



Addendum No. 1 – August 6, 2025

Request for Proposals for Software and Implementation Services for a Court Case Management Software Systems Environment

Due Date and Time: Thursday, August 28, 2025, by 4:00 pm CT

A Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference was held on July 15, 2025, at 2:00 p.m. (CT). The Pre-Proposal Teleconference was facilitated by the County and the County's consulting partner, BerryDunn. The Pre-Proposal Vendor Conference was held via teleconference.

Attendance at the Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference was **not** mandatory. The following vendors identified themselves as being in attendance via phone:

Company	Representative
AJW Inc	Livi Alvarez
BuzzClan	Sanskar Suman
Care4 Software	David Hirsh
Catalis	Justin Ebright
CivicEye	Seth Brown
CivicEye	Jim Tersigni
eNoble	Amy Miller
eNoble	Dennis Rienstra
Equivant	Michael Marinelli
FedTec	Arpit Kaur
FedTec	Harshita Kumari
Fortuna-Insights/Arbitration Integration	Sophie Hsiao
Fortuna-Insights/Arbitration Integration	Henry Garlick
Gravamen Technologies	Amy Diaz
Guidehouse	Jeffrey Nadler
Guidehouse	Melinda Wainscott
Guidehouse	Katie Homan
Guidehouse	James Young
JANO	Vasco Bridges

Company	Representative
JANO	Alexandria Jackson
JANO	Paanya Tummala
Journal Technologies	Philip Betz
Journal Technologies	Chris Bodenhamer
Paylt Gov	Spencer Wolf
PublicisSapient	Jackson Rinehart
Stellar Services	Chuck Romoser
Tyler Technologies	Sophia Thomas
Tyler Technologies	Phillip Goddard
Tyler Technologies	Robert Schott

Please find below questions received prior to, during, and after the July 15, 2025, Pre-Proposal Teleconference, and responses from the County.

1. Does the Probation Department anticipate requiring a Socrata interface?

County Response: Socrata is an initiative driven by the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC). The County is waiting to receive clear guidance and an updated timeline before pursuing an interface with Socrata.

2. Can you share a budget for this project?

County Response: Refer to Section 2.10 of the RFP Specifications document.

3. Is the County engaging an external project management firm for this project?

County Response: The County has retained BerryDunn as a consulting partner for this portion of the system selection project. BerryDunn will be facilitating activities as part of the procurement but will not be participating in the evaluation scoring. Evaluations and resulting decisions will be made solely by County Evaluation Committee. There have been no formal agreements between BerryDunn and the County to provide external project management services for the County during implementation.

4. The Interfaces tab in Attachment B lists all interfaces as “Potential Interfaces”. Which interfaces will be required at go-live?

County Response: Interfaces listed in Attachment B may be required at go-live and will be determined at time of contract negotiations with the County’s chosen vendor.

5. Is the County looking to maintain its current payment system or is that up for replacement.

County Response: The County’s current payment system is not in scope for replacement.

6. Please clarify the user count. The County lists 840 FTE with 92 named users and 92 concurrent users.

County Response: The 840 FTE count is Countywide. There are expected to be 92 users of the future case management system. Refer to Section 2.6 of the RFP Specification Document for a breakdown of users by department.

7. What is the estimated budget for this contract?

County Response: Refer to Section 2.10 of the RFP Specifications document.

8. Is it possible for the County to amend the proposal delivery mode from hard copy to email?

County Response: No, the County will keep the original hard-copy proposal for record.

9. Is it mandatory for the vendor to provide 6 references?

County Response: Yes, the six references are mandatory.

10. Referring to 'Tab 1 – Company Introduction and Relevant Experience – IV. Relevant Experience,' is any experience working with Illinois entities (courts, counties, municipalities, etc.), such as staffing, acceptable, or does the vendor need to have similar experience specifically with Illinois entities (courts, counties, municipalities, etc.)?

County Response: Vendors are encouraged to provide relevant experience for projects similar in scope and size to the County's initiative. The County would like to know if the vendor has experience with Illinois entities, especially courts, though there is no requirement for the experience to be solely related to case management system implementations.

11. Has the County established a target budget ceiling or funding range for this project (including implementation, licensing/subscription, and ongoing support)?

County Response: Refer to Section 2.10 of the RFP Specifications document.

12. Will the County accept proposed milestone-based payment schedules, or is there a preferred payment structure?

County Response: The County is open to reviewing the proposing vendors' payment schedules and make a final determination at the time of contract negotiations.

13. Does the County have a preference among cloud vendors or deployment models (e.g., AWS, Azure), beyond the stated requirement that hosting be within the continental U.S.?

County Response: The County does not have a preference though expects the environment to be secure and compliant with standards for hosting government entities. Table 8-02 in Attachment A asks vendors for specifics regarding hosting, storage capacity, and hardware and software requirements.

14. Are there specific SLAs or system performance metrics (e.g., uptime % requirements) that vendors should plan for?

County Response: See Attachment B, General Technical tab.

15. What Document Management Systems (DMS) are currently utilized within the County's courts or CCMS environments (e.g., OnBase, SharePoint, Laserfiche, or custom DMS solutions)?

County Response: The current CCMS has a native document management system. Document images are stored on tape via Net Archives.

16. Does the County's current solution include a native DMS, or is there a preference to integrate with a third-party DMS?

County Response: The current CCMS has a native document management system. The County expects document management to be integrated with the case management solution. See Attachment B, Document Management tab for specific requirements.

17. Are document OCR and full-text indexing capabilities currently available within the County's existing solution?

County Response: No, this is not currently available within the existing solution.

18. Is the current system capable of managing versioning, security permissions, e-signatures, and sealed documents natively?

County Response: The current system does not manage versioning, though it does provide role-based security permissions. There are certain case types and docket codes that are sealed upon filing. However, there are times when the CCMS does not register the sealed flag on a document level from the Odyssey e-filing system. Electronic signatures are managed through the e-filing system.

19. What integrations are currently in place to support court transcript management and storage workflows?

County Response: The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) is contracted with For the Record for court recording and transcripts. For the Record is not integrated with JANO. County Court Reporters receive a transcript request via email, generate the transcript in For the Record, and e-file the transcript to the official court record.

20. Which digital signature tools are currently utilized within the County's existing environment (e.g., DocuSign, Adobe Sign, proprietary e-signature solutions)?

County Response: The County's current system does not provide signature functionality. However, judges and judicial staff are signing court documents through Odyssey queues.

21. Does the County's system currently support digital certificate-based signatures that comply with applicable state and federal court requirements?

County Response: The current system does not support these features. The Illinois Supreme Court has changed its rules to allow the use of digital signatures that are not certificate based.

22. How are signatures for sealed documents and court orders requiring judicial authorization currently managed?

County Response: Judges review proposed orders through the Odyssey queue. Within Odyssey, Judges have an electronic stamp which applies their signature and signature date to the orders.

23. Is remote signing supported within existing workflows, particularly for mobile or remote use cases?

County Response: Technically, judges can access the Odyssey queue from a web browser on a mobile or tablet device though this is not a standard or common practice.

24. What ETL tools are currently utilized or recommended by the County for data migration and ongoing data integration with the existing CCMS?

County Response: The County does not have any recommendations and assumes the legacy vendor would need to help identify what tools can be used for migration.

25. Is there a preferred ETL platform in use (e.g., Informatica, Talend, SSIS, or custom Python/Node pipelines)?

County Response: No, there is no preferred ETL platform.

26. Does the County currently utilize or recommend an Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) for integrations with state and local systems? If so, which tools are currently in use (e.g., MuleSoft, WSO2, Dell Boomi, Apache Camel)?

County Response: No, the County does not currently use an ESB for integrations with state and local systems. Each integration is addressed individually.

27. For existing systems listed in Table 05 and Table 07, could the County clarify which are expected to be retained and integrated with the new CCMS?

County Response: Table 05 is for informational purposes only to allow vendors to be better informed of the current system when crafting proposal responses. As for Table 07, the County expects to eliminate the need for Microsoft Access with functionality available in the new case management system. Applications such as Word and Excel should be integrated as part of the new case management system or through export features. This table is intended to illustrate the applications that currently support daily work—future integrations are listed as a tab in Attachment B.

28. Are there additional third-party systems (e.g., state-level case systems or justice partners) that vendors should plan to interface with?

County Response: Potential interfaces are defined in Attachment B, Interfaces tab.

29. Can the County provide a list of current integrations supported within the existing environment, including API library availability, real-time event push/pull mechanisms, or batch exchanges for system integration?

County Response: See Table 05 in the RFP Specification Document for a list of current integrations. Technical specifications regarding the interface will be redirected to the legacy vendor upon project initiation.

30. Is there middleware or an integration hub currently embedded within the County's architecture?

County Response: There is no middleware or an integration hub in the County's current architecture.

31. What API rate limits and security standards are currently enforced for high-volume integrations?

County Response: This is a question for the legacy vendor upon project initiation.

32. Does the County intend for all legacy data from the JANO system to be migrated to the new system, or is a partial migration strategy preferred?

County Response: Refer to Section 2.5 of the RFP Specification Document. The County is open to partial or full migration depending on vendor approach, recommendations, cost, and overall viability for the County's business processes moving forward.

33. Can the County provide any sample data schemas or documentation for the legacy JANO system—especially for the Probation module?

County Response: See Table 05 in the RFP Specification Document. There is little documentation available for the Court module and nothing available for the Probation module.

34. Will document imaging or OCR services be required for scanned records as part of data conversion?

County Response: No. Converted documents are to remain as images in TIFF format or a similar image format.

35. What tools and methodologies are currently utilized by the County for data conversion from legacy systems?

County Response: The County is asking vendors to propose their preferred tools and methodologies that would work with their system and best support the County through the data conversion process.

36. Does the County support direct database extracts, CSV/XML extracts, or API-based data extractions from legacy systems?

County Response: No, this would be supported by the legacy vendor.

37. How does the County currently approach decisions related to archiving versus full or partial data migration during system modernization?

County Response: The County Circuit Clerk is the decision maker around archiving data and/or full or partial data migration. This decision will be made, in part, by vendor responses and recommendations provided in Attachment A, Tab 7.

38. Does the County use any centralized Identity and Access Management (IAM) tools currently (e.g., Active Directory, Azure AD)? If so, is integration with SSO expected?

County Response: The County currently uses an Active Directory domain for end-user authentication on their workstations. SSO is preferred—see Attachment B, General Technical tab, requirement GT.75.

39. Will role-based access control definitions from the current system be reused, or should vendors propose a new role framework if unavailable?

County Response: See Attachment B, General Technical tab, requirement GT.76.

40. Does the County require that reporting be handled entirely within the CCMS (e.g., ad hoc, statistical, scheduled), or will external tools (e.g., Access, Excel, SharePoint) continue to be used?

County Response: Ideally, all reporting will be centralized through the case management system.

41. Are there required reports tied to state compliance or judiciary standards that must be automated in the new CCMS?

County Response: See Attachment B, Reporting and Financial tabs for data required reporting elements. The County is required to report to the AOIC. Though the reports submitted to the AOIC are more comprehensive than what is shown publicly online, refer the AOIC's website for a subset of the types of [court data](#) and [probation data](#) collected. The chosen vendor will receive copies of the reports for discovery purposes.

42. Does the County currently utilize native reporting tools within its environment, or are third-party BI tools (e.g., Power BI, Tableau) leveraged for analytics and reporting?

County Response: The previous Courts Technology Specialist, since retired, developed external reports using Microsoft Access and ODBC connections to the AS400 database system

43. What calendar and scheduling tools are currently in use by the County for court scheduling and event management?

County Response: The County's current software is used for court scheduling and event management. There is also a Microsoft Access report that details the daily court calendar.

44. Will the County require these existing tools to be integrated with the proposed CCMS solution?

County Response: The County expects these functions to be native to the new case management system, eliminating the need for third-party tools or applications.

45. Does the County anticipate that probation officers or other staff will require offline/mobile access to the CCMS in the field?

County Response: This functionality would be helpful.

46. Are there any known accessibility (ADA) or usability standards that must be met for the public-facing portal?

County Response: See Attachment B, Portal tab, requirement POR.7.

47. Will County staff be available for User Acceptance Testing (UAT) and data validation during conversion cycles, or should the vendor assume limited availability?

County Response: The County expects key users to participate in both data validation testing and user acceptance testing. Vendors should outline the expected responsibilities and/or time commitment for County users in Attachment A, Tab 3 (Tables 3-01 and 3-02), Tab 7, and Tab 9.

48. Does the County have a preferred project management framework (e.g., Agile, Waterfall, hybrid), or should vendors propose what best fits their methodology?

County Response: The County does not have a preferred project management framework. Vendors should propose what best fits their methodology.

49. In the event of a phased implementation, does the County expect separate go-live milestones for each functional area?

County Response: Yes. If the vendor proposes a phased implementation approach, the County expects separate go-live milestones for each functional area.

50. For vendors proposing multiple solutions (e.g., SaaS and on-premises), will each be evaluated independently and scored separately?

County Response: The County evaluation team will follow the scoring methodology provided in Section 3.1 of the RFP Specifications document.

51. Could the County clarify if contract negotiations will allow for adjustments to pricing tiers based on final scope (e.g., reduced modules or phased delivery)?

County Response: Yes, the County reserves the right to conduct Request for Clarifications and well as Best and Final Offers. Refer to Section 3.1.d of the RFP Specifications document.

52. How many jury summonses does the County send annually?

County Response: In 2024, the County sent 3,325 summonses. The County has sent 2,700 summonses to date in 2025.

53. Is the County interested in summons printing and mailing services?

County Response: Yes, see Attachment B, Jury tab, requirement JR.19. Vendors can scope out pricing in Attachments C1 and C2 as desired.

54. Can the County provide a case count breakdown for probation only (similar to page 9)?

County Response: As of 7/1/25, the County had 1,422 adult probationers and 83 juvenile probationers. These counts do not include court supervision or conditional discharge cases, of which there are approximately 1,200 open cases at a given time.

55. What level of business process reengineering is the County expecting from the vendor during implementation?

County Response: We are unsure how the querant would quantify the level of business process reengineering. Some of this is inherent to the implementation process as the County is introduced to new technological capabilities and given the opportunity to streamline. In general, the County

expects the vendor to offer industry best practices and recommend process changes based on enhanced system capabilities.

56. Are there any critical workflows or statutory obligations specific to Illinois courts that the County expects the system to support out-of-the-box?

County Response: Yes. See requirements outlined in Attachment B.

57. Does the County anticipate maintaining Microsoft Access workflows or reports post-implementation, or are those expected to be replaced entirely?

County Response: No. The new case management system eliminates the need for Microsoft Access reports and workflows.

58. Regarding the “Specific screens or functionality specific to judges” – what does the County envision?

County Response: See Attachment B, Judicial Tools tab. This describes the requested functionality for judges and clerks while in court or preparing for court.

59. Are any departments outside the Clerk, Court, and Probation expected to interface with or access the system (e.g., Sheriff’s Office, Public Defender, SAO post-migration)?

County Response: Yes. See Attachment B, Interfaces tab. The Portal tab also describes functionality needed for an external, read-only version of case information defined by roles.

60. How many databases are there to be converted? What size(s)?

County Response: The County estimates there are approximately one or two databases and will determine the exact number of databases during contract negotiations. This is proprietary information that the current vendor has elected not to disclose.

61. Which vendors participated in the questionnaire the County sent out prior to the RFP’s release?

County Response: At the time, the County sought vendors with Illinois experience who provide solutions across the entire justice ecosystem for courts, public defenders, prosecutors, and probation departments. Accordingly, Journal Technologies, Tyler Technologies, Tyler Technologies, and JANO Technologies participated in the questionnaire.

62. Attachment A, Section 4, asks for relevant experience working with Illinois courts. Will the County only consider vendors that have CMS implementations in Illinois?

County Response: The County will not preclude vendors without Illinois CMS implementation experience from proposing. As defined in requirement GT.112, the County desires the vendor be familiar with Illinois Supreme Court rules and mandates, but this is not critical or required.

63. Section 2.10 states The County has performed initial, high-level estimations, for the acquisition of either a County-hosted, proposer-hosted, or cloud-based software solution

- a. What is the County’s current high-level estimation range for this project?
- b. Has the County received any vendor price proposals for this project?

County Response: The County will not provide any price estimates. Refer to Section 1.6 of the RFP Specifications document.

64. Section 1.2 states that each department has a distinct module and database; however, section 2.8 shows one database for the Jano Technologies eMagnus MultiCourt system.

- a. Is the Jano Technologies eMagnus MultiCourt system used for CCMS, Jury and Probation? If not, what systems are in place?
- b. Are there separate modules in the current system for CCMS, Jury, and Probation?
- c. Are there separate databases for CCMS, Jury and Probation? Or are they all on one database?

County Response: JANO is used for CCMS and Probation with different modules for each. The County's current jury system vendor is Judicial Systems and is not integrated with JANO. The County estimates there are approximately one or two databases and will determine the number of databases for conversion during contract negotiations. This is proprietary information that the current vendor has elected not to disclose.

65. Are there any other databases that will need to be converted?

County Response: The County estimates there are approximately one or two databases and will determine the number of databases for conversion during contract negotiations. This is proprietary information that the current vendor has elected not to disclose.

66. Are there images that need to be converted?

County Response: Yes. Documents are stored as images and should remain in image format.

67. Did a vendor help with the creation of the RFP?

County Response: See the response to Question 3.

68. Will they be authorized to bid on this RFP?

County Response: BerryDunn is a third-party consulting firm and does not provide software.

69. You state there are 92 primary users? How many other users are there?

County Response: The estimate of 92 users refers to direct or named users of the new system. This count does not include users who will access court data through an external web-based portal.

70. Do you allow submissions online?

County Response: See Section 4 of the RFP Specifications Document for submission guidelines.

71. Do the judges need access to the system?

County Response: Yes. See Attachment B, Judicial Tools tab for functionality requested by judges and clerks to use while in court or preparing for court.

72. Do you plan on allowing attorneys access to the system?

County Response: Yes. See Attachment B, Portal tab for functionality needed for an external, read-only version of case information as defined by roles.

73. How do you handle the scheduling of cases across the courts?

County Response: Cases are scheduled individually by courtroom based on judge assignment and availability. Unsure of what "across the courts" refers to in this context as there is only one court.

74. After implementation, the RFP indicates you want to support the environment, would that include a hosted solution? Or only on-premises solution?

County Response: See Section 2.4 of the RFP Specification Document. The County is open to considering various deployment models. These should be priced accordingly in Attachments C1 and C2.

75. Can you extend the due date by two weeks?

County Response: The deadline for proposal submission remains as originally posted: August 28, 2025, at 4pm CT.

76. Can the County confirm which interfaces must be included in the base scope (e.g., Tyler eFile, Enterprise Computer-Aided Dispatch, Brazos, Real Vision, PayIt)? Additionally, can the County provide a prioritized list of interfaces from Attachment B, indicating which are essential for go-live and which may be implemented in later phases?

County Response: Vendors have an opportunity to provide comments, cost estimates, and indicate if an interface is included in the scope of the vendor's proposal in Columns G through K in Attachment B.

77. How firm or flexible is the December 2026 go-live for all modules?

County Response: The County is flexible on this date. Based on experience and the information provided, vendors should provide potential phase start and target go-live dates in proposal responses in Attachment A, Tab 5.

78. Case metrics show a significant increase from 2021 to 2022. Does the County anticipate a similar increase in 2027 when the new system is introduced?

County Response: Beginning in 2022, traffic and criminal cases with multiple charges started to be filed as separate cases. Case metrics in 2027 will likely reflect similar numbers as 2023 and 2024 plus growth.

79. In addition to the functional requirements outlined in Attachment B, is the County able to provide a list of key user tasks associated with each Requirements Category, if available?

County Response: No, this is not available.

80. Can the County share the expected format(s) (e.g., fillable PDF, Word, static image) of the 200–250 forms and templates referenced in the RFP?

County Response: Some forms may be better suited as a fillable PDF while others should be in Word.

81. While we understand the County may not be able to precisely quantify public users, can it provide any assumptions, usage proxies, or estimated peak volumes to help inform performance and scalability planning? (e.g. Expected daily or monthly traffic to the public portal, Anticipated peak usage scenarios such as jury check-ins, court date lookups, case filings)

County Response: The County does not have these metrics to provide.

82. Are there any specific service level agreements (SLAs), recovery point objectives (RPO), or recovery time objectives (RTO) that SaaS vendors are expected to meet?

County Response: See Attachment B, General Technical tab. Vendors can detail their SLAs, RPO, and RTO in Attachment A, Tab 8.

83. Are proposers permitted to submit alternative pricing structures (e.g., user-based vs. enterprise licensing), provided they are clearly explained in the cost narrative and included as supplemental quotes?

County Response: Yes, refer to Attachment A, Tab 2 as well as Attachment C1 and C2.

84. Can the County clarify any requirements, restrictions, or preferences related to subcontracting? Must subcontractors be identified at the time of proposal submission, or can some be disclosed later?

County Response: Subcontracts shall be identified at time of proposal submission. Refer to Attachment A, Tab 1, V Use of Subcontractors.

85. Is the County able to share a high-level summary of responses to the pre-RFP vendor questionnaire? For example, the number of responses received, common functional areas, proposed deployment models, or price ranges? This would help us align our response with the County's expectations.

County Response: The County will not be sharing this information at this time.

86. Does the County have any requirements or expectations regarding foreign language support for public-facing components (e.g., public portal, notices, jury communications)?

County Response: Yes. See Attachment B, Portal tab, requirement POR.6. Spanish is expected at the very least.

87. Will vendor demonstrations be on-site or remote?

County Response: Demonstrations are anticipated to be on-site, though the County reserves the right to change the format upon further discussion.

88. Does the County want one (1) USB drive containing both the Technical and Price Proposals, or two (2) USB drives, one for each Technical and Price Proposal?

County Response: See instructions in the RFP Specifications Document, Section 4.1. There should be one (1) USB drive for the Technical Proposal and one (1) USB drive for the Price Proposal, totaling two (2) USB devices.

89. How many summonses and questionnaires does the County mail annually?

County Response: See response to Question 52.

90. How is the current CMS tracking which cases are in microfilm? Is there a document entry added to each case?

County Response: Yes, cases stored on microfilm contain a docket entry with the microfilm number.

91. Functional and Technical Requirements CM.7 – How is this process handled in your current CMS?

County Response: This feature is not available in the current system.

92. For CM.22 docket-entry linkage, should the system keep an immutable reference between paired entries even after one entry is edited, sealed, or statutorily expunged for example, when a superseded plea agreement is later vacated so downstream financial adjustments and appellate extracts can still trace provenance?

County Response: The County is not prepared to decide at this stage of the process and will be deferred until configuration when the County can see the functionality in real-time.

93. For CM.28–46, which case-summary screen components, such as the charge/status stack, next-appearance countdown, and running financial balance, must remain judge-locked, and

which widgets (e.g., collapsible notes panel, role-based quick-action tiles) can be added or removed by end users?

County Response: No components or data elements should remain judge-locked, though the County will make a final determination during configuration when the County can see this functionality in real-time.

94. Based on industry best practices for citation workflows, will production-phase CCMS ingestion remain the overnight AS/400 DB2/400 flat-file (≈3,500 records/day), or should we instead provision a real-time LEADS 2.0 web-service feed including delta updates for amended or voided citations and, if so, what maximum end-to-end latency (e.g., < 5 minutes) and retry protocol should the solution meet?

County Response: The County is planning to go live with Brazos in October 2025 and has not yet determined the method by which citations will be ingested into the CCMS.

95. For the retention workflow, should CCMS auto-generate a PDF destruction certificate pre-populated with series codes, cubic-foot totals, disposal date, and clerk e-signature—and email it directly to the Illinois State Archivist upon each purge cycle, or will the County handle certificate submission outside the system?

County Response: The County is not prepared to decide at this stage of the process and will defer until configuration when the County can see the functionality in real-time.

96. Based on industry best practices for courtroom schedule integrity, when a judge is reassigned after the session has commenced, should the Calendar module automatically re-sequence the remaining docket to the successor judge honoring resource locks such as interpreter bookings, custody transports, and courtroom allocations while issuing real-time email/SMS/portal notices or freeze the original time slots and merely record the judge change for manual follow-up?

County Response: The County is not prepared to decide at this stage of the process and will defer until configuration when the County can see the functionality in real-time.

97. When a hearing or filing deadline lands on a holiday supplied by the County's iCal/Exchange feed such as Juneteenth or the Illinois Judicial Conference closure—should the Calendar engine automatically roll the event to the next business day, recalculating judge assignments, interpreter bookings, and statutory notice periods, or simply flag the conflict for manual rescheduling?

County Response: Yes, ideally this workflow can be automated based on Court-defined business rules (for example, the judges may not be available the following business day). The County also reserves the right to make a final decision during configuration after seeing the functionality in real-time.

98. Within the Judicial Tools e-signature workflow, should CCMS enforce the Illinois Supreme Court Electronic Filing Standards, such as embedding RSA-2048/SHA-256 X.509 certificates issued by the AOIC PKI or will a NIST SP 800-63-3 AAL2 approach (e.g., FIDO2 hardware token-backed signatures on PDF orders) fully satisfy the County's evidentiary and audit requirements?

County Response: The County is not aware of these standards requested by the AOIC and will discuss further with the chosen vendor upon project initiation.

99. Based on USPS Intelligent Mail e-Doc limits (≈150 k unique IMb barcodes per Mail.dat file), when a jury summons run exceeds that threshold, should the Jury module auto-segment the job into compliant sub-batches, renumbering tray tags while preserving sequential summons IDs, or export a single file and rely on the mail house to split it downstream?

County Response: The County's monthly jury summons run should not exceed that threshold. The County will further discuss this process with the chosen vendor.

100. For ad-hoc analytics, do you prefer embedded drag-and-drop dashboards such as interactive heatmaps of continuance rates by judge and real-time pivoting of case-aging metrics or will a secure nightly OData/XMLA feed into the County's Power BI Gateway (supporting incremental refresh, RLS, and field-level masking) fully meet end-user self-service needs?

County Response: The County could be interested in drag and drop dashboards depending on how real-time case data impacts system speed and functionality. The County will make a final decision when users can see this functionality in real-time.

101. Under GT.10, if the County selects SaaS, must the DR design deliver ≤ 15 -minute RPO and ≤ 1 -hour RTO via cross-region warm-standby (e.g., Aurora Global Database replicating from us-east-2 to us-west-2 with automated failover), or is a single-region, multi-AZ architecture sufficient?

County Response: A single-region, multi-AZ architecture should be sufficient, though County IT would like to discuss this further with the chosen vendor if taking the SaaS route.

Respondents are instructed to return a copy of this addendum form signed by an authorized firm agent as part of proposal responses.

SIGNATURE

COMPANY

DATE