JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

ABILITY-TO-PAY ON-LINE TOOL

CJS-2017-08-ML

September 6, 2017

1. How many users (traffic violators) will be using this system by county?

   Answer: In terms of traffic court case volume, for fiscal year 2015-2016, the five (5) counties reported a total of 431,477 traffic infraction filings. It's estimated less than half this amount could potentially use this newly developed tool to process their case and request a determination.

   Table: 1

	2015-2016 Traffic Infraction Filings	Payment Systems	Case Management System
San Francisco	119,447	Link2Gov	Thomson-Reuters
Santa Clara	131,439	Fiserv	UCS/Tyler Odyssey
Shasta	29,016	Official Payment	Jalan
Tulare	42,683	Lexis Nexis Payments Solutions and Authorize.net with Elavon	eCourt
Ventura	108,892	nCourt, Global Payments, Official Payments, Bank of America	VISION (VCIJIS)

2. How many discreet administrative users will log into this system for the traffic courts for each county?

   Answer: We estimate that there will be seven (7) system users (admin users as well as judicial officers) at each pilot county plus an additional five (5) individuals at the Judicial Council.

3. What is the "query mechanism" that allows the ATP program to upload data from the county systems? Is it different per county?

   Answer: Participating courts will either allow the vendor's system to direct query their Case Management System, or will provide alternate access to

citations outside of their Case Management System. Courts will provide the vendor information necessary to access citations. Please refer to Table: 1 in answer number 1 for list of Case Management systems.

4. Are the queries pulling from the case management systems?

   Answer: Please refer to answer number 3.

5. What are the payment systems that we need to point to for each county? Is this by a web link? What is the mechanism?

   Answer: Please refer to the Table: 1 in answer number 1. The courts use different payment processing systems including Official Payment, Lexis Nexis, Payments Solutions, Authorize.net with Elavon, Fiserv, nCourt, Global Payments, and Bank of America. Users will be directed to existing payment processors by web link. The court will provide the vendor updates on payment status. Vendors wishing to propose their own integrated payment system, if they have one, are free to do so.

6. Can you describe the correct way to direct people to the correct payment system by county?

   Answer: The courts use different payment processing systems including Official Payment, Lexis Nexis, Payments Solutions, Authorize.net with Elavon, Fiserv, nCourt, Global Payments, and Bank of America. Users will be directed to existing payment processors. The court will provide the vendor updates on payment status. Vendors wishing to propose their own integrated payment system, if they have one, are free to do so.

7. Do interfaces already exist to the court records systems and the court payment processing systems or are they to be created as part of this ability to pay tool project?

   Answer: They do not exist.

8. How do you propose to verify the claimed income an individual makes? Or, is it checked prior to uploading the information?

   Answer: A potential integration involves running a name query to a California Department of Social Services database to retrieve a Y/N answer on current status of benefits receipt. Judicial Council staff are currently working with DSS staff on establishing that agreement.

9. Are the rules for the eligibility of the ability to pay tool already created or do they have to be created as part of this scope/project?

Answer: Eligibility and all details regarding possible fine/fee reductions will be defined by each court. The vendor will be provided with detail for a configurable table specific to each of the five (5) counties. The vendor is not responsible for the development of the rules of eligibility.

10. Functional Requirement F 10.3 – what interfaces or subsystems are available to verify a person's submitted information? Assuming this means identity proofing.

Answer: A potential integration involves running a name query to a California Department of Social Services database to retrieve a Y/N answer on current status of benefits receipt. Judicial Council staff are currently working with DSS staff on establishing that agreement. Vendors should propose any additional recommendations they wish to make for identity verification on line.

11. Non-Functional Requirement T 10.1 - Is the ability to pay tool to be hosted by the vendor or will the Judicial Council of California provide the hosting environment?

Answer: The Judicial Council will work with the vendor to determine hosting if the tool is NOT cloud based.

12. Non-Functional Requirement T 10.1 - Clarifying "mobile enabled tool", is the state expecting a mobile application or a mobile enabled website?

Answer: A responsive web application accessed via browser is acceptable, but the Judicial Council is open to vendors who wish to also recommend a companion mobile app.

13. Non-Functional Requirement T 10.4 - of the states provide a document management system and interface to or is the vendor responsible for the management and input of the documents/files indicated in this nonfunctional requirement?

Answer: The vendor would be responsible for the management of any documents submitted as part of an ability to pay determination, only for the period of time before the documents are transferred to the court's case management system.

14. Is the vendor required to go through and obtain an Authority to Connect or Authority to Operate security process before the ability to pay tool can be operational?

Answer: The Judicial Council does not directly require any specific Authority to Connect or Authority to Operate for this pilot project. Any authority required to access a Department of Social Services database will be obtained by the Judicial Council.

15. Non-Functional Requirement T 30.1 - Does this functional requirement require that the application is deployed to five separate data centers to support the five pilot courts or

will the state provide connectivity to a single instance of the ability to pay tool for the five pilot courts?

Answer: A single install base with separate instances is sufficient for the five (5) pilot courts. The five (5) courts should be able to connect securely to the cloud host, over the Internet with HTTPS/TLS encryption.

16. Functional Requirement F10.3: What constitutes sufficient identity / information verification?

Answer: Sufficient identity / information verification would be the First Name, Last name, and citation number. Other possible identifiers will include date of birth and California Driver License number.

17. Functional Requirement F80.1: What are the expected SLAs for the support phase?

Answer: The Judicial Council would like the vendor to provide tier 2 helpdesk/technical support for judicial officers, as well as administrators during the pilot. The Court IT and Judicial Council staff included in vendor training will be the 1st tier.

Estimated SLA requirements are provided below:

Table: 2

Incident Resolution		
Incident Resolution - Priority Level 1	Time to Resolve	1 business day
Incident Resolution - Priority Level 2	Time to Resolve	2 business days
Incident Resolution - Priority Level 3	Time to Resolve	3 business days

18. Functional Requirement F70.1: What is the expected hot data retention period?

Answer: The retention period for daily backups should cover the most recent 30 days of revision history.

19. Functional Requirement F70.1: What are the long-term archival requirements?

Answer: The Judicial Council does not expect vendor to archive documents after the court has finalized the judicial order on a case and transferred the data to its case management system.

20. Non-Functional Requirement T30.2: For the purposes of the pilot, what is the estimated average volume of traffic per (day | week | month)?

Answer: Please refer to Table: 1 in answer number 1.

21. Non-Functional Requirement T20.1-4: What specific systems must be integrated?

Answer: Manual case updates will be done by the court into their case management systems. The pilot courts use the following: Thomson-Reuters, UCS, Tyler Odyssey, Jalan, eCourt, and VISON (VCIJIS).

The courts use different payment processing systems including Official Payment, Lexis Nexis, Payments Solutions, Authorize.net with Elavon, Fiserv, nCourt, Global Payments, and Bank of America. Users will be directed to existing payment processors. The court will provide the vendor updates on payment status. Vendors wishing to propose their own integrated payment system, if they have one, are free to do so.

A third potential integration involves running a name query to a California Department of Social Services database to retrieve a Y/N answer on current status of benefits receipt. Judicial Council staff are currently working with DSS staff on establishing that agreement.

22. Does the CJC have preference or requirement for an on premise implementation of the ATP tool vs a cloud-based solution?

Answer: A cloud based solution is preferred, but not required.

23. Please confirm the CJC's flexibility regarding a shared IP on the tool. What is your position regarding a shared-PI model whereby the CJC holds full access to the product code for use as needed within a predetermined jurisdiction? Under this scenario, the CJC may manage, change and use the ATP tool as needed with the exception of providing it to a separate jurisdiction outside that agreed upon within contract terms.

Answer: The Judicial Council seeks sole and exclusive ownership rights to all developed products and materials. Further detail could be negotiated if selected vendor has a specific request. Any exceptions or changes to Attachment 2, Terms and Conditions must be submitted in a red-line version of Attachment 2, Terms and Conditions.

24. Will there be a single point of contact for the project on behalf of the CJC? That is, will there be a Project Manager designated on the client side? Will the CJC cross-functional team be responsible for approving all project deliverables as well or will it be a single, separate stakeholder?

Answer: Yes, a Judicial Council staff member has been designated as the Project Manager and will, with cross-functional team input, be ultimately responsible for approving all project deliverables.

25. Is the CJC staff assigned to the project team familiar with agile project management terms and methods?

    Answer: Yes, Agile resources will be available.

26. Are the front-end design consultants from the CJC technical developers or functional designers?

    Answer: Consultants recruited to participate on the cross functional team will be functional designers. We also request that the vendor assures functional designer input on their team.

27. Will the pilot scope include only the processing of "Traffic Infraction" cases or other types of cases as well? If so, please provide information on the types of cases.

    Answer: The case type for the pilot is only traffic infractions.

28. Please provide a diagram or process summary of the Traffic Infraction case flow. Is it the same process across all five (5) counties where the ATP tool pilot will be implemented? If not, what are some of the differences?

    Answer: The five (5) pilot courts will utilize the same case flow as it pertains to the on-line tool and how it adjudicates a traffic case. The only differences from court to court will involve system configurable specific court-determined parameters for ability to pay tool calculations and recommendations. We are not going to provide a diagram at this point because the finalized case flow utilized for this on-line environment may differ slightly from current in-court case flow.

29. Please confirm the amount of system users for the pilot for each of the five (5) counties.

    Answer: The Judicial Council estimates that there will be seven (7) system users (admin users as well as judicial officers) at each pilot county plus an additional five (5) individuals at the Judicial Council.

30. Which are the five (5) different court sites where the tool will be piloted?

    Answer: San Francisco, Santa Clara, Shasta, Tulare, and Ventura

31. How many system users per county? Admin/Judicial. Please provide an estimated number of potential defendants' system users. (Based on historical cases?)

    Answer: The Judicial Council estimates that there will be seven (7) system users (admin users as well as judicial officers) at each pilot county plus an additional five (5) individuals at the Judicial Council. In terms of traffic court case volume, for fiscal year 2015-2016, the five (5) counties reported a total of 431,477 traffic infraction filings. It's estimated less

than half this amount could potentially use this newly developed tool to process their case and request a determination.

32. Confirm geographical location.

    Answer: Please refer to answer number 30.

33. Estimated amount of users & user types (roles).

    Answer: Please refer to answer number 31.

34. Is there a vision or roadmap of future expansion of the ATP Tool?

    Answer: Not yet. Future expansion depends on success of pilots and quality of data we are able to collect on who is using the tool, what types of reductions are being made and success rate in cases being resolved with appropriate payments made.

35. Functional Requirement # F20.1 references query from a defendant for a case or multiple cases. Can a defendant have pending traffic infractions in more than one of the five (5) counties simultaneously (pilot counties)?

    Answer: For this pilot, the system will be handling traffic cases within county only, not across multiple counties.

36. Is there a separate mobile app component required aside from the web portal or will a responsive web application accessed via browser (including phones) be acceptable?

    Answer: A responsive web application accessed via browser is acceptable, but the Judicial Council is open to vendors who wish to also recommend a companion mobile app. A browser-resolution sensing HTML5 web application without any client-side installation requirement is expected.

37. What are the local payment processing systems considered for integration to the ATP tool? Can you provide technical information regarding this component? Integration diagram.

    Answer: Please refer to Table: 1 in answer number 1.
                     The Judicial Council expects the vendor to spec out the technical design as part of the functional and design specifications, which are required deliverables.

38. Where does the data for the court records reside? Is the integration required be one-sided or two sided (both systems updating each other)

    Answer: The new system will query the court's database of traffic violations to pull up an on-line user's citation. Two way integration is not planned for the pilot phase.   If the solution is vendor-hosted in the cloud, secured network communication is a requirement. A web services integration

should be encrypted with TLS over HTTPS. A direct database query should be encrypted with an IPSec VPN tunnel.

39. What are the external agency data requirements for the interface? (1 agency)

Answer: We would like for the system to run a name query to a designated state benefits database (likely Cal Fresh). The Judicial Council will establish an agreement with that agency to run a name and return a Y/N answer as to current benefits enrollment.

40. What are the data sets required to manually update key record data?

Answer: The system will need to provide data so courts can manually update court records. Some data points would include: date and time of request for ability to pay determination; date and time of judicial officer order; date and time of payment made etc. All data points will be defined in the specification phase.

41. Describe the user types (roles) that will require training as part of the project scope. How many participants? Are they distributed across locations or may training be centralized? Confirm whether train-the-trainer approach be feasible or all end-users need to be trained by RST?

Answer: Approximately forty (40) people will need to be trained on how to use the tool including judicial officers, court operations and IT staff in the five (5) pilot site counties, and Judicial Council staff. All end users should be trained by vendor staff, either in person or via web-ex.

42. How many people from the Judicial Council staff will participate from the knowledge transfer activities?

Answer: 5-7 people.

43. Is there technical training required as part of the project?

Answer: Yes, as part of the knowledge transfer to Judicial Council staff for support & maintenance and future development.

44. Can you provide more detail regarding support requirements?

Answer: The Judicial Council would like the vendor to provide tier 2 helpdesk/technical support for judicial officers, as well as administrators during the pilot. The Court IT and Judicial Council staff trained as part of the vendor training above would be 1st tier.

END OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS