

NOTICE - REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Idaho Supreme Court acting through the Administrative Office of the Courts (ISC-AOC) requests information for the following:

2025 Enterprise Court Case Management Software Research Project

The ISC-AOC seeks information from firms, developers, or vendors with expertise in large-scale cloud-based court case management software design, development, installation, and support. As a responsible steward of public funds, the ISC-AOC is committed to periodic review of technological developments related to court functions and service. By this RFI, the ISC-AOC hopes to gather materials and perspective about customizable cloud-based Enterprise Court Case Management Systems that are market-ready or in development.

This RFI is issued solely for information and planning purposes. No commitment or intent to replace or purchase any product or service is intended by this RFI. Responses to this RFI will not be considered offers and do not prequalify the submitting entity to submit an offer.

Additional information, including technical specifications and instructions, are available at <https://isc.idaho.gov/procurement>.

Responsive Information Packages are due by 5:00 p.m. on April 18th, 2025.

This RFI issues on the 28th day of February 2025.



Sara Omundson
Administrative Director of the Courts

Posted to <https://isc.idaho.gov/procurement> on February 28th, 2025.



REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI)
Enterprise Court Case Management Software Research Project
2025

Idaho Supreme Court
Administrative Office of the Courts
451 W. State Street
Boise, Idaho 83702

RFI Release Date: 02/28/2025
Deadline for Questions: 03/21/2025
RFI Addendum 1 Release Date: 04/02/2025
Response Deadline: 04/18/2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

A. General Purpose 1

B. Background 1

1. General..... 1

2. Legal Framework 1

3. History and Current Status 2

C. Goal..... 2

D. Contact..... 3

II. RFI PROCESS AND REQUIREMENTS..... 3

A. Calendar of Events 3

B. Time 3

C. Questions and Clarifications 3

D. Procedure and Response 4

E. Respondent’s Costs..... 4

F. Public Records 4

III. REVIEW PROCESS 5

IV. CONCLUSION..... 5

Attachment A – Respondent Information and Certification Sheet

Attachment B – Respondent Questionnaire

Attachment C – Technical Specifications

I. INTRODUCTION

A. General Purpose

This Request for Information (RFI) is intended to serve as an informal research tool by which the Idaho Supreme Court through the Administrative Office of the Courts (ISC-AOC) hopes to gather information and perspective about customizable cloud-based Enterprise Court Case Management Systems that are market-ready or in development.

This RFI is for review and planning purposes only and should not be interpreted as a purchasing tool. As a responsible steward of public funds, the ISC-AOC is committed to periodic review of technological developments related to court functions and service. No commitment or intention to replace or purchase any product or service is implied by this RFI. It is not a pre-qualification of vendors, an invitation for bids, a request for proposals, or a solicitation of interest. Responses to this RFI shall not be considered offers, and any pricing information provided by Respondents shall be used for broad comparison only. This RFI is an informal research tool by which the ISC-AOC hopes to gather information and perspective to help inform potential development of future plans or process.

This RFI, including attachments, addendums, and any responses thereto are public documents subject to Idaho Court Administrative Rule (I.C.A.R.) 32. They will be available for public review upon request and can also be found on the State of Idaho Judicial Branch Supreme Court website at <https://isc.idaho.gov/procurement>.

B. Background

1. General

The Idaho Judicial Branch is a unified court system with seven districts across 44 mostly rural counties, all administered and supervised by the Idaho Supreme Court. Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Idaho Constitution, the Chief Justice of the Idaho Supreme Court is the executive head of the state's judicial system. The Office of the Administrative Director of the Courts is established by Idaho Code § 1-611, and the Administrative Director's duties are outlined by I.C. § 1-612. Those duties, performed under the supervision and direction of the Idaho Supreme Court, include procurement of data respecting the business of the courts, the state of their dockets, their needs, and to report on such and make recommendations regarding improvements in the system or its practices. This RFI issues pursuant to such authority and for such purposes.

2. Legal Framework

Article V, Section 26 of the Idaho Constitution requires that the judicial powers, proceedings, and practices of all the courts, as well as the force and effect of their proceedings, judgements, and decrees, be uniform across each court of the same class or grade.

There are presently 49 District Court Judges that preside over trial courts of general jurisdiction that also hear appeals from their District's Magistrate Division. There are currently 101

Magistrate Judges whose jurisdiction includes civil actions valued less than \$10,000 as well as misdemeanor crime and traffic infraction cases. This roster is supplemented by nearly 70 senior judges who have retired from full-time work and hear cases on an as-needed basis.

In addition, Idaho has one court of special jurisdiction for adjudicating water rights as well as a robust system of treatment courts to address behavioral health issues for justice involved individuals and divert them from the standard criminal case processes. There are currently 69 treatment courts with such types as felony drug court, mental health court, and veteran treatment court, among others. By increasing direct supervision of offenders, coordinating public resources, and expediting resolution, these courts seek to break the cycle of criminal behavior, alcohol and drug use, and incarceration.

The four-member Idaho Court of Appeals hears cases from the District Courts as assigned by the Idaho Supreme Court, which functions as the State's court of last resort. The five-member Idaho Supreme Court also hears appeals from the Idaho Public Utilities Commission and the Industrial Commission and has original jurisdiction to hear all claims against the state, and to issue writs of review, mandamus, prohibition, habeas corpus and any other writ necessary to the complete exercise of its authority.

In calendar year 2024, Idaho's judiciary processed the filing of approximately 95,000 criminal charges, 198,000 infraction charges, 86,000 civil cases, and hundreds of matters at the Idaho Court of Appeals and Idaho Supreme Court. The volume of data to be accommodated by a court case management system in Idaho is therefore significant, as is the ISC-AOC's need for customizable, flexible administrative tools.

Additional information about Idaho's courts can be found at <https://isc.idaho.gov>.

3. History and Current Status

In 2013, the ISC-AOC issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a "Statewide Judicial Court Case Management Solution" that resulted in a series of contracts with Tyler Technologies, Inc. Today, Tyler Technologies provides a cloud-based enterprise court case management system, eFile, jury management, a supervision module and related services by contract with the ISC-AOC.

C. Goal

As established above, the ISC-AOC is not presently seeking a new vendor or contracting opportunity. Rather, we seek information and perspective regarding recent developments in this business sector. No options or alternative systems of case management have been formally researched in at least 10 years, and the ISC-AOC intends to ensure that it relies on up-to-date information in planning for the future. The ISC-AOC hopes to answer the following types of

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

ISC-AOC 2025

ENTERPRISE COURT CASE MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE RESEARCH PROJECT

questions: What emergent technologies or advancements exist or are expected in this area? Are cost savings or other efficiencies available? What other solutions exist, and where have they been successfully implemented?

The purpose of this RFI is solely to gather such information.

D. Contact

This project is being directed by:

Susan Fujinaga, Deputy Administrator
Administrative Office of the Courts
Email: sfujinaga@idcourts.net; RFI@idcourts.net
Telephone: 208-947-7402

Except for official public written communication as described below, Respondents are prohibited from receiving any advice relating to this RFI from any person employed by or affiliated with ISC-AOC.

II. RFI PROCESS AND REQUIREMENTS

A. Calendar of Events

The following is a schedule of events concerning this RFI: (Note: Unless specifically provided otherwise, all events will be administered online at <https://isc.idaho.gov/procurement>)

- 1. Distribution of RFI and Notice February 28, 2025
- 2. Questions/Clarifications Due.....March 21, 2025
- 3. Addendum No. 1 posted.....April 2, 2025
- 4. Information Packages Due, Review Begins.....April 18, 2025

B. Time

All references to the hours of a day shall refer to Boise, Idaho time.

C. Questions and Clarifications

It is the responsibility of the Respondents to review the entire RFI and to formally seek clarification of any point that may be unclear and to ensure the accuracy of their response. Questions or requests for clarifications to the RFI must be submitted in writing and received via email at RFI@idcourts.net with subject line “Questions/Clarifications – Case Management RFI” no later than 5:00 p.m. on March 21, 2025. The ISC-AOC intends to address all clarifications and questions in the written Addendum No.1.

D. Procedure and Contents

One (1) unalterable digital copy of any Information Package submitted pursuant to this RFI must be received no later than 5:00 p.m. on April 18, 2025 by email to RFI@idcourts.net with the project name clearly identified in the subject line. The date and time the email is received will be proof of a timely submission and validation of a Respondent's submission. Submissions received after this date and time may be rejected or unopened.

Each Information Package must include the Respondent Information and Certification Sheet, affixed hereto as Attachment A, and be signed by the person or persons legally authorized to do so.

The Information Package must also include an introductory cover letter, table of contents, firm overview, list of similar projects with purchaser's contact information, identification of any third-party licensors relied upon by Respondent in the provision of case management software and services, and the Respondent's statement of approach/presentation of potential solution, terms, or process with regard to each item listed in the Respondent Questionnaire, affixed hereto as Attachment B, as augmented by the Technical Specifications, affixed hereto as Attachment C. These mandatory response materials may be supplemented by such information or exhibits as the Respondent deems appropriate.

Please be thorough yet concise.

E. Respondent's Costs

Costs for preparing and presenting Information Packages are entirely the responsibility of the Respondent and shall not be charged to the ISC-AOC. Submittal of an Information Package does not create any right or expectation of future contract, remuneration, or response.

F. Public Record

Each submittal becomes the property of the ISC-AOC and will be available for public inspection pursuant to I.C.A.R. 32. If a Respondent believes that specific information it provides is of a proprietary nature, it must isolate the information and mark such pages "confidential" in a specific and clearly marked section of the submittal. The Respondent will be required to include a written statement as to the good faith basis for considering the marked pages as confidential including the specific harm or prejudice if disclosed. Marking any page as "confidential" is not dispositive, and by providing such information each Respondent submits to the sole discretion of the ISC-AOC as to the potential release of such information under I.C.A.R. 32.

III. REVIEW PROCESS

Because this RFI is not a procurement tool, the ISC-AOC commits to no particular review process. The ISC-AOC reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to waive irregularities or request additional information from some, all, or none of the Respondents, and to otherwise act in the best interest of the ISC-AOC as determined by the ISC-AOC.

IV. CONCLUSION

Thank you for your interest in this important research project.

This RFI issues on the 28th day of February 2025.

By: 

Sara Omundson, Administrative Director of the Courts
Idaho Supreme Court

Attachment A

Respondent Information and Certification Sheet

Company Name:

Address:

City/State/Zip Code:

Email:

Phone:

Authorized Representative Name and Title (print):

On behalf of the above-identified entity, I understand and certify as follows:

- That all costs associated with preparing and presenting this Information Package are entirely our responsibility and shall not be charged to the Idaho Supreme Court or the Administrative Office of the Courts;
- That submittal of an Information Package does not create any right or expectation of contract, future remuneration, or response;
- That all submissions become the property of the ISC-AOC and may be subject to public release pursuant to I.C.A.R. 32;
- That I have reviewed the RFI, including its Technical Specifications as well as Addenda number(s) _____; and
- That the information we provide herein is accurate and made in good faith, and that the related products or services described are not the subject of any pending ownership or copyright dispute.

Authorized Representative Signature:

Date:

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

ISC-AOC 2025

ENTERPRISE COURT CASE MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE RESEARCH PROJECT_ ATTACHMENT A

Attachment B

Respondent Questionnaire

Core Functionality

1. **Case Filings:** Please describe your system's case filing process. How does your system handle new case filings? Can the system accommodate multiple filing types (e.g., electronic and conventional)? Additionally, what tools are available for clerks to manage, and review submitted filings, and how does the system notify users of acceptance, rejection, or the need for corrections?
2. **Case Assignment:** How does the system support case indexing, particularly in terms of assigning unique case numbers and tracking cases across different case types (e.g., civil, criminal, probate)? Can the system automatically generate case numbers based on predefined configuration? How does it differentiate and manage case types within the system, and are there options to customize the indexing process based on jurisdictional needs?
3. **New Configuration:** How does the system support the creation and configuration of new case types, including the setup of specific case and hearing types, party and case flags, clerical warning messages, and other customizable attributes? Can users easily create or modify these configurations at will to meet changing court or jurisdictional requirements?
4. **Management of Sentencing Alternatives or Programs:** Please describe how your system can track the progress of justice-involved individuals in meeting court-ordered conditions, such as those required in a treatment court program. Specifically, explain how your system records and monitors compliance with mandated activities (e.g., treatment, counseling, employment requirements, community service, etc.), tracks milestones or violations, and generates reports for court officials. Additionally, outline the structure of this system and if there are any automation features, alerts, or potential for integrations with external systems that allow for real-time monitoring and case management.

5. **Record Retention:** Please explain how the system retains a record of all original, corrected, and/or amended changes entered by court personnel into the system. How does the system maintain an audit trail of modifications to case data, documents, or records, including details of who made the change, when it was made, and what information was altered? Does the system store both the original data and all subsequent changes, and how are these records accessed or reviewed by authorized users? Additionally, how does the system differentiate between corrections, amendments, and updates to data, and are there specific tools in place to track the reason for the change? What safeguards are in place to ensure the integrity of this audit history, and can the system prevent unauthorized edits or tampering with the change logs?

6. **Document Management:** What is the process for case document management within your system? Please explain the process for entering and managing court documents within your system, and how they are integrated into the case record? How does the system handle the creation, organization, and management of documents throughout a case's lifecycle? Specifically, how are document versioning and history tracked (e.g., edits, updates, and previous versions)? Does the system support document annotations or comments by users, and how are these linked to the case? Furthermore, how does the system ensure secure document storage, including access control, encryption, and auditing? Are case documents searchable, and how are they presented within the case file for access by different user roles?

7. **Case and Document Security:** Please explain how case and document security operate within your system. Specifically, how does the system manage access control for different user roles, ensuring that only authorized individuals can view or modify confidential case information or documents? How are permissions set at both the case and document levels, and is there functionality for restricting access based on case type, party involvement, or the Court's Orders? Additionally, what measures are in place to audit and track access to sensitive data, including changes made to documents or cases? How does the system handle sealed or

confidential documents, and can security settings be customized for different court jurisdictions or departments?

8. **Rights and Roles:** Please explain how user rights and roles are structured within your system. How does the system define and manage user roles, and what level of customization is available for assigning specific rights or permissions to different role groups (e.g., judges, clerks, trial court administrators, etc.)? Can roles be tailored to meet the needs of individual courts or departments, and how granular is the control over user access to specific functionalities, cases, or documents? Additionally, how are changes to user rights tracked or audited, and what safeguards are in place to prevent unauthorized access or changes to critical system components?
9. **Testing New Configuration:** Please explain your system's process for moving configurations from a test environment to a live, production environment. What steps are involved in this transition, and how does the system ensure that configurations are accurately replicated without disrupting ongoing operations? Can configurations (e.g., workflows, user roles, case types) be tested extensively before setting a go-live date in the production environment, and what tools or safeguards are in place to validate the configuration changes before going live?
10. **Portal:** Please explain the process of integrating your system with an online, web-based court portal. How does the system manage the exchange of information between the court's internal case management system and the external portal (e.g., for public access or case status updates)? What security measures are in place to protect sensitive data during this integration, including user authentication, data encryption, and access control? Can the system support real-time updates to the portal, and how are changes within the CMS reflected on the web portal?
11. **Court Document Workflows:** Please describe the system's document workflow features, particularly how tasks or documents are routed through various stages of a case. How does the system automate the assignment of tasks or document review to specific users or departments based on case events or workflow

configuration? Can users customize workflows to fit specific court processes, and how are deadlines, notifications, and approval steps managed within the workflow? Additionally, what options are available for tracking the progress of a document or task through the workflow, and how does the system ensure that critical documents or actions are not delayed or missed? Are there reporting tools to monitor workflow efficiency?

12. Calendaring and Scheduling: Please describe your system's calendaring and scheduling tools for court hearings, including multi-party and multi-day events? Does the calendaring functionality allow for distinguishing between different court types (e.g., Magistrate vs. District courts) and individual judges? Additionally, how flexible is the system in managing separate schedules for each court type and judge, including the ability to filter, assign, or limit scheduling based on court type or judge availability?

13. E-filing: Please describe the system's capability for electronic filing. Can the system handle multiple, concurrent filings and large submissions, and how does it validate documents or filings before acceptance? What e-filing tools are available for filers (e.g. redaction, etc.)? Please explain how the system provides service of court documents and how users manage their personal service contacts. Please explain what level of e-filing support you provide for clerks and attorneys? Is there a permanent support structure established for assisting filers who are experiencing technical issues with the e-filing system? Additionally, what features are available to assist clerks in managing, reviewing, and processing e-filed documents (e.g., automatic routing, notifications, rejection options)? How are filing fees managed within the e-filing process, and can the system handle real-time payments? What security measures are in place to protect sensitive documents during the filing process, and how are filings tracked from submission to acceptance or rejection? How user-friendly is the configuration process, and can changes be made without significant downtime or disruption? Is the complexity of making these adjustments similar to or different from reconfiguring the core case management system (CMS)?

14. **Search Functionality:** Please describe the system's case search functionality. Can users search by multiple fields simultaneously, such as case number, party name, attorney, and/or date range? What additional filters or advanced search options are available, such as searching by case type, hearing date, or specific document keywords? Can these filters be expanded upon via new configuration? Does the system support partial or wildcard searches, and how are search results displayed and organized for users? Additionally, can users save or customize frequent search queries, and how does the system handle searches involving sealed or exempt cases to ensure appropriate access is maintained?
15. **Finance:** Please describe how the system supports court finances, including the management of various payment types (e.g., cash, check, credit card) for court fees, fines, and other financial obligations. How does the system handle payment processing, and are there integrated tools for generating receipts and tracking transactions? Can users easily audit financial activities, and what reports are available for reconciling payments, refunds, and outstanding balances? Additionally, how does the system manage fee schedules and automate the calculation of fees based on case type or event? Does the system support partial payments or payment plans, and how are financial records linked to individual cases or parties? Lastly, what security measures are in place to ensure compliance with financial regulations and to protect sensitive payment information?
16. **Data and Evaluation:** Please describe how the system supports data management and evaluation, including ensuring data quality, consistency, and accuracy. How does the system validate data at the point of entry to minimize errors, and are there tools in place for auditing or correcting inaccurate data? How does the system manage event codes and hearing types, and can users customize or modify these codes to reflect changing court processes? What reporting or data analysis tools are available for evaluating case trends, court performance, or specific event outcomes? Additionally, how does the system handle updates to event codes or hearing types, and does it support historical data tracking to ensure consistency over time? Are there measures to ensure data integrity across all case types and

roles, and how does the system handle data archiving or purging as per jurisdictional requirements?

17. **Third-party Owners:** Please explain which components or functionalities of the system, if any, are provided or owned by third-party vendors? Additionally, how are these third-party components integrated into the system, and what is the level of dependency on them for core operations (e.g., e-filing, payment processing, document management)? If applicable, what are the long-term support and update strategies for these third-party solutions, and how does your company ensure that they continue to meet performance, security, and compliance requirements?

Ancillary Functionality

1. **Internal System Reports:** Please describe the system's internal reporting capabilities. What types of standard or built-in reports are available, and how do they cover key areas such as case activity, court performance, financials, and compliance? How customizable are the reports—can users easily modify existing reports or create new ones based on specific data fields or criteria? Additionally, what options are available for filtering, grouping, or exporting report data (e.g., by date range, case type, party, or user activity)? Can reports be scheduled for automatic generation and distribution, and how does the system handle secure access to sensitive or restricted information within reports? For counties that currently run several recurring reports, please explain the transitional process from the old case management system (CMS) to the new one. How does your system handle the migration of existing report templates, data, and historical reporting information? Can existing reports be replicated in the new system, and what tools or support are available to assist with configuring these reports to ensure continuity?
2. **External System Integrations:** Please explain the integration process with other external systems (e.g., financial systems, law enforcement databases, state reporting systems, or third-party applications)? What integration methods or

standards (e.g., APIs, web services, XML, or EDI) are used to facilitate seamless data exchange? Can the system handle real-time data transfers or batch processing, and how customizable are these integrations to meet specific jurisdictional needs? Additionally, how does the system ensure data accuracy and security during the integration process, including handling sensitive or confidential information? Can the system accommodate ongoing updates or changes in external systems, and what is the process for troubleshooting or maintaining these integrations?

3. **Cross-system Data Migration:** Please describe the process for migrating data from a cloud-based system to your system? Can your system accommodate the importing of large datasets while ensuring no loss of functionality or data integrity? Please describe the steps involved in the migration process, including data mapping, cleansing, and validation. Additionally, what tools or support do you provide to ensure a smooth transition, and how are potential issues, such as data formatting discrepancies or incomplete records, addressed? Can the system manage phased migrations if needed, and what are the typical challenges and solutions associated with this process? What type of implementation support is provided?
4. **Self-Represented Litigant and General Public Access:** Please explain how the system handles public access to case information, particularly for pro se litigants or through self-service portals/kiosks? What features are available to allow the public to search for and access case records, and how does the system ensure ease of use for individuals without legal representation? Can pro se litigants file documents, view case updates, or manage their case through the portal? What security measures are in place to protect sensitive or confidential information while still providing necessary public access? Additionally, how customizable is the public interface in terms of layout, language access support, and accessibility for users with different needs?
5. **Stress Test:** Please explain the system's capacity for handling high volumes of users and cases, particularly during peak times such as morning filings. How does

the system ensure performance and stability under heavy workloads, and what measures are in place to prevent slowdowns or downtime during these peak periods? Can the system dynamically scale to accommodate sudden surges in activity, and how are resources allocated to ensure smooth operation for all users? Additionally, what monitoring or alerting tools are available to track system performance, and how does the system handle load balancing, data traffic, or transaction volume to ensure continuous availability and responsiveness? Have you encountered scalability challenges in high-volume environments, and if so, how were they addressed?

6. **Customer Support:** Please describe your customer support and training offers. What types of support are available (e.g., 24/7 support, dedicated account managers, help desk, or online resources), and how do you ensure timely assistance for issues or inquiries? What training options do you provide for new users or during system updates (e.g., in-person training, webinars, documentation, or video tutorials)? Additionally, how are updates to the system communicated to users, and what is the process for rolling out new features or patches? Are updates automatically applied, or do users have the option to schedule them? How do you minimize disruption during updates, and what resources or support are provided to help users adapt to changes or new functionality?

7. **System Failure:** Please explain the disaster recovery plan for your system, particularly in the event of system failure, data corruption, or other critical incidents? Please describe the backup and recovery processes in place to ensure data integrity and minimize downtime. How often are backups performed, and where are they stored (e.g., cloud-based, off-site locations)? What is the expected recovery time in the event of a disaster, and how does the system ensure continuity of service during this period? Additionally, how does your disaster recovery plan handle the restoration of case files, documents, and user settings, and what safeguards are in place to protect against data loss or corruption during the recovery process? Please explain your SLA's.

8. **Remote Work Capabilities:** Please describe how the system supports remote work capabilities for court staff. How can users securely access the system from remote locations, and what tools are in place to ensure the same level of functionality as when working on-site? Does the system support mobile access or specific remote-working platforms (e.g., VPNs or cloud-based access), and how is data security maintained in remote environments, particularly regarding sensitive case information? Additionally, what features are available to ensure that workflows, document management, and case tracking continue uninterrupted when working remotely? Can remote users participate in hearings, manage filings, and access court calendars as seamlessly as on-site staff?

9. **Internal Communication Tools:** How does the system integrate with communication tools such as email, SMS notifications, or other messaging platforms to keep parties informed of case changes? Will court staff have the capability to send court documents directly out of the system? Can applicable parties and participants listed in the certificate of service be directly added to the recipients listed in the outgoing message?

10. **Internal Clerk Resources:** Please describe if the system allows for embedded, clickable links to external resources (e.g., training videos or court processes) within specific areas of the interface, such as in workflows, forms, or user dashboards? Can they be customized based on user roles (e.g., clerks and judges)? What are the security protocols for ensuring that these links or external resources remain accessible only to authorized users? Furthermore, how does the system handle updates to these resources, ensuring that users always have access to the most current versions of training materials?

11. **Forms:** Please explain your system's internal form's engine. How does the system support the creation, customization, and management of electronic forms used for various court processes? Can users easily design and modify forms to meet specific court requirements, including adding custom fields, dropdowns, and logic-based fields (e.g., conditional formatting based on responses)?

12. **Clerical Task Efficiency:** Please explain how your system reduces manual data entry compared to other systems. Does your system provide an integrated workflow or batch processing tools that allow clerks to update multiple document attributes (e.g., name, security, date) simultaneously? How does the system automate or simplify the application of these settings based on case type, document type, or other predefined rules? Additionally, can users configure templates or default settings for certain document types to minimize repetitive updates?

Attachment C - RFI for Enterprise Court Case Management for the Idaho Supreme Court

Criteria	Required	Desired
System Architecture		
Modular and scalable architecture to support various case types (Criminal, Civil, Family, Probate, Appellate, etc.)	X	
Microservices or service-oriented architecture for flexibility in maintaining and updating individual components without impacting the entire system.	X	
Cloud-based infrastructure for scalability and accessibility.	X	
Pared down views for specific audiences	X	
Pared down views for specific audiences with the ability to sign documents		X
Lower (non production) environments copied from Production such as Test, Development, and Stage which are updated on demand and/or on a scheduled basis	X	
Rollback ability to revert system changes in Production		X
User Management and Authentication		
Role-based access control to ensure secure access to system features based on user roles.	X	
Granular user permissions and role management with the capability to create multiple tiers of user accounts, allowing for customized access levels and responsibilities.	X	
Audit logging	X	
Reports to audit user activity (including record view access) as well as audit permissions and roles	X	
Multi-factor authentication (MFA) for enhanced security	X	
Integration with existing identity management systems	X	
Case Management Features		
Case creation and tracking to create, assign, and monitor cases throughout their lifecycle	X	
Document management including integrations for uploading, storing, and accessing legal documents securely	X	
*Ability to attach documents to a case	X	
*Ability to annotate documents within a case	X	
*Ability to run Optical Character Recognition (OCR)	X	
*Ability to email documents to recipients	X	
*Ability to concatenate and compile documents for appellate purposes	X	
Calendar and scheduling for court dates, court hearings, deadlines, and reminders	X	
Task management to assign tasks to specific roles with deadline tracking and history	X	
Role based ability to manage cases from the daily court calendar	X	
Security Groups for different types of documents	X	
Comprehensive and fast search options for cases, parties, documents, and hearings	X	

Attachment C - RFI for Enterprise Court Case Management for the Idaho Supreme Court

Criteria	Required	Desired
Scanning capabilities	X	
Printing capabilities	X	
Financials		
Allow for Payments (Case Payments, payment plans, payment for copies, etc.	X	
Any case payment received will automatically update the case record and balance.	X	
Allow for posting of bonds and later the ability to apply the bond to the fees of the case	X	
Allow for suspension of all or a portion of the fines/fees.	X	
Interoperability and Integrations		
APIs for integration with external systems such as law enforcement, prisons, probation services, etc.	X	
Ability to import electronic citations for each court using a custom template, automatically create a case and have ability to automatically attach image of citation	X	
Application should support web services with readily available APIs and offer reasonable secured access to prevent bad actors from accessing same	X	
Ability to create cases in their entirety (cases, parties on cases, charges on cases) by API	X	
Ability to obtain various data such as case details, parties and connections, hearings, dispositions, access documents, more... by API	X	
Ability to create custom web services APIs to integrate with vendors web services architecture	X	
Standards compliance: Support for legal and judicial standards (e.g., ECF – Electronic Court Filing standard).	X	
Integrating with any product used for Supervision monitoring.	X	
Integration with the Portal the ISC IT Team is building.	X	
Electronic filing (e-filing) system that accepts filings from attorneys and the public.	X	
Data import/export functionality for integration with external platforms and systems. For sharing Data Warehouse or Power BI, security events exported to SIEM	X	
Security and Compliance		
End-to-end encryption for sensitive data (e.g., case details, personal information).	X	
Audit trails for actions taken within the system (view records, document uploads, case updates, etc.).	X	
Data retention policies to ensure data is stored and disposed of according to legal requirements.	X	
Compliance with industry security standards, including but not limited to CJIS, SOC II Type 2, FedRAMP, State RAMP.	X	
Data backup and recovery strategies to ensure availability and integrity of data.	X	
Data Categorization	X	

Attachment C - RFI for Enterprise Court Case Management for the Idaho Supreme Court

Criteria	Required	Desired
Performance Scalability		
High availability to ensure minimal downtime.	X	
Scalability to accommodate increasing caseloads and users.	X	
Performance optimization to handle large amounts of case data and multiple users concurrently.	X	
Usability and Accessibility		
User-friendly interface with customizable dashboards for various user roles.	X	
Mobile responsiveness: Access to the system via mobile and tablet devices.		X
Accessibility compliance (e.g., WCAG standards) for people with disabilities.	X	
Kiosks and Public Access that is fully operational with role-based document-level and case-level security	X	
Reporting and Analytics		
Real-time reporting for case status, workload, and other key metrics.	X	
Ability to create and run custom reports using a readily available tool and have those reports available for users to run from the application interface	X	
Customizable reports for judges, administrators, and other stakeholders.	X	
Data visualization tools for quick interpretation of data.	X	
Predictive analytics for case timelines and workload management.	X	
Detailed system logging and performance metrics	X	
Support for a live replicated copy of the application database where we have permissions to:		
*Create and run on demand custom queries without impacting production		X
*Create and use scheduled stored procedures to output data on a schedule		X
*Support for SQL Server Integration Services or equivalent to create complex integration packages		X
Notifications and Alerts		
Automated notifications for case updates, deadlines, or court hearing reminders.		X
Configurable alerts based on user roles (e.g., lawyers receiving alerts about court date changes).	X	
Text notifications to case parties re: hearing dates, payment dates, etc.		X
Alerts for Server, Services, File Transfers, Security and Ques	X	
Application architecture monitoring and alerts – ability to be notified of features needing attention (stuck jobs, integration issues, long running reports, etc.)	X	
Workflow Automation		
Business process automation for repetitive tasks (e.g., document routing, case updates).	X	
Configurable workflows for court procedures (e.g., case assignment, approval processes).	X	
Dynamic task assignment based on case priority or status.	X	
Data Management and Migration		

Attachment C - RFI for Enterprise Court Case Management for the Idaho Supreme Court

Criteria	Required	Desired
Data migration tools for transferring data from Tyler Technologies Enterprise Justice Suite	X	
Data integrity checks during migration to prevent data loss or corruption.	X	
Support for large datasets and complex queries on case data, including historical data.	X	
Data that is recoverable if there was an unforeseen disaster.	X	
Backups of the data on a regular basis that is stored and compatible with Power BI.	X	
Legal and Regulatory Compliance		
Adherence to legal rules of procedure in the specific jurisdiction.	X	
Compliance with digital evidence management requirements	X	
Retention and disposal policies in line with court guidelines.	X	
Support and Maintenance		
24/7 technical support for users	X	
System monitoring tools to track performance, security, and compliance.		X
Regular system updates and patching for security and functionality improvements.	X	
Patches can be rolled back or reverted from if they cause unforeseen issues in production		X