJD references the National Center for State Courts ("NCSC") CourTools trial court performance measures, which can be found at <https://www.ncsc.org/courtools>.

Q37. *Can FJD explain the specific requirements that the organization envisions for mobile responsiveness and functionality within the new CMS? This includes any standards for design, performance metrics for load times, or adaptive layouts ensuring optimal user experience across different devices.*

A37: While without specific requirements currently, FJD is interested in having certain aspects of the overall solution being compatible with mobile devices.

Q38. *Can FJD specify which existing judicial or legal systems, such as e-Filing platforms, court scheduling systems, or document management tools, require direct integration?*

A38: FJD cannot currently specify as direct integration requirements is believed to be dependent upon vendor's proposed solution.

Q39. *Can FJD detail which forms, and documents need customizing and describe the anticipated level of complexity such as whether FJD envisions simple field additions or more complex, dynamic forms that incorporate conditional logic, integration with other systems, or automated workflows?*

A39: Petitions, notices of court events, and case management orders will not involve much complexity, being templates with variables pointing to data in a database. More complexity is anticipated with orders entered by judiciary.

Q40. *Can FJD specify which email and communication platforms, such as Microsoft Outlook, Slack, or others, are essential for integration?*

A40: FJD currently uses Microsoft Outlook and Office 365.

Q41. *Can FJD specify which third-party services or APIs, such as document management systems, legal research tools, or other essential software, need integration with the new CMS?*

A41: FJD uses API, sFTP, SOAP, and REST to communicate with third parties.

Q42. *Can a Certificate of Authority replace a Power of Attorney Document?*

A42: Yes, where said Certificate of Authority identifies by name and title the officer or agent signing the proposal.

Q43. *Does the pricing section need to be a separate document from the approach?*

A43: No.

Q44. *Please provide a glossary of the acronyms and terms used in Attachment D of the RFP.*

A44: Document Management System (“DMS”), Release from Prison (“RIN”), Protection from Abuse (“PFAD”), Court Notices (“HOV”).

Q45. *What are the key performance indicators for both FJD IT and business processes that FJD aims to improve as part of modernization efforts?*

A45: Some include new developed features, number of critical bugs, server downtime, mean time to repair, and technology related expenses as compared to revenue.

Q46. *What roles and personas interact with each of the user interface excerpts in the RFP?*

A46: See A15.

Q47. *How is user access managed for internal FJD users, CLAIMS users, and Civil Mental Health Program System users?*

A47: Managed through Active Directory Security Groups. Process completed mostly by internal administrative staff using applications with tools to establish and change accessibility for groups or individual users.

Q48. *What are the roles and personas, internal and external, that require access to reporting capabilities over CLAIMS data and Civil Mental Health Program System, respectively?*

A48: CLAIMS requires administrator and user administrator roles to have full access, whereas the calendar administrator and supervisor roles require more limited access. Civil Mental Health Program System requires the system administrator and internal user administrator access to report to the Philadelphia Department of Health and Human Services as well as to the Pennsylvania State Police.

Q49. *What types of phased modernization approaches has FJD considered to offset risks at go live?*

A49: FJD will consider any phased approach if and as recommended by vendors when proposing their respective solution.

Q50. *What, if any, are the key milestone dates that FJD is targeting as part of a modernization effort, and what is driving those milestone dates?*

A50: Milestone dates have not been given by FJD currently. Lifetime support policies of the technologies currently in use are driving, in part, the need for modernization.

Q51. *What are the most urgent capabilities that FJD requires from a modernized solution?*

A51: Web based access outside of FJD's internal network, workflow configuration with technical support, improved user experience (e.g., unified dashboards as opposed to navigating through multiple screens to retrieve information and perform tasks).

Q52. *What skills and programming languages do FJD developers have the most experience with, and what languages are FJD developers most interested in acquiring?*

A52: .NET and Microsoft based programming languages.

Q53. *What IT server infrastructure is hosting the current Contexte used by FJD for CLAIMS and the Civil Mental Health Program System?*

A53: VMware.

Q54. *What public cloud platforms are currently in use at FJD, and how are those cloud platforms currently used?*

A54: FJD is in the initial stage of using Microsoft Azure.

Q55. *What public cloud platforms does FJD plan to use going forward, and how are those cloud platforms planning to be used?*

A55: Microsoft Azure as a primary IT operational environment.

Q56. *How are forms, emails, and attachments stored in the existing system?*

A56: Emails are stored with user accounts and/or with parties named in filings. Individual filing attachments are stored on the docket connected by either direct upload or with a barcoded scan coversheet to connect to a specific case. A forms library is used.

Q57. *How do the data structures, access requirements, application logic, and business processes of the Court of Common Pleas, Trial Division, differ from that of the Court of Common Pleas, Family Division?*

A57: Differences mostly are found in the business process, with Family Division cases being more linear whereas cases for Trial Division, Civil, have alternate paths based on case type and filing practices.

Q58. *What additional FJD tools or platforms interact with the current system to interact with or extract data?*

A58: SQL Loader and Tableau.

Q59. *What data retention policies are applicable to data stored within CLAIMS and the Mental Health Program System data?*

A59: Court of Common Pleas and Municipal Court follow the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts' Record Retention & Disposition Schedule with Guidelines as found at <https://www.pacourts.us> and as required by 204 Pa. Code § 213.51.

Q60. *What is FJD's long-term strategy with respect to Banner?*

A60: FJD wishes to replace it with a modernized solution.

Q61. *What criteria did FJD use to prioritize the important capabilities of a modernized solution?*

A61: Potential impact on business operations as well as budget, including how capabilities will address an organizational need or fill an existing gap.

Q62. *How would FJD be interested in sharing the intellectual property developed as part of this project with other court systems – including, but not limited to, the other judicial districts within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?*

A62: FJD, anticipating having ownership in any work product or deliverable a vendor provides under an agreement stemming from this RFP, would consider such matters at the appropriate time.

Q63. *What experience does FJD have in facilitating training of internal users when deploying new and enhanced IT systems.*

A63: FJD staff have helped develop many of the systems currently in use and have successfully trained current users.

Q64. *What training modalities does FJD typically employ? Would FJD be open to new training modalities?*

A64: Instructor led, written documentation materials, on the job shadowing, collaborative training, as well as coaching and mentoring. Yes, FJD is open to new training modalities.

Q65. *What project communication and change adoption activities will FJD perform as part of this modernization effort?*

A65: FJD is open to reviewing vendor's recommendations.

Q66. *What is the payment gateway used to accept e-Filing payments and how is it currently integrated with the e-Filing application?*

A66: PayPal.

Q67. *It was mentioned in the demonstration that users cannot update large amount of data that came from e-Filing into Banner. Is that a constraint with Banner or user process?*

A67: e-Filing restricts large sized documents so to not congest the network.

Q68. *What is the volume of filings that come from the Guardian Tracking System ("GTS") into Banner? How does that process work?*

A68: For information, please go to <https://ujportal.pacourts.us/guardianship/overview>.

Q69. *What are the new functionalities that are currently paper based that you are looking to incorporate into the new system (e.g., court order entry)?*

A69: Issuing court orders, third party filings, answers, garnishee filings, and intervenor actions.

Q70. *Can FJD provide a list of functional requirements categorized as "must have" versus "good to have" within e-File, Civil CMS, Orphans' CM, Family CM, CLAIMS CM, and Civil Mental Health Program systems?*

A70: Must have single case electronic filing for attorneys and self-represented litigants, bulk scheduling of cases, payment integration, read-only access to court calendar, ability to upload exhibits while the case is in process and after filing, ability to file second and post-trial actions electronically, email notification for major case and hearing events. Would like to have guided filing for self-represented litigants, category driven searches, and ability to send reports to those otherwise external to the system.

Q71. *Can FJD list different user roles that are available in each of the internal applications that are in scope (i.e., Civil CMS, Orphans' CM, Family CM, CLAIMS CM, and Civil Mental Health Program systems)?*

A71: See A15.

Q72. *Please list the number of PL/SQL Stored Procedures that are integrated into Civil CMS, Orphans' CM, Family CM, CLAIMS CM, and Civil Mental Health Program applications.*

A72: Civil CMS and Orphans' CMS have about seven hundred eighty-one (781), while Family CMS has about sixty-five (65). CLAIMS and Civil Mental Health Program applications are third party hosted.

Q73. *Please list the current number of APIs that are built into Civil CMS, Orphans' CM, Family CM, CLAIMS CM, and Civil Mental Health Program systems and their purpose.*

A73: Civil CMS has two (2), Sheriff and Register of Wills, while Orphans' CMS has two (2), Guardian Tracking System ("GTS") and Orphans' Division Financials. CLAIMS is without any APIs, but several integrations were built as custom integrations (e.g., nightly cashier export, judgement export, satisfaction export, bulk satisfaction export, agency exports for hearing results and approved cases, *legal intelligencer* export, document conversion, PayPal, and city agencies).

Q74. *Please list the number of notification templates that exist in the system.*

A74: CLAIMS has seventeen (17) email notification templates.

Q75. *What is the current authentication process and methods that are in place for internal users in the Civil CMS, Orphans' CM, Family CM, CLAIMS CM, and Civil Mental Health Program systems?*

A75: FJD uses an in-house built authentication. See A35 and A47. For CLAIMS, internal users are created and monitored by the administrator.

Q76. *What are the applications involved in managing credentials of external users that are self-registered using e-File? How is the integration handled? Are they part of Active Directory as well?*

A76: FJD uses an in-house built security application to manage external users' credentials which is not part of Active Directory. Self-registered e-File users have unique accounts to access the e-Filing System so to manage their own accounts with tools available via the e-Filing System. CLAIMS, however, does not permit self-registration, with accounts created by FJD staff and added to a user list of all filers. Once the account is created, the user can update emails and passwords without FJD intervention. For Civil Mental Health Program System, see A35.

Q77. *What is the retention policy for cases that are created? What is the current archival process that is in place?*

A77: See A59. Please also See <https://www.phmc.pa.gov/Archives/Records-Management/Documents/RM-2002-County-Records-Manual-2017-Update.pdf>

Q78. *Do judges or other internal users have access to current intranet applications (not Banner but any other) on mobile devices? Would it be a nice to have to be able to access all or a subset (e.g., motion tracking) of applications to have mobile compliance user interface?*

A78: Generally, no. Having ability to access applications on mobile devices would be welcomed. While CLAIMS is a web-based application, to where judiciary does have mobile access, an improved experience would be beneficial.

Q79. *Please provide the total number of users by internal application (i.e., Civil CMS, Orphans' CM, Family CM, CLAIMS CM, and Civil Mental Health Program systems).*

A79: Civil and Orphans' have a collective total of one thousand three hundred forty-eight (1,348) users. Family CMS has nine hundred eighty-two (982). FJD does not have a user count for only internal CLAIMS users. Civil Mental Health Program System has three hundred forty-five (345).

Q80. *Please provide the approximate volume of reports which need to be developed by application (i.e., Civil CMS, Orphans' CM, Family CM, CLAIMS CM, and Civil Mental Health Program systems).*

A80: About five hundred (500) reports. CLAIMS has forty-four (44) canned reports, but building custom reports based on queries to the database with the ability to integrate charts and graphs is desired. Civil Mental Health Program System has monthly reports, but ability to have more category-based reporting that could also be produced more frequently is desired.

Q81. *How does one determine within the e-Filing application if a defender is a first-time filer automatically? Are there any APIs available that can be consumed to find this information?*

A81: Currently, the filer indicates their status and FJD staff confirms upon submission review. No API is available to find this information. Developing an indicator within the database is preferred.

Q82. *Are there any search requirements that need to go against the content of documents in repository?*

A82: Currently, this is not a primary focus, but is a future consideration for FJD.

Q83. *Are these applications high availability 24/7 application in the current setting? Can they be unavailable for weekly or monthly scheduled maintenances?*

A83: e-Filing, CLAIMS, and Civil Mental Health Program System are high availability twenty-four hours daily, seven days weekly (24/7) applications. Scheduled maintenance with minimal periods of unavailability after hours or on weekends is preferred.

Q84. *Please provide the volume of cases by application (i.e., Civil CMS, Orphans' CM, Family CM, CLAIMS CM, and Civil Mental Health Program systems).*

A84: See A11. CLAIMS has three hundred twenty-four thousand, five-hundred forty-eight (324,548) cases between 2018 through 2023, three hundred fifty-five thousand, two-hundred fifty-six (355,256) dispositions, and eight hundred seventy-three thousand, one-hundred eighteen (873,118) second and post-trial filings. Civil Mental Health Program System has approximately seven thousand nine-hundred forty-three (7,943) cases annually.

Q85. *Are there any user interface and user experience standards that future applications are to be complaint with?*

A85: FJD is open to reviewing vendor provided industry standard options and recommendations.

Q86. *Can the FJD provide a breakdown of case type for each court/office by case type?*

A86: Civil/Orphans

SG ACT 39 OF 2005	TD
AJ ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE-TRIAL DIV	TD
8A ADOPTION	TD
T0 ADVAIR	TD

2G AIR POLLUTION CONTROL	TD
2A AIRPLANE, AVIATION	TD
AI ALLEGED INCAPACITATED PERSONS	OC
8B AMEND BIRTH RECORDS	TD
AP APPEAL FROM REGISTER	OC
P6 APPOINT JUDGE OF ELECTIONS	TD
BB APPROVAL TO POST BAIL	TD
AS APPROVED SURETIES	TD
8P APPT ARB/COMPEL ARBITRATION	TD
XJ ARTELON SPACER IMPLANT LIT.	TD
2B ASSAULT, BATTERY	TD
AV ASSURANCE VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE	TD
86 AUCTION MOTOR VEHICLE	TD
1J BAD FAITH	TD
BJ BAIL JUDGMENT	TD
8T BLOOD TRANSFUSION	TD
5I BOARD OF LICENSE & INSPECTION	TD
5P BOARD OF PENSIONS & RETIREMENT	TD
5R BOARD OF REVISION OF TAXES	TD
62 BOARD OF REVISION OF TAXES-MVA	TD
61 BOARD OF REVISION OF TAXES-NPT	TD
7B BOND AND WARRANT	TD
7Q BUSINESS DISTRICT LIEN	TD
CM CEMETERY TRUSTS	OC
7Y CENTER CITY DIST ASSESSED LIEN	TD
RR CERT. - PHILA.R.C.P. 4018.1	TD
7X CERTIFIED/EXEMPLIFIED JUDGMENT	TD
8C CHANGE OF NAME (ADULT)	TD
1B CITY BUSINESS TAX CASE	TD
8J CITY PETITION TO SELL W/S	TD
CC CIVIL CONTEMPT	TD
5C CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION	TD
1H CIVIL TAX CASE - COMPLAINT	TD
8G CIVIL TAX CASE - PETITION	TD
7G CLAIM FOR GAS SERVICE	TD
WC CLAIM FOR WATER SERVICE	TD
C1 CLASS ACTION	TD
74 CMWLTH - COUNTY COLL/TAX LIEN	TD
72 CMWLTH - DEPT OF REV/TAX LIEN	TD
77 CMWLTH - LABOR & INDUSTRY LIEN	TD
71 CMWLTH - MISCELLANEOUS LIEN	TD
76 CMWLTH - SALES & USE TAX LIEN	TD
75 CMWLTH - TAXES FOR EDUC LIEN	TD
73 CMWLTH-DPT OF REV/PERS INC TAX	TD
42 COMMERCE-FIN. MONITOR PROGRAM	TD
8L COMPEL MEDICAL EXAM	TD
ZC CONFESSION OF JUDGMENT	TD
7C CONFESSION OF JUDGMENT	TD
7U CONFESSION OF JUDGMENT (1806)	TD
8R CONFIRM ARBITRATORS AWARD	TD
1T CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT	TD
1P CONTRACT PRODUCT LIABILITY	TD

1C CONTRACTS (GOODS), ENFORCE	TD
10 CONTRACTS OTHER	TD
CF CORPORATE FIDUCIARIES	OC
KU CORPORATE TRUST LITIGATION	TD
PS COST OF CARE SEIZED ANIMAL ACT	TD
1Z CREDIT CARD COLLECTION	TD
8D DEC OF TAKING - EMINENT DOMAIN	TD
DE DECEDENTS ESTATE	OC
5Y DEPT LABOR & INDUSTRIES	TD
91 DEPT. OF L&I CLAIM/LIEN	TD
92 DEPT. OF STREETS CLAIM/LIEN	TD
DD DISCIPLINARY DOCKET	TD
KT DISPUTE RE: BUSINESS TORT	TD
KF DISPUTE RE: FRANCHISE	TD
KC DISPUTE RE: NON-COMPETE	TD
KB DISPUTE RE: SURETY BOND	TD
KA DISPUTE-SALE OF BUS. OR ASSETS	TD
2C DRAM SHOP	TD
DF DRUG FORFEITURE	TD
3S EJECTMENT	TD
P5 ELECTION APPOINT MAJORITY INSP	TD
P7 ELECTION APPOINT MINORITY INSP	TD
8E ELECTION MATTERS	TD
50 EM DOMAIN-APPEAL-BOARD OF VIEW	TD
1E EMPLOYMENT, WRONGFUL DISCHARGE	TD
ES ENFORCE SUBPOENA (CW OF PA)	TD
E6 EQUITY - DRUG TRAFFICKING (TRO)	TD
E5 EQUITY - LEAD CONTAMINATION	TD
E1 EQUITY - NO REAL ESTATE	TD
E3 EQUITY - NO REAL ESTATE (TRO)	TD
E2 EQUITY - REAL ESTATE	TD
E4 EQUITY - REAL ESTATE (TRO)	TD
E7 EQUITY - VACANT PROPERTY W-D	TD
3A EQUITY/LABOR	TD
8H EXHUME BODY	TD
5F FAIR HOUSING COMMISSION	TD
70 FAMILY COURT SUPPORT ORDER	TD
69 FEDERAL SUPERFUND LIEN	TD
7I FEDERAL TAX LIEN	TD
7N FINES, COST &/OR RESTITUTION	TD
3F FORECLOSURE	TD
1Y FOREIGN ATTACHMENT	TD
7F FOREIGN JUDGMENT	TD
8F FORFEITURE UNDER 42PA CS#6801	TD
4F FRAUD	TD
3G GARNISHMENT(LAND), ENFORCE	TD
IP INALIENABLE PROPERTY	OC
IC INCAPACITATED PERSONS	OC
1D INSURANCE, DECLARATORY JUDGMNT	TD
KI INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY	TD
IV INTER VIVOS TRUST	OC
4S ISSUANCE OF FOREIGN SUBPOENA	TD

8S ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA	TD
8W ISSUE OF CIVIL SEARCH WARRANT	TD
7D JUDGMENT INDEXED/FAMILY COURT	TD
7L JUDGMENT INDEXED/ORPHANS COURT	TD
7A JUDGMENT ON ARREARAGES	TD
8K JURY DUTY VIOLATION OF SUMMONS	TD
70 JUVENILE JUDGMENT	TD
55 L&I - FIREARMS	TD
3L LANDLORD/TENANT - COMPLAINT	TD
2L LIBEL, SLANDER, MISREPRESENT	TD
56 LIQUOR CONTROL ENFORCEMENT	TD
4A MALPRACTICE - ACCOUNTING	TD
2D MALPRACTICE - DENTAL	TD
4L MALPRACTICE - LEGAL	TD
2M MALPRACTICE - MEDICAL	TD
4Y MALPRACTICE - MISCELLANEOUS	TD
58 MALT AND BREWERY BOARD	TD
M1 MANDAMUS	TD
ML MARRIAGE APPLICATION AMENDMENT	OC
T1 MASS TORT - ASBESTOS	TD
XE MASS TORT - RISPERDAL	TD
5E MC - CODE ENFORCEMENT	TD
5D MC - DENIAL TO OPEN JUDGMENT	TD
5L MC - LANDLORD/TENANT	TD
5M MC - MONEY JUDGMENT	TD
5N MC - NUISANCE CASE	TD
9S MC - SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER	TD
IM MC-IMPOUNDED VEHICLE APPEAL	TD
RL MC-RED LIGHT VIOLATION APPEAL	TD
QQ MC/CP COURTS-FINES,REST,BAIL	TD
7M MECHANICS LIEN	TD
80 MENTAL HEALTH - PRISON HEALTH	TD
8M MENTAL HEALTH ACT	TD
8I MENTAL RETARDATION	TD
MI MINORS	OC
51 MISC ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY	TD
MS MISC NOTICE	TD
Z2 MISC SUMMONS	TD
79 MISCELLANEOUS JUDGMENT/LIEN	TD
89 MISCELLANEOUS PETITION	TD
2V MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT	TD
4M MOTOR VEHICLE PROPERTY DAMAGE	TD
XQ MT - ELMIRON	TD
XU MT - ESSURE	TD
XW MT - GLEN MILLS SCHOOLS	TD
XN MT - PARAQUAT PRODUCTS	TD
XM MT - ROUNDUP PRODUCTS	TD
XV MT - VENA CAVA FILTER	TD
XO MT - ZANTAC	TD
XI MYLAN FENTANYL PATCH LIT	TD
1N NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS	TD
NP NON-PROFIT CORPORATIONS	OC

3N NOT RESIDENTIAL OWNER OCCUP-MR	TD
SF NOTICE - SCIRE FACIAS	TD
NM NOTICE MECHANICS LIEN CONTRACT	TD
88 NOTICE TO RESUME PRIOR SURNAME	TD
8N NUNC PRO TUNC PETITION	TD
XA NURSING HOME LITIGATION	TD
OJ OATH OF OFFICE - JUDICIARY	TD
OO OATHS OF OFFICE - MISC	TD
4B OBJ TO SHERIFF'S PROPERTY DET	TD
60 OFFICE OF ADMIN REVIEW	TD
JR OJR - ADMINISTRATIVE DOCKET	TD
7J OLD MISC JUDGMENT INDEX	TD
2H OTHER TRAFFIC ACCIDENT	TD
5J PA ELECTION CODE	TD
53 PA LABOR RELATION BOARD	TD
5Q PA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD	TD
P1 PARTITION	TD
KP PARTNERSHIP DISPUTE	TD
54 PENNDOT-AUTHOR/ISSUE AUTO TAGS	TD
5V PENNDOT-MOTOR VEHICLE APPEALS	TD
5B PENNDOT-SUSP-CHEMICAL REFUSAL	TD
2Q PERSONAL INJURY - ABUSE-AD	TD
2R PERSONAL INJURY - ABUSE-FAC 1	TD
2X PERSONAL INJURY - ABUSE-FAC 2	TD
2F PERSONAL INJURY - FELA	TD
2O PERSONAL INJURY - OTHER	TD
4O PERSONAL PROPERTY DAMAGE-OTHER	TD
P4 PET-APPT BOARD OF VIEWERS	TD
P2 PET-APPT CONSERVATOR-ACT 135	TD
P3 PET-SET ASIDE NOMINATION PET	TD
19 PETITION RE: COVID-19	TD
8Q PETITION TO STAY ARBITRATION	TD
5H PHILA DEPT OF HEALTH	TD
5A PHILA HOUSING AUTHORITY	TD
5K PHILA PARKING AUTHORITY	TD
PR POWER OF ATTORNEY	OC
2S PREMISES LIABILITY, SLIP/FALL	TD
PD PRESUMED DECEDENTS	OC
2P PRODUCT LIABILITY	TD
6P PRODUCT LIABILITY - FORMULA	TD
PI PRODUCT LIABILITY - INJECTAFER	TD
9P PRODUCT LIABILITY - TALC	TD
Q1 QUIET TITLE	TD
W1 QUO WARRANTO	TD
3C R.E.-FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCE	TD
7K REAL ESTATE BAIL LIEN	TD
7R REAL ESTATE BROKERS LIEN	TD
90 REAL ESTATE TAX CLAIM/LIEN	TD
7P REAL ESTATE TAX LIEN PETITION	TD
3O REAL PROPERTY - OTHER	TD
1R RECOVER(OVERPAYMENT), ENFORCE	TD
5O REGISTRATION COMMISSION	TD

7Z REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENT	TD
P8 RELOCATE POLLING PLACE	TD
3R RENT, LEASE, OR EJECTMENT	TD
1V REPLEVIN	TD
3D RESIDENTIAL OWNER OCCUPIED-MR	TD
3X RESIDENTIAL REVERSE MORT-MR	TD
8U RESUME MAIDEN NAME	TD
5S SCHOOL DISTRICT PHILA	TD
KS SECURITIES LITIGATION	TD
7S SELF ASSESSED TAXES	TD
P9 SEQUESTRATION/RE LIEN	TD
PW SEQUESTRATION/WS LIEN	TD
7H SOUTH ST -HEAD HOUSE DIST LIEN	TD
SN SPECIAL NEEDS TRUST	OC
1S STOCKHOLDERS' SUITS	TD
1G SUBROGATION ACTION	TD
5X TAX REVIEW BOARD	TD
ST TESTAMENTARY TRUSTS	OC
3T TORTS TO LAND	TD
6T TOXIC TORT - ETO GAS	TD
2T TOXIC TORT PERSONAL INJURY	TD
3E TOXIC WASTE, CONTAMINATION	TD
7T TRAFFIC COURT JUDGMENT	TD
SP TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	TD
87 TRANSFER STRUCTURED SETTLEMENT	TD
4T TRUTH IN LENDING	TD
1U UNINSURED/UNDERINSURED SAVINGS	TD
7E US DISTRICT COURT	TD
8V VACATE/MODIFY AWARD	TD
VC VECCHIONE GUARDIAN	OC
7V WAIVER OF MECHANICS LIEN	TD
WS WATER & SEWER SERVICE	TD
WL WENTWORTH LITIGATION	TD
WP WENTWORTH PROGRAM	TD
1W WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT	TD
5W WORKMAN'S COMPENSATION BOARD	TD
7W WRIT OF EXECUTION	TD
2E WRONGFUL USE OF CIVIL PROCESS	TD
5Z ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	TD

Family Court

AD ADMINISTRATIVE DOCKET	XX
BC BIRTH CERTIFICATE	XX
CU CUSTODY	XX
DI DIVORCE	XX
AB DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	XX
IN INTIMIDATION	XX
NC NAME CHANGE	XX
PC PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT	XX
SV SEXUAL VIOLENCE	XX

CLAIMS – Small Claims, Landlord-Tenant, Code Enforcement, and Private Criminal Complaints.

Civil Mental Health Program System – See A35.

Q87. *When is the estimated award or contract start date? Is there a required or targeted Go Live Date?*

A87: While the FJD would like to begin the project as soon as possible, no definitive estimate can be given at this time. There is no required or targeted Go Live Date currently.

Q88. *Can the FJD provide a comprehensive list of all necessary integrations?*

A88: FJD expects the awarded vendor to develop a list of what integrations are necessary during a discovery process.

Q89. *How many total databases are there to be converted?*

A89: Three (3) for e-Filing / FJD Banner, one (1) for CLAIMS, and one (1) for Civil Mental Health Program.

Q90. *Can the FJD provide a list of those databases?*

A90: See A89. For e-Filing / FJD Banner, PARENTS, PROD, and ORPHANS.

Q91. *Does the FJD have a need for a vendor to digitize paper documents to put into the system? If so, can FJD provide an estimate of quantity of documents?*

A91: FJD does not have such a need.

Q92. *How many e-Filings does the FJD process annually?*

A92: For CP-Civil and OC-Orphans,

CP 2019	412,686
OC 2020	3,895
OC 2022	5,157
CP 2022	465,559
OC 2019	3,999
OC 2024	446
CP 2023	500,463
OC 2021	4,712
CP 2024	62,384
CP 2021	439,555
CP 2020	405,549
OC 2023	5,120

For CLAIMS, See A84.

Q93. *What is the accounting or finance system or software for each court and/or office?*

A93: FJD Banner database is used for fee assessment and receipts. A product called Passport is used for accounting and distribution functions. Civil Mental Health Program System does not charge for filing.

Q94. Does the FJD want the ability for the public to e-File multiple documents at once?

A94: Yes, this ability is currently available to FJD.

Q95. Would the FJD be open to accepting responses that included solutions currently in development, with the assumption that the FJD would have input into the product build overall?

A95: Yes.

Q96. What dedicated project roles does the FJD plan to assign to this project, including both business and technical subject matter experts, if any?

A96: FJD would assign both technical and business subject matter experts as appropriate.

Q97. Would the FJD like vendors to provide pricing for the first-year cost as well as the total solution cost for the complete term of the contract?

A97: Yes.

Q98. Are there any service level agreements (“SLAs”) or response time expectations for addressing technical issues?

A98: FJD is open to reviewing scope and cost for various levels offered by vendor regarding SLAs and response times contained therein.

Q99. What level of ongoing support and maintenance will be required for the Court Case Management system?

A99: Depends on vendor’s proposed solution. FJD is open to consider varying approaches for ongoing support and maintenance.

Q100. What is the end-of-life timeline for the courts current CMS solution?

A100: None has been established.

Q101. Is the awarded vendor expected to support the current CMS solution (FJD’s BANNER)? If not, can the FJD guarantee 10-15 years of support for the current CMS solution.

A101: See A99.

Q102. Can the FJD provide details on the data migration process, including data cleansing, mapping, and validation requirements?

A102: FJD expects vendor to provide these details within their proposal.

Q103. Will the Court CMS need to comply with accessibility standards to ensure equal access for all users?

A103: See A28.

Q104. What training resources and materials will be expected for users to facilitate the transition to the new system?

A104: Vendor provided training of super users as well as a combination of vendor created, and FJD created materials.

Q105. Are there any specific key performance indicators (“KPIs”) or metrics that the system should be able to track and report on?

A105: Case activity and employee performance.

Q106. What level of flexibility is desired in terms of system configuration and customization by end-users?

A106: As much as possible with proper training. The expectation is for simple workflows, modifications of document templates, adding / removing case types, and docket codes should be user configured while more complicated workflows and functionality will probably need technical intervention.

Q107. Are there any specific requirements or expectations regarding data retention policies and archival procedures?

A107: See A77.

Q108. Does the Court CMS need to comply with specific industry standards or regulatory frameworks (e.g., CJIS, HIPAA)?

A108: See A32.

Q109. Will there be an opportunity for vendors to present demonstrations or prototypes of their proposed solutions?

A109: FJD reserves the right to invite all, some, or no vendors to demonstrate their proposed solution to the FJD.

Q110. What is the current payment number of transactions per office?

A110: Civil processes approximately sixteen thousand (16,000) e-Filing transactions with an associated fee monthly.

Q111. What is the average transaction amount?

A111: An average cannot be determined currently.

Q112. Can the FJD provide these numbers broken down by payment method (e.g., credit, debit, e-Check)?

A112: FJD is not able to provide a breakdown of e-Filing transactions based on payment method.

Q113. Would the FJD like the option for customers to be able to pay at the counter?

A113: Yes, ability to pay at the counter is required.

Q114. If the FJD would like the ability to pay at the counter, how many points of sale (“POS”) devices are needed per location.

A114: FJD will maintain the current ability to pay at the counter, but vendor provided POS devices are not anticipated to be needed.

Q115. Was the RFP written internally or by a consulting firm or vendor. If written by a consulting firm or vendor, are they allowed to bid?

A115: The RFP was written internally by FJD employees. Two (2) independent contractors who assist the FJD IT staff with maintaining the current FJD Banner CMS and e-Filing environments helped develop Attachments A & D of the RFP. Neither will bid on this RFP.

Q116. Please confirm the timeline of the Oracle 19 upgrade is slated for the 2nd quarter of 2024.

A116: Timeline for the Oracle 19 upgrade remains to be determined.

Q117. Given the extensive nature of the total solution requested, would FJD be open to exploring a phased solution approach where each phase is priced out to align with the FJD’s budget cycle while prioritizing the immediate needs of the project?

A117: Yes.

Q118. Was this released previously as an RFI?

A118: No.

Q119. List the existing infrastructure by applications in scope.

A119: e-Filing and FJD Banner uses mainly Linux, Oracle Data Appliances, Web Logic, VxRail, SharePoint, City Network, and Virtual Machines.

Q120. What is the technology stack for the applications within the specified scope, with Oracle Forms, PL/SQL, and Oracle Database mentioned in the RFP? Are there any additional technologies utilized in CMS, and does the e-Filing Portal employ the same technology stack?

A120: e-Filing and FJD Banner has PL/SQL, Oracle DB, PHP, and .NET.

Q121. What is the current continuous integration and continuous deployment (“CICD”) and software development and operations (“DevOps”) capabilities?

A121: All development is done by internal FJD IT staff.

Q122. What is the budget range for the proposed project?

A122: FJD's budget for this procurement is currently unavailable.

Q123. *Are there any specific cost considerations or constraints that must be considered?*

A123: No specific considerations. Cost will be weighed heavily but will not necessarily be the determining factor in this procurement's selection process.

Q124. *What is the desired timeline for the project?*

A124: FJD is flexible based on the approach proposed by vendors.

Q125. *Share the scoped application database size, number of databases, number of tables, stored procedures, number of views as the RFP contains database information around FJD's Banner only.*

A125: 750 GB contained within three databases for e-Filing / FJD Banner. The other information is available within the RFP for both e-Filing and FJD Banner applications. CLAIMS and the Civil Mental Health Program System are approximately 110 GB contained within two databases with minimal views, two-hundred one (201) tables, and some redundancy.

Q126. *Are there any new functionalities or business rules that need to be incorporated into the new system?*

A126: Electronic issuance of judicial orders and other court dispositions, such as jury verdicts and arbitration awards, as well as conflict checking for both judiciary and counsel.

Q127. *What are the licensing details for the third-party managed software ("CLAIMS")?*

A127: Term licensing type for access to the product as well as to receive maintenance and support services.

Q128. *Does the FJD technical team have access to CLAIMS backend database/documents?*

A128: Yes, to a data dictionary.

Q129. *Prioritize key features of the applications in scope (Critical, High, Medium, Low).*

A129: FJD prefers to express priorities as stated through the published RFP and Q&A documents.