

eNotification Hearing Project – Texting/eMail Messaging Services

Vendor FAQ RFP Meeting – May 10, 2016

Vendor FAQ RFP Questions submitted to the STATE at the May 10, 2016 RFP FAQ meeting.

Responses are provided by the Fourth Judicial District, Minnesota Judicial Branch. All responses are provided for the exclusive purpose of responding to Vendor RFP questions concerning the requested system solution. This information is provided to the best of our knowledge and remains the property of the Minnesota Judicial Branch. Public release of this information is strictly prohibited without the express written permission of the STATE.

Attending on behalf of 4th Judicial District: Sarah Lindahl-Pfieffer, Project Sponsor; Marcy Podkopacz, Senior Manager/Team member; Fred Hendrickson, Senior Manager/Team member; John Erar, Senior Project Manager/CIO; Paul Hinz, Project Manager Supporting

1. Define Node and Session Level
 - a. Node refers to Court location, mainly focused on the 4th District’s regional service centers at Ridgedale, Brookdale, and Southdale and Hennepin County Government Center
 - b. Session level refers mainly to calendars and hearing types (pre-trial, trial, etc)
2. What is the difference between Section 5, part A; Requirements; the preferred solution must: and Section 5, Part B; Essential Requirements: the preferred solution should?
 - a. The Requirements “must” are mandatory. The Essential Requirements listed are important and desirable but may not be mandatory at this time. The State reserves all rights to determine the solution that best fits its needs.
3. Why is the CJIS requirement in Essential Requirements and not mandatory?
 - a. CJIS compliance and associated requirements are dependent on the type of data being transmitted from point to point. Much, if not all, of the data contained in hearing reminders is considered public data and may not require CJIS compliance or be subject to STATE security requirements. Compliance with CJIS security standards will remain a highly preferred system state goal as will the ability to encrypt message content at rest and in transit. The State reserves the right to determine whether CJIS compliance is mandatory or highly preferred relative to the selected system solution.
4. In Section 5, Part A, bullet 6 speaks about the ability to easily add, edit or remove message content. Can you explain this need?
 - a. Notifications will be sent out for different reasons or hearing types. The goal is to have the capability to tailor messages for different types of hearings and ensure that the message content is applicable for the hearing type.
5. Project Goals – Vendor proposals should include costs to develop the integrations.
 - a. Vendor time to either be involved in or to create and deploy the integration should be included in the proposal cost. It is understood that solutions will vary and some solutions may have a canned integration that can be tailored to each customer and some solutions require a unique integration. Proposals should include the appropriate cost for a working solution.
6. Is there any consideration for an extension?

- a. Dates presently are fixed and the STATE sees no compelling reason for an extension. Any extensions, if made, would need to be material and would be made available to all respondents.
7. Does the State have an existing program to deliver voice messages via phone for notification? If not, is there a reason that this RFP is limited to electronic messaging and does not include voice messaging (a method of notification available to a larger percentage of defendants)?
 - a. Text and email messaging solutions are presently considered more technologically advanced and mainstream for State Court purposes. However, there is no reason a vendor cannot include voice messaging in their proposal for consideration as a separate voice messaging cost addition. Where the supplier chooses to add this to their proposal, the vendor **must** separate voice call messaging services from the primary text and email services being requested and must price this component separately.
 8. FCC rules are clear that text and email messaging for marketing purposes require opt-in and documentation of consent. The rules of non-marketing electronic messaging (to a known client, from a government, or from a political candidate) are vague and contestable. Will the State maintain responsibility for documenting electronic messaging consent from defendants? How will messaging consent be obtained and managed?
 - a. The Court assumes the responsibility to collect that consent from hearing participants.
 9. How does the State currently collect phone numbers (for texting)? How does the State know when a number is message-capable (vs. a landline)? Is "message-capable" flagged in MNCIS?
 - a. Any phone number recorded as a cell phone number is the responsibility of the Courts.
 10. How does the State currently collect email addresses? Is there a field in MNCIS that contains email address for the defendant?
 - a. Yes, the case management system has a place to record the preferred email address for participants.
 11. Can defendants provide any email address, or are they allowed to supply an email used by a family member or other advocate? Is this differentiation noted in MNCIS in some way?
 - a. Yes, any email address can be used. No, this is not currently differentiated in MNCIS between a client or a family member email address.
 12. If non-defendant emails are stored in MNCIS, is the delivery of a notification to an advocate considered by the court to be an official notification to the defendant?
 - a. Distribution of a text or email reminder does not replace the official paper notification sent participants by US Post Office or provided to the defendant in Court proceedings.
 13. Can the State please provide **estimates** in the table below:

Number of unique defendants per year	Dependent on Case Type. The Court declines to provide an estimate for purposes of this RFP.
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Average number of unique appearances per defendant requiring a notification/reminder	Unknown
Percent of defendants with a phone number available in MNCIS	50%
Percent of defendants with a message-capable phone number in MNCIS	Unknown
Percent of defendants with an email address in MNCIS	50%

14. Under Section C. Expectations: *The solution must be economical to administer and must provide for a cost-effective business model in transmitting an unlimited number of either texts and/or email messages. The STATE prefers a pricing model that is not based on the number of individual texts or emails sent but on a bulk number of messages.* Our Targeted Messaging pricing is based on the number of messages that the MN Courts would be interested in sending, such as 500,000 messages, 1 million messages or 2 million messages per year. Would it be acceptable to submit pricing based on the number of messages that the MN Courts is interested in sending?
- a. Yes, pricing based on bulk texting rates would be acceptable. You may provide pricing on an "up to" range basis from 0 to 250,000, then 250,001 to 500,000, 500,001 to 1M ranges, etc. or a pricing structure that is customary in terms of your proposed pricing model with existing business clients. **Bear in mind, we are looking for the most economical, cost-effective, and competitive pricing structure available in vendor RFP responses.**