

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES
DIGITAL EVIDENCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
RFI NUMBER: 180-24-02

Updated May 17, 2024

1. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this?
(like,from India or Canada)

Yes

2. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

Many of the meetings can be held by Reliable Electronic Means. The anticipation would be to have some onsite meetings during discovery, implementation, and training.

3. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA?
(like, from India or Canada)

The question isn't clearly understood so if you need more information please resubmit. The location of vendor staff performing work to accomplish the tasks can be located outside the USA. Per section 3.03 statements there is a requirement to provide a narrative description of the organization and project team, personnel roster, and resume. The anticipation would be an address of the team members would be included within the description areas. Under section 2.04 for cloud-based services, the expectation is the response would include hardware and software hosting services details.

4. Can we submit the proposals via email?

See section 1.04 and 1.05 of the RFI for requirements.

5. Will client be migrating any archived data in the new cloud system? If so, how much?

This would be a new application to house digital evidence submitted to the courts mainly consisting of videos and audio files. We do not anticipate any archived data to be converted.

6. Do client perform transcription on video and audio files? If so, how many hours of transcription do you use per year?

We do not anticipate any transcription of the files.

7. The RFI list / reference a total of 56,643 cases per year from both civil and criminal courts. How much data storage per year do you anticipate is needed?

It is hard to estimate the amount of data storage required but an estimate to use in estimate calculations would be 1 TB per year. Keep in mind the current records system will continue to contain all the digital documents.

8. Of the 55 judges, 5 judicial referees and 390 judicial staff, will there be a specific number of these employees that will not not require access to the digital evidence management system? If so, how many?

Our expectation is all staff and judges would have access to the system. Also should include external attorneys having the capability to submit and use the system.

9. The RFI stated API integration with the current court and appellate court case management system. What is/are the name(s) of this current system(s)?

The current district court case management system is Enterprise Justice from Tyler Technologies and the appellate court system is C-Track by Thomson Reuters.

10. How much data is currently being stored on CD's and Flash Drives?

This question is hard to estimate without actually looking at all the CDs, DVDs, and Flash Drives stored throughout all the court houses in the state. Please see response #7 for amount of data estimates for each year for the RFI. As stated in the RFI the system would be implemented for all the court houses throughout the state.

11. Will access to the solution be required during court proceedings?

Yes

12. Can you provide samples of your typical proprietary video and audio file formats?

No. Some examples formats would be body cam videos, videos from security systems, and various audio systems.

13. What is the current court and appellate court case management systems?

See response #9

14. How much evidence in the form of paper does is received monthly that needs to be scanned and digitized?

None. The current court management system will continue to house all the paper documents

15. Is offsite data collection required for this opportunity?

Don't understand the requirement. The system should be available for external court staff to submit evidence into the system.

16. How many users do you anticipate accessing the solution monthly?

Court staff would be all mentioned in the RFI and questions. Also anticipated external submitters to be in vicinity of 500.

17. Will the solution be physically installed in ND facility, or do you have a Private Cloud?

See the RFI section 2.04 which signifies a cloud-based service.

18. Will the users require the need to download any of the documents?

It can be anticipated there would be a need to download and of the contents.

19. Is there Personal Identifiable Information (PII) that needs to be identified and redacted prior to any documents being released?

It is not anticipated to be able to do this.

20. In 3.04 Method to Complete the Project it states that "Scope of Work as described in Sections 2.04 - 2.06 of this RFI" Can you provide Sections 2.05 and 2.06 as this is not listed in the document?

Please disregard any reference to section 2.06.

21. Is there a preferred API?

No

22. Is there a list of specific APIs for retrieval and reporting that you could provide?

No We anticipate this to be integral to the system and be available for programming of an external application for needs of extraction and reporting.

23. Is there a requirement for vendor personnel to perform on-site work?

It should be a mix of on-site and off-site work. Some items like discovery, training, and implementation would be on-site work.

24. Is vendor staff able to work remotely to reduce/avoid travel costs?

Yes

25. In 3.04 Method to Complete the Project it mentions, "A description of any data collection instruments and methods to be used in collecting data." What sources will data need to be collected from as it mentions in 2.03 Background and Purpose of this Request the data is stored on CD's and Flash drives?

Most data should be directly uploaded into the system but there could be occasions where other evidence would need to be digitized and uploaded. Examples could include a crow bar, knife, large pictures, etc.

26. Is there a need to query data in-place? i.e. network drive, servers?

No

27. This section references "A description of the vendor's approach to meeting the Purpose of the RFI and Scope of Work as described in Sections 2.04 - 2.06 of this RFI". 2.05 or 2.06 are missing from the RFI.

Please disregard the comments of 2.05 and 2.06

28. We understand we have to quote for the integration. However, we kindly request clarification on the specific application to which we are required to integrate, as well as the type of integration needed.

The general idea behind this is 2 parts. If a certain application as a whole has to integrate with another certain application to make the main application work this should be included. The ND Courts uses Odyssey from Tyler and if the application has/could have interface with the main court's system, include description and costs.

29. As a unified court system, are all 53 district courts using the same case management system?

Yes

30. Is it your vision that the Supreme Court will also utilize the DEM solution to view the appropriate exhibits in product OR will content need to be exported/downloaded and provided to the Supreme Court outside of the product?

This hasn't been determined yet.

31. Can authorized internal users see exhibits for a case outside of their district (i.e., does a clerk located in McKenzie need to be restricted from seeing exhibits for a case that might be filed in Dunn?).

If the application can accomplish this, specify it as a function capable within the application and describe the capability.

32. The RFI specifies on-site training. Would the ND State System support training to include one representative from each of the eight judicial districts who would then train the appropriate users within their district (train the trainer approach)? We have had great success with remote training, would the ND State system be open to considering that approach?

The courts would review your available training options.

33. What CMS is used by prosecutors?

The court doesn't have this information available.

34. What CMS is used by North Dakota Commission on Legal Counsel for Indigents?

The court doesn't have this information available.

35. Is the State looking at a phased implementation approach?
a. If a phased implementation approach is requested, which courts or areas of the court are to be implemented first?

The thought is to do one implementation of the system. Any other options should be defined and described within the response.

36. Is the State looking at physical evidence management solutions along with digital evidence?
a. If physical evidence is being requested, should vendors propose and provide pricing for both physical evidence & digital evidence systems?
b. If physical evidence is being requested, should vendors scanners and printers for physical evidence? What are the quantities of each being requested?

Currently only looking for digital evidence management.

37. How many judges does the State have at each level of the court?

This information is described in section 2.01 of the RFI

38. Where is digital evidence data currently stored (on premise or cloud)?

Currently digital evidence is stored on thumb drives, CDs, DVDs on premise.

39. How much data will be imported from the old system into the new system?

Don't anticipate data imported from old system during go live.

40. How many sites across the state will require on-site training?

Number of sites for training has not been determined as of this writing. Vendor could give description of training including number of hours and a cost for their estimated amount.

41. Is there a technical questionnaire that will be provided to potential bidders? Section 2.02

A technical questionnaire has not been developed as it is anticipated each vendor would submit system functionality as part of their response.

42. Are you able to provide an estimated amount of storage needed?

See previous answer. #7

43. What is the current trial court case management system in use today? Can you provide details regarding the scope of integration required as called out in section 2.03

See previous answer. #28

44. Are you requiring the migration of existing evidence (DVDs, flash drives, images, documents) into the newly proposed digital evidence management system? If so, what is the estimated amount of data that will be migrated.

No.

45. Can you elaborate on the court's access, security, functionality, and storage needs? Section 2.03

Access would be for all court staff to access system, security would be up to what is within the application with the anticipation of controlled through active directory and be role based, functionality is how the system works for users, and storage needs is for the system to handle all types of images and video formats.

46. How many users of the system would require onsite training?

Anticipating all court users would require some level of basic training based on functions of the software.

47. Will you accept an e-mail or electronic portal submission in lieu of mailed hard/electronic copies?

Specifics is contained in Section 1.04

48. RFI Section 3.03 Experience and Qualifications states, "Vendors must describe the experience of their organization in conducting and completing the kind of research and analysis described in this document including evaluation, multi-site project coordination, collaborative research strategies, and use of qualitative and quantitative research methods." This sentence does not seem to align with the cloud-based digital evidence management system scope of work described in the RFI. Can you please clarify what you mean by research and analysis as it pertains to the RFI scope?

An extended explanation for research and analysis as described here as an example is examining the current intake and storage of digital evidence, methods of storage, process improvements, future trends of evidence storage, large project management, historical changes to software system, and how vendor determines what changes to make to software for the future. This is not a finite list of items but some examples of the vendors processes for current and future projects and software improvements.

49. We understand this RFI is for budgetary purposes and will not result in an awarded project or contract. As such, we respectfully request to remove submission of project team resumes from the RFI proposal requirements as those would be provided in the subsequent RFP response.

This is granted. A replacement is to provide an overview of experience the company has in place of resumes with some completed project descriptions would suffice.

50. Can you please provide information related to your existing technical environment and potential systems that will be integrated?

As stated previously, the courts use Enterprise Justice formerly known as Odyssey from Tyler Technology. Current technical environment is Odyssey running on premise servers and each person/courtroom having Windows based desktop computers or laptops to access any applications. As per anticipated integrations this was described in previous question/answers.

51. Can the State please provide an overview of the technical environment within the state Court System (Per Section 2.02 Technical Overview)?

For the purpose of the RFI, there are previous questions and answers already. An overview is the Court used Tyler Technologies Enterprise Justice software formerly known as Odyssey. The software we anticipate on using is to store digital evidence and be able to be retrieved by any desktop or laptop computer in the courts. A vendor should be aware there should be a way to link or identify the digital evidence to a court case record and this should be described in the RFI.

52. What is/are the estimated data size and storage requirements?

See response #7 and can extrapolate from those estimates.

53. Will the proposed DEMS be used for managing the digital evidence needs of all the State Courts (civil, tribal, family law, probate, etc.), or will it be just for select courts (criminal, civil, appellate, etc.)? If only for a subset of courts, can the State please specify which courts?

This would be for all the state courts.

54. What are the retention requirements for the digital evidence? Is retention based on statute of limitations? Is it based on crime/charge/offense or something else (or some combination of factors)? Please clarify retention guidelines.

- a. Do the retention requirements vary by the different courts (criminal, civil, appellate, etc.)?
- b. Do all cases within a given case type have the same retention period? Or will there be sub criteria?

The retention schedule is published on the main court website and is the same across the state and courts.

55. Can the State please confirm their internal processes for how cases and evidence are currently handled within the court system?

a. Who creates and submits the case/folder?

i. Will the case and case folder information (i.e. case report, suspect/defendant/victim info, offense info, etc.) be initially created/submitted to the court via the proposed DEMS, or will the initial case creation/submission be submitted to the court via a backend system (CMS), with only the digital evidence being submitted via the proposed DEMS? Ex – will the case already exist in the CMS prior to submitting the digital evidence, or will the case be created in the proposed DEMS first?

It is anticipated the case creation process will not change from current process. The DEMS system is anticipated to only store the various digital evidence currently stored on external drive systems like CDs, DVDs, etc.

b. Who, if anyone, reviews the digital evidence within the court system prior to submitting to the court?

The process has not been defined and could be dependent on vendor's software ability. If the software can accomplish this process, it should be described in the software functionality answer.

c. Who, within the courts, has access to the digital evidence – Judge, court clerk, attorneys, etc.?

It is anticipated all court staff would have access to the digital evidence and if the software has additional security to limit access it should be described in the response.

56. How many total users within the State Courts (Internal Court Users) will access and manage digital evidence within the proposed DEMS?

See response #55.c

57. Will all State Court (Internal Users) users have the same access/functionality within the DEMS, or will access/functionality vary based upon court (criminal, civil, etc.)?

See answer #55.c

58. What steps does digital evidence go through once it is submitted? Ex: Does it need to be reviewed by one or more people before being shared to the opposing party?

The detailed steps can be described during a discovery period of a project. The functionality of the software and potential options should be described in the response.

59. Do the State Courts desire video redaction functionality?

It is not anticipated for that to be required. If the software can accomplish this on videos, please describe the functionality in the response and if this is core functionality or an additional feature.

60. Is there any legacy/existing digital evidence to be migrated to the proposed DEMS?

- a. If there is data to be migrated, what is the total size of existing/legacy digital evidence to be migrated?

See response #5

61. In the RFI, Section 2.01 Background Information – it states that in 2023 the North Dakota Commission on Legal Counsel for Indigents was appointed to serve on 16, 200 cases. Are these 16,200 cases included in the Criminal (26,763) and Civil (29,880) case numbers provided in the RFI Background Info, or are those cases completely independent of (and in addition to) the number of cases provided for both Criminal and Civil?

The base understanding the 16,200 cases were included in the Criminal and Civil case numbers.

62. The RFI Section 2.01 Background references 2 Case Management Systems (CMS) – one for the Prosecutors, and one for the Commission on Legal Counsel for Indigents. What specific CMS systems are in place?

See response #34

