ADDENDUM No. 2

(please sign and return with the submittal)

CHANGES

1. Section 2, Instructions, 2.27. Discussions with Offerors in the Competitive Range is revised to read as follows:

   The City will notify each Offeror whose Offer is in the Competitive Range or made the 'short list' and provide any questions or requests for clarification to the Offeror in writing. The Competitive Range is determined at the City's sole discretion. Each Offeror so notified may be interviewed by the City and asked to discuss answers to written or oral questions or provide clarifications to any facet of its Offer. The Offerors in the competitive range will be required to provide a demonstration of their product.

   Demonstrations - Offerors in the competitive range will be invited to construct a hands-on sample or presentation of their solution at the City of Phoenix. In addition, each finalist may prepare and deliver a presentation of their proposed solution based on the script developed by the evaluation panel. Demonstrations will be evaluated in accordance with Section, 4, Evaluation Process. The City will also require a hands-on lab demonstration designed specifically for the evaluation panel.

   If an Offer in the Competitive Range contains conditions, exceptions, reservations or understandings to or about any contract or solicitation scope requirement, the City may discuss or negotiate the conditions, exceptions, reservations or understandings with Offeror. But, the City in its sole discretion may reject any and all conditions, exceptions, reservations and understandings, and the City may instruct any Offeror to remove the conditions, exceptions, reservations or understandings from the Offeror's Offer. If the Offeror fails to do so, the City may determine the Offer is nonresponsive, and the City may revoke its determination that the Offer is in the Competitive Range.

   To the fullest extent permitted by law, the City will not provide any information, financial or otherwise, to any Offeror from other Offers received in response to this solicitation. During discussions with Offerors in the Competitive Range, the City will not give Offerors specific prices or specific financial requirements that Offerors must meet to qualify for further consideration. The City may state that proposed prices are too high with respect to the marketplace or otherwise unacceptable. Offerors will not be told of their relative rankings before Contract award.

2. Section 3, Scope of Work, 3.3, Staffing Requirements and Qualifications, (A)(3)(c) has been revised to read as follows:

   c. *The Contractor will be expected to participate in day-to-day activities remotely unless otherwise requested by the City. The City will require an onsite presence during key aspects of the implementation.*
      i. *Offshore Work Performance: Any services that are described in the specifications or scope of work that directly serve the City of Phoenix or its customers and involve access to secure or sensitive data or personal client data shall be performed within the defined territories of the United States. Unless specifically*

Issued 10/5/2023.

stated otherwise in the specifications, this paragraph does not apply to indirect or 'overhead' services, redundant back-up services or services that are incidental to the performance of the contract. This provision applies to work performed by subcontractors at all tiers.

3. Section, 4, Evaluation Process, Key Personnel Evaluation Criteria is revised to read as follows:

    Key Personnel
    1. *Offeror must describe their project team including an organizational chart of the project team including subcontractors, staffing for all project phases, description of roles and responsibilities through a RACI, staffing assumptions, resumes for each key personnel, process for replacement of key personnel and approach for staffing additional project team members. Offerors must identify which of their resources will be on-site during which periods/stages of the project. (Section, 3, Scope of Work, 3.3(A)(3)(a),(b), (c),(h))*

4. Section 9, Submittals, 9.1., Copies, is revised to read as follows:

    Please submit one electronic copy of the Submittal Section and all other required documentation. Please do not lock the electronic copy with password protection so that the City may digitally incorporate the successful offer into the awarded contract.

    Please submit only the Submittal Section, do not submit a copy of the entire solicitation document. *The Offer will remain in effect for a period of 290 calendar days from the opening date and is irrevocable unless it is in the City's best interest to release offer(s).*

5. RFP 24-0024 Attachment F has been revised and replaced with RFP 24-0024 Attachment F_revA2.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Note: Spelling, grammar, and punctuation of the questions are shown exactly as submitted by the potential respondents.

Question #	Question	Answer
1.	1. Can the PMC provide more details on expected future needs or any planned expansions to ensure our design is scalable and adaptable?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Requirements.

2.	2. Can the PMC clarify any specific security protocols, encryption levels, or other security considerations that our solution should strictly adhere to?	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Exhibit B - Non-Functional Requirements.
3.	3. Are there any known constraints or anticipated risks we should be aware of and address in our system architecture to ensure the success of the CMS Replacement Project?	There are no known constraints or anticipated risks at this time.
4.	4. Are there any specific development tools, languages, or software solutions that are preferred or should be avoided?	There are no preferred development tools, languages or software solutions.
5.	5. Could we receive more insights regarding the preferred database types, and are there any specific structures that the system should support or avoid?	The Court is seeking to move from an Informix database to a modern RDBMS for the future state of the system
6.	6. Can the PMC detail any specific middleware or frameworks that are crucial for integration points, or any that should be notably avoided?	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Exhibit B - Non-Functional Requirements.
7.	7. Can the PMC specify any required performance metrics or benchmarks, such as load times and concurrent users, that you are baselining from?	The Court does not hard metrics available related to the current case management system.
8.	8. Can the PMC specify any anticipated scalability and performance requirements, such as the number of concurrent users or transactions per second, that the CMS Replacement needs to support?	Currently, the Court does not have these metrics. There are ~300 active user accounts in the system now.
9.	9. Would the PMC like vendors to include pricing associated with Auto-redaction? a. If so- what would need to be auto-redacted? b. Can PMC estimate how many documents would need to include auto-redaction?	The Court currently uses paper-based files and is open to Offerors proposing auto-redaction features.

Issued 10/5/2023.

10.	10. What is the current payment number of transactions the PMC processes?	Based on a three fiscal year average, 143,940 per year.
11.	11. What is the average transaction amount?	Based on a three fiscal year average, $150.
12.	12. Can the PMC provide these numbers broken down by payment method (credit/debit/e-check/etc)?	Based on a three fiscal year average: Electronic Funds: 7.2% Cash: 8.0% Credit/Debit Card: 77.5% Check/Money Order: 7.3%
13.	13. If the PMC would like to give the public the ability to pay at the counter, can the PMC provide the number point of sale devices to include in our proposal?	Information is as follows: Inperson cashier workstations: 10 IVR (staff assisted) : 26 Payment Portal/virtual cashier: 2 feeds
14.	14. How many databases would need to be converted? a. What is the current size of each database?	Informix DB is 250G, OnBase is 65G, OnBase Files are 1.2 TB, but the Court only has concluded cases imaged currently.
15.	15. Does the PMC require vendors to include any current pending or active lawsuits as a part of their RFP response?	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Attachment G - Minimum Qualifications Questionnaire
16.	16. If the Vendor can offer OnPrem, Hosted, and Cloud-based options, how does the PMC prefer to receive these responses? Separate Cost Workbooks?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Section 3, Scope of Work, 3.10 (A).
17.	17. Would the PMC prefer the vendor to include any specialty court management systems in their response?	Refer to the RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements. Offeror responses should include all functionality necessary to meet the requirements outlined in the RFP.
18.	18. Would the PMC prefer the vendor to include any Jury	A jury management system is not in scope for this project.

	management systems in their response?	
19.	19. Would the PMC prefer the CMS Online Public Access portal to be multi-lingual?	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Attachment F - Cost Workbook_revA2, Value-added Services and Feature tab. The Court is open to Offeror's proposed additional features and services.
20.	20. How many forms is the court using at this time?	The Court's current system is paper-based which requires numerous forms. The Court seeks to move to paperless with system features to generate necessary paper documents on demand. We do not anticipate creating a one-to-one conversion of existing paper forms.
21.	21. How many forms would PMC like the vendor to develop as part of the project?	The Court seeks to move to paperless and wants a system with user-maintained form design features.
22.	22. How many reports does the court have in use at this time?	Information is as follows: 300 from UI, 150 End of day batch, 20 End of week, 50 End of Month
23.	23. How many reports would PMC like the vendor to develop as part of the project?	This will depend on the functionality of the public portal and the application. The Court seeks to move to paperless. Many of these reports are no longer used, duplicates, and obsolete and should be replaced with technology (docket reports).
24.	24. Exhibit E – On page 101, Exhibit E is included in the submission checklist. We do not see any fields requiring input. What would the PMC specifically like to see submitted in order to fulfill this requirement.	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Addendum No. 2.

25.	25. Page 66 & 67 Offeror Services #8 "c" & "j" look to be the same requirement. Is PMC expecting different items from the vendors on these? If so – can more clarification be provided.	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Addendum No. 2.
26.	26. Requirements REQID 1170 – "Ability for the system to electronically receive plea agreements from Prosecutor's Office" – would the electronic plea agreements be a part of the prosecutor card interface or would there need to be a separate interface included? Is an electronic plea agreement part of the Prosecutors Office daily report?	The Court's current solution does not include this functionality. The Court is seeking the Offeror's proposed solution in how it can accommodate this functionality in a future state.
27.	27. Requirements REQ1560 - Docket Displays – Would PMC be providing the push/full file to the awarded vendor or would an integration need to be included for this?	The Court's current solution does not include functionality for electronic signage. The Court is open to the Offeror's proposed solution in how it can accommodate this functionality in a future state.
28.	28. What is the file size limitation for the email submission?	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, 2.11. Submission of Offer, (F).
29.	29. How many e-Filings is PMC processed annually?	The Court's current solution does not support e-filing.
30.	30. Section 2.11 Submission of offer (page 8) requests responses be submitted via email to procrument@phoenix.gov, and Section 9. Submittals (page 101) requests one original response document and one electronic copy (on portable drive or CD). Which submission method would the PMC prefer?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Addendum 2.
31.	31. Attachment F – Cost Workbook, Tab 3 "Implementation": Could you please specify the elements or items that are considered when calculating the cost of the Solution #8 "Project timeline"?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Addendum 2 and RFP 24-0024, Attachment F, Cost Workbook_revA2.

32.	32. Section 5 - Standard Terms and Conditions – 5.8 Contract Termination - Would the City be willing to make this paragraph apply both ways? If that is not possible we need a stronger definition around delays and failures as well as a defined cure period.	
33.	35. Section 6 - Special Terms and Conditions – 6.24 Specifications - Discovery is always needed on these large projects to identify the intricacies for the Court. Any changes from the intended scope will be detailed in change order and agreed to by both parties prior the start of any work.	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Section 5, 5.5(A), Contract Amendments
34.	36. Section 7 – Defense and Indemnification - Vendor will need to discuss some reasonable level of limiting liability on this project	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Section 7, Defense and Indemnification and Section 2, Instructions, 2.5, Exceptions.
35.	Requirement 540 asks for "the system to display all unpaid financial orders, bail orders and post & forfeit eligible amounts". Is this referring to ALL amounts in the system, for a party, or for a case?	The Court's current solution allows amounts due for an individual by various groupings/subgroupings such as payment plan, case, charge, obligation type, etc.
36.	Due to several team members being out of office the next few weeks, hitting the Oct. 20 deadline may be difficult. Is an extension possible?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Addendum No. 1.
37.	In section D "Solution Development and Configuration" Question 3e under "Deliverables" there is reference to Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity. Are there specific features or capabilities City of Phoenix is looking for that you do not currently have? Are there any features you have access to now that are 'must-keeps'?	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Section 3.3., (A)(2)(d)(vii). The Court is seeking responses from Offerors outlining disaster recovery features included with their proposed solution.

38.	What will the auditing in Figure one consist of? FCE cases, financials?	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Exhibit B-Technical (Non-Functional) Requirements , Security & Auditing Category.
39.	Could you clarify what type of tools or reports City of Pheonix is expecting to help monitor and report performance? Is a case statistic report acceptable? If not, what specific parameters are being sought?	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Exhibit A - Functional Requirements, and Exhibit B-Technical (Non-Functional) Requirement. The Court is seeking Offeror proposals that describes functionality for monitoring and reporting performance.
40.	Would you please clarify the statement "Provide Special Accommodations" located in Table 1, on page 22?	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Exhibit A - Functional Requirements, Level 1 Capability, Provide Interpretation and Special Accommodations.
41.	Would you please describe your remote hearing setup (devices, networks, etc.) and provide greater detail in normal process and procedures during the remote hearings? For example, does CoP expect the CMS to include video conferencing, or is there a 3rd-party system to interface with?	The Court leverages Webex as the video conferencing platform, FTR (For the Record) for audio recording and Case Center by Thompson Reuters for digital evidence management.
42.	Requirement 880 refers to "jail court staff". Are these court users who will have constant access to the CMS, or is this referring to staff at the jail who will need special notification?	jail court staff' simply refers to court employees who are located at the Maricopa County Intake Transfer and Release facility where initial appearances are held.

43.	ReqID 4550 "Ability for the system to accept data from an online user form (e.g., motion to continue, generic motion, etc.)": Isn't this E-Filing or is there some other online application you are talking about or that we would need to provide?	This would be e-filing.
44.	ReqID 4600 "Ability for system to integrate with AOC to receive validated para-professional license numbers": I am not sure type of occupations they mean by "para-professionals". Are you talking about licensing or accreditation for interpreters, bonds men, document service agents, etc., or maybe an attorney import that includes bar numbers?	This is a new requirement from the AOC. Please see the following link for more information. https://www.azcourts.gov/cld/Legal-Paraprofessional
45.	1. On page 101 of the RFP the City requests print copies of the proposal submission, but on pages 5 and 102 it states that electronic submissions are preferred. Can the City confirm that electronic submissions are accepted?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Addendum No. 2
46.	2. Would the City consider allowing an additional question and answer period to ensure all team members have time to thoroughly review the RFP?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Requirements, Section 1, Introduction, Schedule of Events. Written Inquiries Due Date was September 22, 2023 at 2:00 p.m. MST.
47.	3. In Exhibit E, the "Direction" field (row 13) of the Long Form Complaints interface page is blank. Can the Court specify if this interface is inbound, outbound, or bi-directional?	The interface is inbound.
48.	4. In Exhibit E, the "Direction" field (row 13) of the Non-Long Form Criminal Complaints interface page is blank. Can the Court specify if this interface is inbound, outbound, or bi-directional?	The interface is inbound.
49.	5. In Exhibit E, the "Direction" field (row 13) of the Victim Data interface page is blank. Can the Court specify	The interface is inbound.

	if this interface is inbound, outbound, or bi-directional?	
50.	6. In Exhibit E, the "Target System" field (row 5) of the Warrants interface page lists "PPD Warrant Database" and the "Vendor" field (row 17) is blank. Can the Court specify the vendor used by Phoenix Police Department as the target system for this exchange?	Currently, there is no 'interface', this is a flat file that is picked up via SFTP.
51.	7. In Exhibit E, the "Direction" field (row 13) of the Civil Non-Traffic interface page is blank. Can the Court specify if this interface is inbound, outbound, or bi-directional?	The interface is inbound.
52.	8. In Exhibit E, the "Source System" field (row 3) of the Teletypes interface page lists "Maricopa County" and the "Vendor" field (row 16) as "CMS." Can the Court specify the vendor used by Maricopa County as the source system for this exchange?	Currently, there is no 'interface', this is a flat file that is picked up via SFTP.
53.	9. In Exhibit E, the "Target System" field (row 4) of the Release Orders interface page lists "PPD" and the "Vendor" field (row 16) is blank. Can the Court specify the vendor used by Phoenix Police Department as the target system for this exchange?	Currently, there is no 'interface', this is a flat file that is picked up via SFTP.
54.	10. In Exhibit E, the "Source System" field (row 4) of the ParkingCADE interface page lists "unknown." Can the Court specify potential vendors used as the source system for this exchange? Also, the "Direction" field (row 13) of the ParkingCADE interface page is blank. Can the Court specify if this interface is inbound, outbound, or bi-directional?	Inbound only. Currently, there is no 'interface', this is a flat file that is picked up via SFTP.

55.	11. In Exhibit E, the "Target System" field (row 4) of the PPD Stats – Civil Non-Traffic interface page lists "PPD" and the "Vendor" field (row 16) as "CMS." Can the Court specify the vendor used by Phoenix Police Department as the target system for this exchange?	Currently, there is no 'interface', this is a flat file that is picked up via SFTP.
56.	12. In Exhibit E, the "Target System" field (row 4) of the PPD Stats – OTH interface page lists "PPD" and the "Vendor" field (row 16) as "CMS." Can the Court specify the vendor used by Phoenix Police Department as the target system for this exchange?	Currently, there is no 'interface', this is a flat file that is picked up via SFTP.
57.	13. In Exhibit E, the "Vendor(s)" field (row 17) of the MQ-DDP interface page is blank. Can the Court specify the vendor(s) that would be involved in this exchange?	This is an interface with the Administrative Office of the Courts.
58.	14. Turbocourt mentioned in RFP, but no details provided in Exhibit E: What kind of case filings are you accepting or expecting to accept through an e-filing interface with TurboCourt?	TurboCourt is the state-standard e-filing solution. The Court is seeking offerors to explain if there are options available for leveraging this tool with their products.
59.	15. Can you identify the different filing source case initiations contained in Spec #2170 and #2180 that will provide a case import filing?	The requirement contains examples of agencies that cite into the Phoenix Municipal Court.
60.	16. In Exhibit A, ReqID 880 states "Ability to automatically notify jail court staff of the need of a court appointed attorney and the status of appointment." Does the Court desire an interface with the jail software solution to exchange this information? If so, can the Court specify the frequency, direction, file format, and software vendor(s) involved in this exchange?	The Court is seeking to learn if the Offeror's proposal includes CAA modules or functionality.

61.	17. In Exhibit A, ReqID 1170 states "Ability for the system to electronically receive plea agreements from Prosecutor's Office." Would this exchange with the Prosecutor's Office have similar parameters to the Long Form Complaints, Non-Long Form Criminal Complaints, and Victim Data exchanges listed in Exhibit E?	This is not a current interface, the Court is seeking to learn how your solution could achieve this with Karpel (the City's current prosecution CMS.).
62.	18. In Exhibit A, ReqID 3570 states "Ability for system to interface with community service providers." Does the Court anticipate granting community service providers user access to the system, or do they desire an interface with a community service provider system? If the latter, can the Court specify the frequency, direction, file format, and software vendor(s) involved in this exchange?	The Court does not currently interface with these agencies. We are seeking to gain information on how the Offeror's solution could provide this functionality. It is not our desire to provide direct user access to outside agencies.
63.	19. Does the City have requirements or expectations for the project start and end dates? If yes, what are those requirements or expectations?	Project will commence within 30 days of contract sign-off. Completion will be determined during the project schedule baseline (3.7 item B 7)
64.	20. In addition to the homegrown CMS and OnBase, are there any additional ancillary sources, such as homegrown databases, archived data, access databases, excel files, that are in scope for data conversion?	Yes. Victim restitution and evidence management data exist external to the existing CMS database and will need to be accommodated during the system migration. It is possible that other items could be identified during project discovery.
65.	21. Will the City provide system documentation (data dictionary, file layouts, diagrams) to help with data conversion estimation, or provide these to the selected vendor?	The Court will supply this information to the selected vendor.
66.	22. Are the documents stored in OnBase single-page tiff or multi-page tiff?	Documents are stored in OnBase single-page tiff.
67.	23. How many tables exist in the current CMS?	There are about 250 tables the exist in the current CMS.

68.	24. How many active and inactive cases are in in your current CMS?	There are 544,695 Active and 667,040 Inactive in the current CMS.
69.	25. How many cases are filed annually?	Three Fiscal Year Average: 111,926 charges are filed per year
70.	26. Do you track payment plans in the CMS?	The current CMS allows for payment plan tacking.
71.	27. Do your financials currently balance for a case in the CMS?	Yes, the current CMS allows for case financials to be balanced.
72.	28. In Exhibit A, ReqID 4590 states "Ability for system to integrate with the Maricopa County Sheriff to send and receive jail related data (e.g., jail time served, failure to surrender, etc.)." Can the Court specify the frequency, direction, file format, and software vendor(s) involved in this exchange?	The Court is seeking a new interface for this requirement.
73.	29. In Exhibit A, ReqID 4660 states "Ability for system to integrate with Department of Health Services (DHS) to receive list of program providers." Can the Court specify the frequency, direction, file format, and software vendor(s) involved in this exchange?	The requirement in question is categorized as an optional feature and does not exist in the current CMS.
74.	30. In Exhibit A, ReqID 4680 states "Ability for system to integrate with the DPS to send criminal history data and receive criminal history data." Can the Court specify the frequency, triggers, and file formats involved in this exchange?	The Court is seeking a new interface for this requirement.
75.	31. In Exhibit A, ReqID 4700 states "Ability for system to integrate with Neighborhood Services and Planning and Development to receive third-party proof of service information, notify that proof of service is required, and judicial ruling of proof of service submitted." Can the Court	Currently, there is no 'interface', this is a flat file that is picked up via SFTP.

	specify the frequency, direction, triggers, file format, and software vendor(s) involved in this exchange?	
76.	32. In Exhibit A, ReqID 4780 states "Ability for system to integrate with Animal Control to receive tickets from rabies animal control." Can the Court specify the frequency, direction, triggers, file format, and software vendor(s) involved in this exchange?	Currently, there is no 'interface', this is a flat file that is picked up via SFTP.
77.	33. In Exhibit A, ReqIDs 4810 and 4820 state "Ability for system to integrate with the Prosecutor's Office to receive property abatements" and "Ability for system to integrate with the Prosecutor's Office to receive witness subpoena list for hearings," respectively. Would this exchange with the Prosecutor's Office have similar parameters to the Long Form Complaints, Non-Long Form Criminal Complaints, and Victim Data exchanges listed in Exhibit E?	Currently, there is no 'interface', this is a flat file that is picked up via SFTP.
78.	34. In Exhibit A, ReqID 4830 states "Ability for system to integrate with the Superior Court to file and process appeals." Can the Court specify the frequency, direction, triggers, file format, and software vendor(s) involved in this exchange?	The Court is seeking a new interface for this requirement.
79.	35. In Exhibit A, ReqID 4860 states "Ability to integrate with justice partners to receive and record information into the case record (e.g., arrest information, etc.)." Can the Court specify the frequency, direction, triggers, file format, justice partners, and software vendor(s) involved in this exchange?	This would either be a new interface or included in the list of existing interfaces.

80.	Can you confirm that there is one source of data for conversion? • How many cases and images will be converted? • From what systems are they converted? • What will be converted from each system? • Number of Images converted? Per day? Per month? Per year? • Number of records and size? • What is the format of the images to be converted (TIF, PDF – single page, multi-page)? What is the average size of documents to be converted?	The Court currently uses an informix database that contains all our data except for document imaging of concluded cases which is in OnBase. Case counts are "544,695 Active 667,040 Inactive". OnBase data is currently 1.2TB.
81.	Document/Template Migration – internal forms and templates? • If yes, specifics as to quantity, etc.	The Court is seeking a solution that will allow for user created documents and templates for future changes or adds. Currently, we have 66 document templates that will need to be migrated to the new solution.
82.	Does the RFP accurately represent the number of concurrent users listed as 290?	Correct, Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Requirements, Section 3, Scope of Work, 3.1.
83.	Training – onsite training, online training • Timing specifics, if any • Train the trainer or end user • Any other specific requirements	The Court is seeking the Offeror's approach to facilitating training for the new CMS.
84.	Do you have a preference between a hosted or on-premises solution?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Requirements, Section 3, Scope of Work, 3.10(A).
85.	What is your intended project duration? Start date to go-live date.	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Requirements, Section 3, Scope of Work, 3.7(B)(7).

86.	Public Access: • Do you want access to images?	The Court is seeking for Offerors to describe their solution's functionality allowing for flexibility in offering public access to case information.
87.	Do you have a projected start date?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Requirements, Section, 2, Instructions, 2.1.
88.	Does this address all interfaces that the client expects the vendor to deliver as part of our proposal? 1) Long Form Complaints 2) Non-Long Form Criminal Complaints 3) Victim Data 4) Warrants 5) Officer Schedules 6) MQ - Core 7) Civil Non-Traffic 8) DUI Warrants 9) Teletypes 10) Collection Agency Warrants 11) Collection Agency Weekly Referrals 12) Payment Portal 13) Release Orders 14) MVD Conviction File 15) Tax Intercept 16) Bar Code Cover Sheets 17) PPD - ALPR 18) Boot & Tow Tape 19) New Warrant Tape 20) PO Documents 21) Parking CADE 22) Parking Payments 23) SAP Disbursements 24) PPD Stats - Civil Non-Traffic 25) PPD Stats - Other 26) Prosecutor Cards 27) MQ - DDP 28) MQ - MVD	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Exhibit E - Court Interface Inventory.
89.	How many physical locations will be part of the implementation?	Two, Phoenix Municipal Court (PMC) and Jail Court

90.	If not, please identify any other interfaces that the client expects the vendor to deliver as part of the proposal and provide the information below for each interface: • Interface Name • Source System • Target System • Description of the interface • Frequency • Volume (payload size) • Security Settings • Error Handling • Format • Direction • Trigger(s) • Delivery Method • Stakeholders • Vendor(s) • Data dictionary/mapping (if available)	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Exhibit E - Court Interface Inventory.
91.	How many cases are processed annually?	3 Year average: 244,150 distinct cases have one or more transactions during the year .
92.	Does PMC intend to keep its current POS hardware? Are they open to replacing their hardware and payment gateway provider?	The payment gateway provider (Paymentus) is contracted by the City. The hardware will change if needed.
93.	What is the anticipated annual growth of cases processed?	Court filings are driven by factors that are external to the court.
94.	Section 2.27 of the RFP: Can you share the "Competitive Range" amount?	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Section 2, Instructions, 2.28. Also, Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Amendment No. 2
95.	Section 3 - Scope of Work, Subsection 3.E.2.a - Figure 3: Is the Orders user an internal or external user? Is the Protective Orders WebApp used by any external users?	The protective orders module is an internal only module used by court staff. The public facing site is managed by the state (AZPoint).

Issued 10/5/2023.

96.	Is the City of Phoenix evaluating any Case Management Solutions currently?	Refer to the RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Requirements.
97.	Is there a solution preference?	Refer to the RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Requirements.
98.	Is there any incumbent who is managing the current Case Management solution?	The Court's current CMS is developed in-house, with no incumbent.
99.	Are key personnel required to be in-person during the project implementation?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Amendment No. 2
100.	For accessing the Case Management System, Out of 290 users, how many users will need full rights (upload, edit cases), and how many will need read-only rights (only view the cases or participate in a workflow process)?	All users will need the ability to be granted roles and rights based on their job duties and organization roles.
101.	Is the court's preference more towards a Cloud-based Case Management System or On-Premises Case Management System?	Refer to RFP 24-0024, Solicitation Requirements, Section 3, Scope of work, 3.10(A).
102.	Do you have a budget already available for this project? If yes, what is the maximum budget you are planning to spend on this project?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Requirements, Attachment F, Cost Workbook
103.	Have the court seen demonstrations of any Case Management System? If yes, what is the name of the solution and vendor which provided the demonstration?	Refer to the RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Requirements.
104.	Is there any expected timeframe within which you would like this system to go live?	Refer to RFP 24-0024 Solicitation Requirements, Section 3, Scope of Work, 3.7(B)(7).

The balance of the specifications and instructions remain the same. Bidder must acknowledge receipt and acceptance of this addendum by signing below and returning the entire addendum with the bid or proposal submittal.

Name of Company: _____

Address: _____

Authorized Signature: _____

Print Name and Title: _____

Issued 10/5/2023.