The following is additional information regarding Request for Proposal #MUN-4301, titled MCIS 2.0 Replacement Project and released on 04/17/2018. This addendum includes both questions from prospective proposers and the City’s answers and revisions to the RFP. This addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and therefore, the information contained herein shall be taken into consideration when preparing and submitting a proposal.

| **Item #** | **Date Received** | **Date Answered** | **Vendor’s Question** | **City’s Answer** | **RFP Revisions** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 04/18/2018 | 04/30/2018 | What are the most important systems that this solution will need to integrate with? | There is a list of all current external systems which the Court integrates with. This list can be found in Appendix J within the Current State Solution Architecture document in section 3.2 of the RFP. There are also some additional future state external system integrations noted in the Functional Requirements. The Court considers all equally important at this time. |  |
| 2 | 04/18/2018 | 04/30/2018 | Do you anticipate that the SMC will need to procure any of the following similar technologies in the somewhat near future? If so, when?   * E-Filing System * Court Calendaring System * Jury Management System * Etc. | This RFP is an opportunity for vendors to propose a solution or ‘hybrid’ solution (see Section 1 of the RFP) that meets the Functional and Technical Requirements to support the business needs of SMC. We are open to evaluating proposals that include technologies the vendor feels would benefit SMC. |  |
| 3 | 04/19/2018 | 04/30/2018 | Would it be possible for you to provide a list of all documents we should have found, so we can make sure we have all the correct information? I have found Appendices A-L except G and K seem to be missing, plus a number of un-numbered exhibits. | Appendices G and K do not exist.  Embedded below is a list of all the documents in the RFP: |  |
| 4 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | The time and location of the pre-proposal conference has changed to the following:  Location – 700 5th Avenue, **Suite 2750**, Seattle, WA 98104-5042  Date and Time – 05/03/2018 at **10:00 AM Pacific Time**. |
| 5 | 5/2/2018 | 5/14/2018 | Will Seattle allow development and test activities to be performed offsite? | Refer to Item #8. |  |
| 6 | 5/2/2018 | 5/14/2018 | Will Seattle allow development and test activities to be performed outside of the United States? | Refer to Item #8. |  |
| 7 | 5/2/2018 | 5/14/2018 | Can Seattle further elaborate the vision of the activities involved after the 3 months of Acceptance test?  The RFP states that an additional 3 months will occur in case changes are made.  Please clarify what activities are envisioned in these three additional months? | The City does not have additional details regarding the Final Acceptance Process at this time.  However, the City may further define specific acceptance details once the highest-ranked vendor is selected. |  |
| 8 | 5/3/2018 (Pre-Proposal Conference) | 5/14/2018 | Are there any specific guidelines the City will offer in terms of work locations, vs local, domestic, offshore? | Vendors can complete activities onsite, offsite and/or offshore. However, the vendor must comply with certain restrictions depending on the level of access needed to the City’s and SMC’s networks/systems.  Below are general access control & remote access policies. However, the City may further define or update these policies once the highest-ranked vendor is selected. Also refer to Item #10 for information regarding background checks.  General Access Control Policies:    Remote Access Policies:    Once the highest-ranked vendor is selected, SMC will require vendor personnel to complete “Washington State Patrol’s Security Awareness Training for Non-Certified Users” at https://www.wsp.wa.gov/\_secured/access/access.htm. |  |
| 9 | 5/3/2018 (Pre-Proposal Conference) | 5/14/2018 | Would we be dealing with a 3rd party vendor for Data Migration activities? | No, the selected vendor will work with City of Seattle directly for data migration activities. |  |
| 10 | 5/3/2018 (Pre-Proposal Conference) | 5/14/2018 | Would onsite personnel only need background checks, or will anyone else? | Seattle IT and SMC background checks (see Section 9 of the RFP) are required for anyone who has physical access to SMC or SMT buildings, and anyone who has access to associated networks/systems. Also refer to Item #8 for information regarding access to networks/systems. |  |
| 11 | 5/3/2018 (Pre-Proposal Conference) | 5/14/2018 | Should we submit our Software Licensing agreement as a part of this RFP Submittal? | Yes. The City requests all vendors to submit its licensing and maintenance agreement with the Vendor’s proposal. |  |
| 12 | 5/3/2018 (Pre-Proposal Conference) | 5/14/2018 | Is probation part of your current system? Did you specify the number of probation licenses in the RFP? If not, could we get that specification? Particularly Probation Employees | Yes, Probation is part of the current system. There are 47 Probation staff employed at SMC (as of May 1, 2018). |  |
| 13 | 5/3/2018 (Pre-Proposal Conference) | 5/14/2018 | Is this more of a case-based system or a person-based system, or a combination of both? Do we want to associate the tickets with the person? | We are open to evaluating solutions that meet the Functional and Technical Requirements to support the business needs of SMC, and that the vendor feels would benefit SMC – case-based and/or person-based. |  |
| 14 | 5/7/2018 | 5/17/2018 | Would you be able to say how much you anticipate this MCIS replacement costing? | We are open to evaluating solutions that meet the Functional and Technical Requirements to support the business needs of SMC, and that the vendor feels would benefit SMC. We prefer the vendor propose a cost in their submittal using the provided Price Proposal worksheet (Appendix E). |  |
| 15 | 5/17/2018 | 5/29/2018 | How many jury summons do you issue per year? | 13,920 jury summons issued in 2017. |  |
| 16 | 5/17/2018 | 5/29/2018 | How many locations are jury trials held? | 1 location (Seattle Justice Center) with four trial courtrooms. |  |
| 17 | 5/17/2018 | 5/29/2018 | How many clients on average are on probation? | 6,500 people in various forms of supervision at any given point in time. |  |
| 18 | 5/17/2018 | 5/29/2018 | What is the average case load size? | Our caseloads vary by case type and program.  There may be as few as 45 on an intensive caseload and up to 100 on a more generalized caseload. |  |
| 19 | 5/17/2018 | 5/29/2018 | What assessment instruments do you currently use?  Do you plan on adding or changing any of these in the near future if so to what? | We currently use the Wisconsin risk assessment tool which is electronically imbedded in our current probation information system.  We may change our tool in the future but have yet to develop a timeline or product direction. |  |
| 20 | 5/17/2018 | 5/29/2018 | Regarding Worksheet C Probation:  Item PR -021 - “The system must provide the ability to configure probation calendar events limits with the ability to override the maximum limit.” Can you please explain how this is used?  Is this to manage the number of clients that can be enrolled in a program or a service? | Yes, this is to manage how many people can be enrolled in a program or service.  For example, a limit may be set of 10 people, but a worker can override the limit. |  |
| 21 | 5/17/2018 | 5/29/2018 | Regarding Worksheet C Probation:  Item PR-030 – “The system must provide the ability for probation staff to document recommended case conditions.” Can you please provide information on the workflow?  Is this for Pretrial or post-conviction?  Do you prepare a presentence investigation report for the court? | In some instances, probation assesses the probationer and completes a form with recommendations for the Judge to review.  Need ability to enter the recommendations and generate form to provide to the Judge.  This feature could be pre or post-conviction.   Not all the conditions are accepted by the Judge so while the conditions need to be documented, they are not being officially applied to the case or tracked. |  |
| 22 | 5/21/2018 | 5/29/2018 | I have been going over both the RFP itself, as well as the variety of embedded documents and I cannot seem to find how many total users the City expects for the replacement system? | There are approximately 150 current MCIS users, and approximately 250 SMC employees. |  |
| 23 | N/A | 5/31/2018 | N/A | N/A | Appendix C & D, instructions tab:  For each requirement, Vendor must indicate which of the following seven (7) options will be used to meet the requirement **– Vendor must only make ONE (1) selection for OOTB, Configuration (w/ selected complexity level), Customization (w/ selected complexity level), Future Product Release, or Integration with 3rd Party Product.** |
| 24 | N/A | 5/31/2018 | N/A | N/A | Appendix C & D, instructions tab:  If Vendor selects **“Integration with 3rd Party Product”** as the option that will be used to meet the requirement, the **Vendor must include in the Explanation column whether the integration is:**   * **“in a production environment with a paying client (include client)”.** * **“in development”.** * **“not in development”.** |
| 25 | N/A | 5/31/2018 | N/A | N/A | Appendix C & D, instructions tab:  If Vendor selects **“Future Product Release”** as the option that will be used to meet the requirement, **the product feature must be on a published committed roadmap.** |
| 26 | N/A | 5/31/2018 | N/A | Options Analysis Report for the MCIS 2.0 Replacement Project: |  |
| 27 | 5/31/2018 | 6/18/2018 | If a table does not have a description in Appendix H – MCIS 1.0 Data Dictionary, does that mean the data will not need to be migrated to the new system? | No, these will be migrated as well. |  |
| 28 | 5/31/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Are there any other systems or peripheral data stores that should be considered in scope (Access databases, financial tracking spreadsheets, etc.)? | There are two main systems (MCIS and a document storage system called PaperWise). There are a few other minor sub systems which may or may not be incorporated into the new system. |  |
| 29 | 5/31/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Is any registry money data tracked separately?  If so, will this data need to be migrated? | The Seattle Municipal Court has three separate trust accounts: Bail Trust, Victim Restitutions, and Jury Duty. These data sets extract data from MCIS, external functions are performed, and data is then inputted into MCIS. We would need these systems and data to be migrated to and fully integrated within the new MCIS. |  |
| 30 | 5/31/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Is Protection Order data tracked separately from the main database?  If so, will this data need to be migrated? | No Contact Orders are tracked in the system, and we exchange data with WA State Patrol. |  |
| 31 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Appendix A - Proposal Response, Section 2.2 Financials, page 4  Section 2.2 Financials asks Vendors and subcontractors to submit a copy of certified financial statements for the last five years. Would it be acceptable for the Vendor and each subcontractor included in the Vendor’s proposal to provide links to these documents on public websites in the interest of reducing the inclusion of hundreds of additional printed pages per hard copy? | Yes. |  |
| 32 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Appendix A - Proposal Response, Section 2.2 Financials, page 4  The requirements of Section 2.2 Financials asks Vendors and each subcontractor to submit a copy of its certified financial statements with its proposal for each of the last five years (but doesn’t state where to provide this information). Attachment 3-Financial Statements asks Vendors to attach a copy of the Company’s audited financial statements for the last two years. Please confirm how many years of financial statements are required, and confirm that this information for both the Vendor and subcontractors should be included in Attachment 3-Financial Statements. | Vendor AND subcontractor(s) certified financial statements (or links to these documents on public websites– see Item 31) for the last five years shall be included as part of Attachment 3-Financial Statements.  See Item 34 for location of attachments within proposal. |  |
| 33 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | The requirements in Section 2.2 Financials, Table 2 Company Financials asks for gross revenue numbers. Our company only publishes net revenue numbers. Please confirm it is okay to use net revenue numbers for this table response. | To provide identical instructions to all vendors, see RFP Revision for Appendix A – Section 2.2 – Table 2, COMPANY FINANCIALS. | **RFP Revision:**  Appendix A – Section 2.2 – Table 2, COMPANY FINANCIALS is deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows: |
| 34 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Appendix A - Proposal Response  Please confirm whether Vendors should include the required attachments immediately after the requirement section or at the end of the Vendor's response to Appendix A - Proposal Response. | Vendors shall include the required attachments immediately after the requirement section. |  |
| 35 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | MCIS 2.0 Security Response  Please confirm that Vendors should provide responses to the security questions following the questions table (and not under each question row). | The Security Response answers can be answered in the space following the questions on the form directly underneath the question (e.g., respond in the same box). The field (box) with questions and answers from the responder can be expanded.  The responder should also provide a paragraph or two of an explanation of how they meet or do not meet the requirement they are being asked to meet. |  |
| 36 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Appendix C- Functional Requirements  MC-074- The system must provide the ability to suspend and track accounting activities including details, (e.g. reason, end/review date, etc.) allow for automatic and manual release, and maintain history. -need further information. What would be the reasoning to suspend and track accounting activities? And is this a total system shut down, or the ability to suspend accounting activities for a closed period, etc.? | This is not a complete system shut down. See below with some examples of when suspension on a case may occur:   * When a hearing is scheduled in the future, no fees should be added (that may automatically add based on age of case) * When a case is placed in a specific status (e.g. bankruptcy, on appeal, etc.), suspend all automatic activity * Judge suspends monthly payment for a period of time   In any case, the system should automatically, or Staff could manually, add a reason for suspension and applicable dates. |  |
| 37 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Appendix C- Functional Requirements  MC-100- The system must provide the ability to automatically and manually assign cases eligible for collections to a third party agency. What is being generated for the 3rd party collections agency? A file? Integration with their system, etc.? | Inform a 3rd party that cases are assigned to them for collection processes. Information on the case is given, (e.g. case number, name, address, charges, dates, etc.). The system would be able to run batch jobs to create files to be exchanged; systems will not be integrated. |  |
| 38 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Appendix C- Functional Requirements  MC-087- what bank is currently being used for EFT transactions? | Wells Fargo |  |
| 39 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Appendix C- Functional Requirements  MC-086- what filings can be rejected and refunded? And where are rejections tracked today? | When a case filing is incomplete (e.g. officer excluded required information such as law number) it may be rejected and returned to filer. These are tracked today on a spreadsheet. If payment received prior to a case filing, the funds are held in an account in the system; if the case filing is rejected the payment is refunded to payer. |  |
| 40 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Appendix J - Data Exchanges  Please specify if existing Interface Specifications are documented and can be made available for Design stage. | Interface Specifications will be made available for the Design stage. |  |
| 41 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | SOW - section 1.1.9 Organizational Change Management, Training  Do you have a training organization in place? | Currently a training organization is not in place. An Organizational Change Management (OCM) Specialist is a member of the Project Management Team and will manage a Change Team to help support the Vendor’s OCM Plan and integrate it with the project OCM Plan. |  |
| 42 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | SOW - section 1.1.9 Organizational Change Management, Training  Do you have a Learning Management System (LMS)? If so, please name the LMS. | Currently, an LMS is not utilized for MCIS training. However, the City of Seattle and SMC utilize Cornerstone for various training modules. |  |
| 43 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Are there requirements to build and deliver training in languages other than English? | No. |  |
| 44 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | SOW - section 1.1.9 Organizational Change Management, Training  How do you currently train and support external users of MCIS (e.g., people who hold citations, manage cases, etc.)? | At this time, there is no training established for external users of MCIS. |  |
| 45 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | SOW - section 1.1.9 Organizational Change Management, Training  We understand that training for the MCIS upgrade has three components - 1) End User - which will be taken by about 250 people across the organization; 2) System training - how many users do you estimate for system training?  3) External training (portal) - please confirm if there are external user groups, who will need to be trained. | System Training: Refer to Item 22.  External Training: If the process for submitting documents through use of the Portal changes, then City Law and Defense Attorneys will need training. |  |
| 46 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | SOW - section 1.1.8 - Application Deployment  Section states - "Vendor shall provide on-site production support for the primary production deployment of MCIS 2.0. Vendor shall provide on-site production support for other production deployment phases as specified in the Release and Implementation Management Plan" Question - Are you expecting multiple deployments driven by business or are the other production deployment phases or just bug-fix releases as part of warranty/on-going support? | We are open to evaluating deployment approaches that the Vendor feels would most benefit SMC – single deployment or phased deployments. |  |
| 47 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | SOW - section 1.1.6 Data Migration  Section states - "Vendor shall support the City in data cleansing activities". Please elaborate the nature of support expected. | Vendor is expected to provide guidance on how data is used in their system so that the City can use this information to guide their data cleansing activities. |  |
| 48 | 6/1/2018 | 6/18/2018 | Appendix D - Technical Requirements  TR-34 and TR-35 imposes certain technology requirements which may or may not available on a proposed solution built on top of certain SaaS and PaaS products. Question: Will it be acceptable for the proposed solution to achieve the same ends without implementing the specific technology requirements in TR-34, TR35 and others of a similar ilk? | The City is open to alternate methods as long as the vendor can explain how these methods can be used to satisfy the requirement. |  |
| 49 | 6/1/2018 | 6/18/2018 | Appendix E - Price Proposal  In the HW-SW tab, the pricing proposal detail requests pricing information for hardware and software components broken down by model number, unit price, extended price etc. Question: Does this pricing model implies that the City of Seattle is not considering  other innovative models for delivering the proposed solution outside of the traditional custom software deployed on an on-premises data center? For example: Per user per month + computing resources consumption per month + storage consumption per month + network bandwidth consumption per month. In other words, is the City of Seattle precluding a solution built on SaaS and PaaS products deployed in a Public Cloud? | No, “Vendors may propose different deployment options, including on premise, hosted, or Software-as-a-Service (SaaS)” per Section 1 of the RFP.  The vendor shall list pricing for SaaS and PaaS components in the software section and add further clarification in the assumptions tab of Appendix E – Price Proposal.  We are open to evaluating solutions deployed on public or private service providers, which can provide attestation of compliance for PCI (see PCI Compliance Response in RFP section 11.3-j) and are approved as a provider to handle CJIS data (see Security Response in RFP section 11.3-i Question 4). |  |
| 50 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | How many physical locations will be part of the implementation? | One physical location, SMC. |  |
| 51 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Do you have a preference between Hosted or On Premises solution? | No, we are open to evaluating deployment approaches that the Vendor feels would most benefit SMC. Per Section 1 of the RFP “Vendors may propose different deployment options, including on premise, hosted, or Software-as-a-Service (SaaS)”. |  |
| 52 | 6/1/2018 | 6/18/2018 | How many cases will be converted?  • What systems are they converted from?  • What will be converted from each system?  • Number of records, size?  • Data converted?  • Images converted? | Please see Table 4 in Section 1.1.6 under the Statement of Work document for current court metrics on cases and documents. All documents are stored as images so the number of images to be converted is the same as the number of documents. These are all currently in scope for conversion but conversion scope has not been fully defined yet. There are an additional 2.8 million citations not in our case count which we understand other vendors may also consider cases.  Please refer to item 28 for what systems are being evaluated for conversion. |  |
| 53 | 6/1/2018 | 6/8/2018 | Can you confirm that there is one source of data for conversion? | Refer to Item 28. |  |
| 54 | 6/1/2018 | 6/18/2018 | PP-006 - The system must provide the ability for users to select a profile type to self-register and manage their individual user accounts, including editing account information (e.g. name, phone, email, address, notification options, etc.) and maintain history.  Is this for defendants on the case? If so, how do you intend to validate their identity when self-registering. | Yes it could be a defendant on a case (they'd register using identifiers such drivers license, vehicle license, name, address, DOB, etc.).  This also may be an attorney, or other parties on the case; also could be external business partners (e.g. treatment agency, bail bond company, etc.).  What would be required for registration and validation would depend on the type of entity and determined as we work on the system. For example, attorneys could validate with their bar number, a treatment agency representative could validate with their license number. |  |
| 55 | 6/1/2018 | 6/18/2018 | CA-021 - The system must provide the ability to track, and report Judicial Officer time spent on cases (e.g. in court, research in chambers, etc.).  Is this similar to a timesheet data entry tool? Or is the requirement to automatically track the judge’s time. | This is not timesheet (entire day at work); it is to track individual Judicial Officer time spent on a case. Where possible, automate tracking Judicial Officer time (e.g. hearing start/end time). Provide ability for Judicial Officer to manually enter start/end time for working on cases outside of the courtroom (e.g. in chambers). |  |
| 56 | 6/18/2018 | 6/22/2018 | It has come to my attention that the embedded .xls for the Pricing Worksheet (Appendix E) has several fields with incorrect formatting and is also missing several calculated fields, specifically, the “Total Five (5) Year Cost of Ownership” field.  How would you advise we complete the sheet?  (I can make the assumption that the “Total Five (5) Year Cost of Ownership” is the Total Initial Cost, plus Annual Ongoing Support for each of the five years, however there is a line item in there for maintenance as well as Weekly Onsite Support, which I assume will be a factor of both the number of weeks you’d require onsite support as well as the number of years for maintenance.) | Weekly Onsite Support covers on-site production support during and immediately following the primary production deployment of the solution. This cost will not be included in the Total Cost of Ownership calculation, as the City may further negotiate the number of weeks of such support once the highest-ranked vendor is selected.  HW/SW Maintenance is the cost of support associated directly with software and hardware products required to deliver the proposed MCIS 2.0 solution.  This would include items such as vendor provided product upgrades.  Annual Ongoing Support costs are professional services costs (i.e., vendor staff costs) to support ongoing operations of the MCIS 2.0 solution.  This would include items such as enhancements or changes to custom interfaces provided by the vendor.  Deliverables tab: The specific deliverables in the table should align with the deliverables prescribed in the multiple Key Deliverable tables included in the embedded Statement of Work, and augmented by any additional deliverables the Vendor proposes in their response. | **RFP Revision:**  Appendix E – Price Proposal is deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows: |
| 57 | 6/22/2018 | 6/22/2018 | N/A | N/A | For on-premise solutions, the City will add "fully loaded" labor costs for system administration and hardware costs.  Proposer must provide the City with complete requirements and specifications of the required hardware to support the proposed Solution, including a full bill of material (BOM) as part of their Proposal.  This information allows us to complete a full cost analysis for proposed solutions.  In this regard, we ask that you please provide a technical description and/or a high-level solution design of a typical production deployment for a customer of our size, given what is known about our environment.  Include any relevant detail, including system sizing, recommended (or required) OS/Database/JRE and version, ancillary software components, and details on the ability to run in a virtualized environment. |