MINNESOTA
COMPETENCY ATTAINMENT BOARD

Forensic Navigator Case Management System
Questions and Answers
October 30, 2026

Procurement & Administrative

1. The MNCAB notice accepts questions until October 19 at 11:59 PM CST, while the RFP's question section schedules answers for October 19 at 5:00 PM CST. What is the final question cutoff and answer-publication date/time, and does "CST" in the October schedule mean a fixed UTC−6 offset or Minnesota local time?

   The RFP question cut off was October 19, at 11:59PM CST, Minnesota local time.

2. Can you please confirm the proposal is due on Sunday, November 15th 11:59 CT?

   Proposals are due Sunday, November 15, 11:59 p.m. CST, Minnesota local time.

3. Can you please confirm MNCAB would like two separate emails for submission containing the following information:

   a. Email A, "RFP Proposal": cover letter, work plan, all narrative sections, and Attachments A, B, C, E, F, and G?

   b. Email B, "RFP Cost Detail": Attachment D only

   Correct. The response must include (A) the proposal with required additional documents, and (B) a detailed cost proposal. These two items must be submitted separately, using the following subject line in each email: A. Forensic Navigator Case Management System Solution RFP Proposal B. Forensic Navigator Case Management System Solution RFP Cost Detail

4. The evidence of financial stability and security measures must go in a separate PDF marked "confidential." Should that PDF be attached to Email A?

   Yes. Please include the confidential PDF with Email A and clearly identify it as confidential.

5. What are the anticipated dates for evaluation, demonstrations, and award?

   Proposal evaluation and product demonstrations are expected to occur in November and December 2026. Contract award will follow. The implementation contract term is anticipated to run from January/February 2027 through June/July 2027. All dates are estimates and subject to change.

6. Would you consider extending the deadline for submission? Our proposal can only be completed after we receive Q&A responses and that leaves a short window for submission.

Not at this time. MNCAB intends to maintain the current submission deadline; however, MNCAB reserves the right to extend or modify the schedule as needed.

7. If we are not selected, will there be any opportunity for a debrief or other feedback?

   MNCAB does not anticipate providing individual debriefings or proposal-specific feedback to vendors who are not selected.

Contract, Legal & Security Requirements

8. Attachment H, Exhibit A §§8.3–8.4 require FedRAMP Moderate authorization and ISO27001 for all cloud services. Must those credentials cover the proposed SaaS application and every integration/monitoring component, and may an agency-authorized current FedRAMP Moderate offering satisfy the provisional-ATO wording?

   Moderate authorization controls are acceptable and should apply to integration and monitoring services.

9. Attachment H §26.3 addresses pre-existing IP, while §27 limits copyrighted components. For the requested commercial system, will a schedule distinguishing the pre-existing subscription platform and licensed dependencies from State-owned custom work satisfy those provisions, or should proposed revisions be included in Attachment B?

   Attachment H is the Sample Contract. Each Party retains its pre-existing intellectual property, but the selected Contractor must give MNCAB licensing permissions that allow us to use the products, documents, or services under the Contract. Section 27 of the Sample Contract requires the selected Contractor to hold the State harmless against any copyright claims. Any objection to either provision must be noted in Attachment B, Exceptions to Terms and Conditions.

10. For some security documentation and responses, a signed NDA is required. Are you willing to complete an NDA to receive access to sensitive documentation, such as SOC II and ISO reports?

    a. If so, please provide a name, title, and email for the person who will be acting as the signatory. We can provide the NDA for review prior to signature.

    As indicated in the RFP, security measures information is not available to the public. The Security Questionnaire, Attachment G, is marked as a confidential document that will not be shared outside of MNCAB.

11. FedRAMP Moderate Authorization
    Attachment H, Section 8.3 references FedRAMP Moderate authorization for Cloud Services. Would MNCAB accept a SaaS solution hosted on FedRAMP Moderate-authorized cloud infrastructure, with application-level security controls aligned to NIST SP 800-53 Moderate, without requiring separate

FedRAMP authorization for the SaaS application? Please clarify whether this provision is mandatory for the proposed solution or may be addressed through an approved contractual exception.

FedRAMP certified Moderate authorization controls are acceptable.

12. ISO 27001 and Security Certification Requirements
    Please clarify whether the ISO 27001 certification requirement referenced in Attachment H must be independently satisfied by the SaaS application provider, or whether relevant cloud-provider certifications, supplemented by documented application-level security controls and independent security assessments, would be acceptable.
    Cloud-provider certifications, documented application-level security controls and independent security assessments, would be acceptable.

System Architecture & Technical Environment

13. What system currently supports forensic navigator case management? Are there any current architecture diagrams that can be provided?

    MNCAB's current system is a custom solution developed by a third-party consulting vendor. It utilizes Azure SQL and a .NET/Java architecture with limited external integrations.

14. Can you please describe the data migration scope listed in the Core functional requirements. Any data related to source systems, approximate number of defendant and case records, whether documents and attachments are in scope, and how much history is to be migrated is helpful for pricing accuracy.

    MNCAB anticipates that all existing case and document data will be migrated to the new system. MNCAB currently maintains approximately 163 MB of data, including 10,000 documents. There are approximately 2,300 unique defendant records and 5,000 cases with associated documents.

15. How is content currently stored? (paper, shared drives, local folders, Google Drive, etc.) Is there an existing ECM or document management system in place? If so, please provide as much detail as possible, including system names, forms, workflows, integrations or other functionality.

    Content is currently stored across multiple locations, including the existing case management system, shared network drives, spreadsheets, and other business documents. MNCAB does not currently utilize a separate enterprise content management (ECM) or document management system.

16. Will any data conversion or migration be needed for this project?

    The current case management system data resides on Azure SQL. We do not anticipate a need for conversion, but the data will need to be migrated from the existing system tables to the data repository of the replacement case management system.

    a. Please provide the make, model, and version of system that we will be working with. (Laserfiche version 12, Microsoft SharePoint, Shared Drive, etc.) **N/A**

i. If your system requires a mass export tool, do you have access to the module? **N/A**

b. Do you have any estimates for the amount of content that will be converted or migrated? **The current total size of all tables combined is approximately 1GB.**
   i. Number of documents **Approximately 10,000**
   ii. Number of pages **N/A**
   iii. Diskspace estimation **Approximately 163MB**
   iv. If applicable: Database size for associated metadata, etc. if applicable **N/A**
   v. If applicable: How many database tables contain information we will need for the migration? (ex. documents, versions, metadata, annotations, etc.)

   Currently, there are 55 DB tables containing the following primary data:
   CaseNotes
   Audits
   CourtHearings
   courthearings_backup
   CaseDirectory
   CourtCaseCharges
   CaseGroupEvents
   CurrentSubjectList
   CaseGroupUserDocuments
   AuditEntries
   CaseGroups
   HeldHearings

c. If applicable: What is the current systems database platform? (SQL, Oracle, etc.)

   Azure SQL

   i. Is there backend access to the database, or do we have to do an export through the current system? **An export from the current system will be required.**

d. Do you have a set number of document types or metadata categories to be converted? **Unknown at this time.**
   i. Can you provide a list or report with the associated metadata/index fields included? **Not at this time.**

e. Are there electronic annotations in your current system that must be migrated? (redactions, highlights, notes on the page, etc.) **Yes.**

f. Are the annotations baked onto the page/file or available as a separate overlay? **N/A**

g. For any document versioning in your current system, does each version need to migrated, or just the live/final version? **Live final version**

h. Any additional information you can provide on the system or dataset that may be helpful is appreciated.

17. Existing Case Management System and Data Availability
    Could MNCAB identify the existing case management system, including its underlying technology and database platform? Please confirm whether the selected vendor will be provided with database

schemas, data dictionaries, sample extracts, and access to technical resources familiar with the existing system.

The existing case management system is a java based UI with .net components querying Case, Defendant, Navigator and associated court documents residing on Azure SQL tables.

18. Does the MNCAB (or State overall) have a standard or preference for integration tools?

    The Minnesota Judicial Branch integration services team has specific subscriber terms and policies governing message exchange patterns, transport and format for accessing MNCIS records. More information is available at https://mncourts.gov/integration-services.

19. How should the requested mobile/browser and Microsoft Word workflows comply with §2.8 and Exhibit A §4.2's portable-device restrictions? Please confirm the permitted managed-client/session model and whether Microsoft 365 remains within MNCAB's existing approved service boundary.

    The portable device restrictions apply to the vendor's handling of MNCAB data and prohibit the storage of MNCAB data on portable devices under the vendor's control. The only exception is the temporary use of portable media to facilitate data restoration during backup or recovery operations. The acceptable session model would allow access to the case management system only from managed, compliant devices owned by MNCAB, or through approved guest identities using approved devices.

20. Is there a preference for system deployment? We can offer an all-inclusive Cloud platform which includes automated updates and disaster recovery; or a self-hosted solution to provide complete control over your environment. Both options can be proposed if you prefer.

    MNCAB would prefer an all-inclusive cloud-based platform.

21. The RFP mentions production, QA, Test, and recovery environments. Please fully list any other environments you require for this project.

    Do each of these systems need to be separated, or can we combine some (QA and test for example)?

    MNCAB would prefer to have the following environment available:

    a. **Production**
    b. **UAT**
    c. **QA/DEV**

    QA and UAT could reside on the same system but would need to have separate code repositories to ensure accurate testing and release protocols

Users, Licensing & Access Control

22. Your current notice describes 54 forensic navigators and 10 certified competency attainment programs. For consistent migration and licensing estimates, what are the initial licensed staff/admin/affiliate seat counts, annual case volumes, retained document volume, current export formats and required retention periods? Which optional Attachment C features should be included as separately priced options?

    Current staff complement includes 1 program administrator, 2 program managers, 6 program supervisors, 53 forensic navigators, 3 learning and development staff, 1 program specialist, and 1 IT personnel. Additional positions are expected to be added.

    On average about 6,000 cases received each year.

    Current document storage is approximately 2 MB. MNCAB anticipates document volume will increase as additional records are stored and managed electronically within the new system.

    Current export formats are csv, pdf, word document

    MNCAB retains most records for long-term business and operational purposes. Detailed retention requirements will be determined as part of implementation and system configuration.

    Vendors may determine which optional Attachment C features, if any, should be proposed and priced separately.

23. How many users will require access to the system at go-live, by user type or role?

    MNCAB currently anticipates fewer than 100 total users. Additional users may be added in the future based on operational needs. MNCAB requires role-based access control. All users will have access appropriate to their assigned duties, with permissions varying by role. Management and leadership users will require additional oversight and reporting capabilities, while designated IT staff and program specialists will require broader administrative and system access. MNCAB does not currently anticipate third-party, external, or public user access to the system.

24. For pricing accuracy, can MNCAB please provide the number of internal users by role (forensic navigators, supervisors, managers, program staff, attorneys, system administrators, other) as well as the volume of any expected external users (defendants, etc)?

    MNCAB currently anticipates fewer than 100 total users. Additional users may be added in the future based on operational needs. MNCAB requires role-based access control. All users will have access appropriate to their assigned duties, with permissions varying by role. Management and leadership users will require additional oversight and reporting capabilities, while designated IT staff and program specialists will require broader administrative and system access. MNCAB does not currently anticipate third-party, external, or public user access to the system.

25. Can you confirm the target user base in terms of "full" access vs. "partial", read-only or external 3rd-party access?

    MNCAB requires role-based access control. All users will have access appropriate to their assigned duties, with permissions varying by role. Management and leadership users will require additional oversight and reporting capabilities, while designated IT staff and program specialists will require broader administrative and system access. MNCAB does not currently anticipate third-party, external, or public user access to the system.

26. Our solution is licensed by the features included with each user. Please provide the estimated user count of each type. a. How many full users are required? (full repository access: scan, add, edit / version documents, build forms / workflows, participate in workflows, admin. system)
    b. How many participant users are required? (unlimited submission and participation in forms processes, read-only repository access)

    MNCAB requires role-based access control. All users will have access appropriate to their assigned duties, with permissions varying by role. Management and leadership users will require additional oversight and reporting capabilities, while designated IT staff and program specialists will require broader administrative and system access. MNCAB does not currently anticipate third-party, external, or public user access to the system.

27. Can you provide an estimate for the number of concurrent users on the system? While we do not offer concurrent licensing, this information is helpful when providing hardware recommendations.

    MNCAB currently anticipates fewer than 100 total users. Additional users may be added in the future based on operational needs. While concurrent usage has not been formally estimated, MNCAB expects only a subset of users to access the system simultaneously.

28. User Population and Transaction Volumes
    Please provide the estimated number of named and concurrent users by role, including forensic navigators, supervisors, administrators, and other stakeholders. Additionally, please provide approximate annual case intake volumes, active caseloads, document storage volumes, and anticipated growth over the next three to five years.

    MNCAB currently anticipates fewer than 100 total users. Additional users may be added in the future based on operational needs. User counts by role have not been finalized. While concurrent usage has not been formally estimated, MNCAB expects only a subset of users to access the system simultaneously.

    MNCAB receives approximately 6,000 cases per year, although actual annual volumes may vary. Individual forensic navigators generally manage active caseloads of approximately 30 to 50 defendants at any given time, while the total number of associated cases may be significantly higher.

    Current document storage includes approximately 10,000 documents totaling about 163 MB of data. MNCAB anticipates continued growth in users, case volumes, and document storage over the next

three to five years but cannot provide specific growth projections at this time. Vendors should describe how their solution can scale to accommodate future increases in users, caseloads, documents, and overall system usage.

29. Licensing and Pricing Structure
    Does MNCAB have a preferred licensing or pricing model, such as named-user subscriptions, concurrent-user licensing, enterprise licensing, or annual SaaS subscriptions? Should implementation costs and recurring software, hosting, and support costs be presented separately for evaluation?

    MNCAB is open to various licensing and pricing models but prefers a transparent, predictable cost structure. Vendors should clearly identify all one-time and recurring costs. Implementation costs and recurring software, hosting, licensing, and support costs should be presented separately for evaluation.

Implementation, Training & Project Approach

30. Are all listed requirements assumed to be required for the initial go live and scope of the RFP response?

    MNCAB recognizes that some requirements may be implemented in phases. Vendors should identify any proposed phased approach and clearly describe what is included in the initial go-live.

31. Is MNCAB open to a phased implementation or should we assume one go-live?

    MNCAB is open to a phased implementation depending on the proposed approach and timeline.

32. What MNCAB resources and roles will be assigned to the project, and what level of availability should the vendor assume?

    MNCAB requires role-based access control. All users will have access appropriate to their assigned duties, with permissions varying by role. Management and leadership users will require additional oversight and reporting capabilities, while designated IT staff and program specialists will require broader administrative and system access. MNCAB does not currently anticipate third-party, external, or public user access to the system.

33. For forms and workflow development, will the selected vendor be responsible for building the required forms and workflows, or will the proposer's staff be performing development after proper training? a. If vendor development is preferred and within project scope, please provide some examples of forms and workflows, as well as an estimated count, for cost estimation purposes.

    MNCAB anticipates fewer than 10 standardized forms and documents. Detailed workflow, form, and configuration requirements as well as responsibilities for forms and workflow development will be refined during discovery and implementation. Vendors should describe their approach and the expected roles of vendor and MNCAB staff.

34. Our customers generally prefer remote services due the ease of scheduling and travel savings. Remote training sessions are recorded and provided to the customer to allow them to reuse as needed. Is this approach acceptable, or would you require on-site services?

    Yes. MNCAB is open to remote training, including recorded training sessions for future use. MNCAB is also open to onsite services where appropriate. Vendors should describe their recommended approach.

35. Implementation Schedule and Phased Deployment
    The RFP anticipates implementation between January/February 2027 and June/July 2027. Is MNCAB open to a phased implementation approach, prioritizing core case management and essential integrations, followed by additional capabilities? Please clarify whether the anticipated completion date is mandatory or may be adjusted based on integration dependencies, migration complexity, and user acceptance testing.

    MNCAB is open to a phased implementation approach, depending on the proposed implementation plan and timeline. Core case management functionality and essential integrations are expected to be operational by June/July 2027.

36. Training and Deployment Expectations
    Please clarify the expected number of training participants, locations, and training sessions. Does MNCAB anticipate centralized training, train-the-trainer delivery, or statewide end-user training? Are onsite implementation, training, or go-live support activities required?

    MNCAB currently anticipates fewer than 100 total users. Additional users may be added in the future based on operational needs. As a statewide agency, MNCAB is open to centralized, train-the-trainer, or end-user training approaches. Vendors should describe their recommended training strategy. MNCAB is also open to remote or onsite implementation, training, and go-live support, depending on the proposed approach.

Integrations & External Systems

37. For MNCIS and eFile & eServe, please confirm MNCAB's existing Court Integration Services subscriber access and intended use of Case/Document notifications and queries plus the published Subsequent Filing service for competency reports, including permitted filing codes and eFS firm/user setup. At what stage will the selected team receive development/test access? We have reviewed the public CourtXML and Subsequent Filing integration documentation.

    MNCAB's current integration subscription is limited to CaseGet queries that gather all associated attributes including charges from criminal proceedings filed for defendants who are ordered to work with the agency. Subscriber access to MNCIS would be granted upon vendor selection, signed contractual agreements and a detailed plan outlining the scope of case record integration data, notifications and e-filing workflows.

38. Which integrations must be operational at initial go-live?

    MNCAB anticipates that integrations with MNCIS, eFile & eServe, and Microsoft 365 applications (Word and Outlook) will be prioritized for initial go-live.

39. (Attachment C, #6, #19) Please list the "other MNCAB systems and applications" to be integrated for pricing accuracy.

    Other MNCAB systems may include user provisioning/deprovisioning via EntraID synchronization or via the HRM system.

40. Is mobile access expected through a mobile browser, a native app, or both?

    Mobile access is desired via browser on an agency owned, managed and security compliant device.

41. For Integrations, can you clarify from those systems mentioned in the RFP which you want quoted/included in the bidder responses? (e.g. including Security Incident Event Management (SIEM) system, MNCAB identity providers using SAML 2.0, ADFS or EntraID, Microsoft 365, Minnesota eFile & eServe, and Minnesota Court Information System (MNCIS)

    A SIEM system that would facilitate active monitoring and logging of authentication and access events. The preferred identity provider for authentication would depend on the ability of the proposed solution to integrate with MNCAB's EntraID or HCM system. MNCIS utilizes SOAP messages formatted in the CourtXML schema and a combination of authentication credentials and white listing source IP's for each environment.

42. The RFP also mentions "other MNCAB systems and applications". This is not possible to estimate without more detail. Please clarify if this request is to ensure that the proposed integration solution is able to scale efficiently beyond those listed in question #4, or if there are specific other systems that must be scoped at this time?

    Other MNCAB systems may include user provisioning/deprovisioning via EntraID synchronization or via the HRM system.

43. MNCIS Integration – Interface Specifications and Access
    The RFP requires automated receipt and processing of court orders and related documents from the Minnesota Court Information System (MNCIS). Could MNCAB provide the available integration specifications, supported APIs or data exchange mechanisms, authentication requirements, and technical documentation? Please also confirm whether the selected vendor will receive access to a non-production integration environment and technical support from the MNCIS team.

    MNCIS information and integration details are available here: https://mncourts.gov/integration-services **Non-production access is available.**

44. MNCIS Integration – Scope and Data Exchange
    Please clarify the expected scope of integration with MNCIS, including the specific data elements and events that must be exchanged, such as defendant information, case details, court orders, hearing schedules, case status changes, and court dispositions. Is the integration expected to support real-time,

event-driven, or scheduled data synchronization? Please identify which data exchanges must be bidirectional.

MNCAB expects integration with MNCIS to support the exchange of defendant information, case details, court orders, hearing schedules, case status changes, and court dispositions. MNCAB recognizes that synchronization requirements may vary by integration. Depending on the business need and technical capabilities of the integrated systems, MNCAB may support a combination of real-time, event-driven, and scheduled synchronization approaches. Vendors should describe their recommended approach for each proposed integration.

45. Minnesota eFile and eServe Integration
    Could MNCAB clarify the expected integration functionality with Minnesota eFile and eServe? Specifically, should the proposed solution support direct electronic filing of documents, receipt of filing confirmations and rejection notifications, retrieval of filed documents, and synchronization of filing statuses? Please confirm whether APIs, technical specifications, integration credentials, and a testing environment will be made available.

    MNCAB expects the proposed solution to support direct electronic filing with Minnesota eFile and eServe, as well as the receipt of filing confirmations and rejection notifications. Applicable APIs, technical specifications, integration credentials, and testing environments will be made available to the selected vendor during implementation, as appropriate and subject to applicable access and security requirements.

46. Additional Systems and Microsoft 365 Integration
    Beyond MNCIS, Minnesota eFile and eServe, and Microsoft 365, are there any additional internal or external systems that must be integrated with the proposed solution? For Microsoft 365, please identify the required integration capabilities, such as Outlook, calendars, SharePoint, Word document generation, and Entra ID authentication or group synchronization.

    Other MNCAB systems may include user provisioning/deprovisioning via EntraID synchronization or via the HRM system. MNCAB has not yet determined the full scope of Microsoft 365 integration requirements. Vendors should describe available capabilities and associated options. Detailed requirements will be refined during implementation.

47. Please provide as much detail as possible on the system integrations desired below.
    1. Minnesota Court Information System (MNCIS)
        1. Please briefly describe the system and its function.
        2. Please provide the system version and hosting location (in house servers, private Cloud, etc.).
        3. Is this a commercially available system that was purchased and is supported by a third party, or was it custom built and supported internally?
        4. Is there an API available for this system?
        5. What level of backend access to the system do you have?
        6. Please briefly describe the desired integration functionality.

Information on MNCIS integration details are available here:
https://mncourts.gov/integration-services

2. Minnesota eFile and eServe
    1. Please briefly describe the system and its function.
    2. Please provide the system version and hosting location (in house servers, private Cloud, etc.).
    3. Is this a commercially available system that was purchased and is supported by a third party, or was it custom built and supported internally?
    4. Is there an API available for this system?
    5. What level of backend access to the system do you have?
    6. Please briefly describe the desired integration functionality.

Information on eFiling service and integration details are available here:
https://mncourts.gov/integration-services/integratedefilingservices

3. For optional requirement 45, Videoconferencing integration is mentioned. Can you please describe how you would like this integration to work? For example, are we storing and reporting on video info from a third-party conference application or are we expected to host video calls within the app itself? If integrating with a third-party application, please respond to the questions below.
    1. Please briefly describe the system and its function.
    2. Please provide the system version and hosting location (in-house servers, private Cloud, etc.).
    3. Is this a commercially available system that was purchased and is supported by a third party, or was it custom built and supported internally?
    4. Is there an API available for this system?
    5. What level of backend access to the system do you have?
    6. Please briefly describe the desired integration functionality

Video conferencing capability hasn't been fully developed nor architecturally planned. MNCAB will consider the feasibility, planning and incorporation of this feature depending on the respondent's capability and expertise.

Data Migration, Records & Metadata

48. What historical data must be migrated? Approximately how much data and how many documents must be migrated?
    MNCAB anticipates that all existing case and document data will be migrated to the new system. MNCAB currently maintains approximately 163 MB of data, including 10,000 documents.

49. What is the current annual case volume?

    MNCAB receives approximately 6,000 cases per year. Actual annual volumes may vary.

50. Do you have any estimates for the amount of content that will be stored in the system? Number of documents, number of pages, diskspace estimation, etc.?

    The current MNCAB case management system occupies approximately 163MB of combined disk space and includes approximately 10,000 documents.

51. Historical Data Migration – Scope and Volumes
    Please provide approximate volumes of data expected to be migrated, including defendant profiles, active and closed cases, case notes, contact histories, assignments, service referrals, competency program records, court records, and associated documents. Is the expectation to migrate all historical records or only active cases and a defined period of historical data?

    MNCAB anticipates that all existing case and document data will be migrated to the new system. MNCAB currently maintains approximately 163 MB of data, including 10,000 documents.

    DB Tables include:
    CaseNotes
    Audits
    CourtHearings
    courthearings_backup
    CaseDirectory
    CourtCaseCharges
    CaseGroupEvents
    CurrentSubjectList
    CaseGroupUserDocuments
    AuditEntries
    CaseGroups
    HeldHearings

52. Data Migration – Relationships and Historical Records
    Does MNCAB expect the migration to preserve historical relationships between defendants, multiple cases, navigator assignments, service records, documents, and case activities? Are there specific requirements for preserving historical audit trails, timestamps, record ownership, and closed-case histories?

    Yes. Historical relationships between records are expected to be preserved. Detailed requirements for audit trails, timestamps, record ownership, and closed-case histories have not yet been fully defined and will be refined during implementation.

53. Data Quality and Migration Responsibilities
    Has MNCAB completed a data quality assessment of the existing system? Please clarify whether the source data contains known issues such as duplicate defendant records, incomplete information, inconsistent identifiers, or missing relationships. Will MNCAB be responsible for source data cleansing and validation, with the selected vendor responsible for transformation, migration, and reconciliation?

MNCAB has not completed a formal data quality assessment. Potential data quality issues include duplicate defendant records, incomplete information, and the absence of a consistent defendant identifier across historical records. MNCAB will be responsible for source data cleansing and validation, while the selected vendor will be responsible for data transformation, migration, and reconciliation.

54. Our system uses metadata templates that contain fields common to each document type for use in indexing. Please provide a list of document types/metadata templates and the estimated field count for each. For example, a HR folder might have a template with fields for employee name, ID number, title, and supervisor (4 fields total).

    MNCAB has not finalized document types, metadata templates, or indexing requirements. Anticipated metadata fields may include defendant name, unique person ID, county, court file number, date of birth, offense information, date received, and other case-related data elements. Metadata requirements may expand or be refined as business needs are further defined. Vendors should describe their approach to configurable document types, metadata management, and indexing. Detailed requirements will be refined during implementation.

Functional Requirements, Workflows & Reporting

55. Is there a preference between a configurable platform to meet MNCAB's needs (like a Microsoft or Salesforce) vs an off the shelf product?

    MNCAB does not have a preferred platform aside from meeting security, performance, usability and feature requirements.

56. Our solution offers portals for non-authenticated users.

    1. Public Portal: This option allows read-only access to the repository for non-licensed public users. Please indicate your preference with regards to a public portal, along with estimated number of concurrent users AND monthly views.
    2. Forms Portal: This option allows forms submissions by non-licensed public users. Please indicate your preference with regards to the forms portal option, along with estimated monthly submissions.

    MNCAB is still evaluating potential needs for public-facing portal functionality and does not have estimated user or submission volumes at this time. Vendors may describe available options and associated costs.

57. Forensic Navigator Workflow and Assignment Rules
    Could MNCAB provide existing workflow documentation, process diagrams, assignment rules, and sample forms covering defendant intake, case screening, navigator assignment, transfers, supervision, case closure, and reopening? Please also clarify the expected assignment criteria, including workload balancing, geography, county, and staff availability.

MNCAB will not be providing existing workflow documentation, process diagrams, assignment rules, or sample forms at this time. Vendors are encouraged to demonstrate the capabilities of their proposed solution, including standard workflows, configurable business processes, and form management functionality. Specific workflow requirements and assignment criteria will be refined and finalized during the discovery and implementation phases.

58. Competency Attainment and Service Coordination
    Could MNCAB provide sample competency attainment plans, bridge plans, progress reports, service referral forms, and outcome reporting templates? Please clarify whether competency program participation, service coordination, and outcome tracking are primarily internal recordkeeping functions or whether direct integration with external service providers and competency programs is expected.

    MNCAB cannot provide samples at this time. Competency program participation, service coordination, and outcome tracking are primarily internal recordkeeping and case management functions. Direct integration with external service providers or competency attainment programs is not currently anticipated, although vendors may identify relevant integration capabilities in their proposals.

59. Document Generation and Court Filing
    Please identify the approximate number and types of standardized documents, forms, notices, bridge plans, and progress reports that must be generated by the proposed solution. Are these documents expected to use agency-provided Microsoft Word templates, and should the system support automated population of case information, approval workflows, and electronic signatures?

    MNCAB anticipates fewer than 10 standardized documents and forms to be generated through the system. MNCAB expects these documents to utilize agency-provided Microsoft Word templates where appropriate. The proposed solution should support the automated population of case information, approval workflows, and electronic signatures.

60. Reporting and Analytics
    Could MNCAB provide examples of existing operational, court, board, legislative, and statewide program reports? Please clarify the approximate number of standard reports and dashboards expected at implementation and whether additional reporting requirements will be provided during discovery.

    MNCAB does not currently have standardized reports or dashboards available as examples. Reporting requirements, including operational, court, board, legislative, and statewide program reporting needs, will be further defined during discovery. Vendors should describe their reporting and dashboard capabilities, recognizing that specific reporting requirements may evolve as business processes and data definitions are refined.

Budget, Funding, Pricing & Cost Proposal

61. Could MNCAB provide the anticipated budget or available funding range for the initial implementation, including configuration, integrations, data migration, and training? Additionally, is there an established annual budget for software licensing, hosting, maintenance, and ongoing support?

    MNCAB has not established a fixed budget or funding range for this project. The agency anticipates both one-time implementation costs (e.g., configuration, integrations, data migration, training, and deployment) and ongoing costs (e.g., licensing, hosting, maintenance, and support). As a small government agency, MNCAB must be mindful of costs; however, the agency is seeking a solution that best meets its operational needs and is not solely focused on obtaining the lowest-cost offering. Proposals will be evaluated based on overall value, including functionality, implementation approach, support, security, and total cost of ownership.

62. Project Budget and Available Funding
    Could MNCAB provide the estimated project budget or available funding range for the implementation of the Forensic Navigator Case Management System, including software configuration, integrations, data migration, training, and deployment? Additionally, please clarify whether a separate budget has been established for recurring software licensing, hosting, maintenance, and support services.

    MNCAB has not established a fixed budget or funding range for this project. The agency anticipates both one-time implementation costs (e.g., configuration, integrations, data migration, training, and deployment) and ongoing costs (e.g., licensing, hosting, maintenance, and support). As a small government agency, MNCAB must be mindful of costs; however, the agency is seeking a solution that best meets its operational needs and is not solely focused on obtaining the lowest-cost offering. Proposals will be evaluated based on overall value, including functionality, implementation approach, support, security, and total cost of ownership.

63. Is there an established or anticipated budget for this initiative?

    No. MNCAB has not yet established a budget for this initiative.

64. Has MNCAB established an estimated budget or not-to-exceed amount for implementation and for annual ongoing costs?

    MNCAB has not yet established a budget for this initiative.

65. What amount has been budgeted for this project (implementation, first year and annually ongoing)?

    MNCAB has not yet established a budget for this initiative.

66. Should optional features #39–57 be priced as part of the base proposal or as separately priced options?

    The optional features identified in items #39–57 should be priced separately where applicable. If an optional feature is included as a standard component of the proposed solution, it does not need to be separately priced.

67. Attachment D is structured by deliverable or phase. Where should recurring subscription, hosting, and support costs be shown? May responders add a year-by-year table for the ongoing term?

    Recurring subscription, hosting, maintenance, and support costs should be itemized within the applicable deliverable or project phase(s) in Attachment D. Vendors may include a supplemental year-by-year cost breakdown to clarify ongoing costs over the contract term.

Incumbent & Prior Market Research

68. Can you summarize how this RFP relates to the RFI from earlier this year from the MN CAB for Case Mgmt?

    The RFI was conducted to gather market information and better understand available solutions and vendor capabilities. Information obtained through the RFI informed the development of this RFP, which serves as MNCAB's formal solicitation for proposals.

69. Is there any relevant incumbent for any portion of the work being requested in the RFP?

    Yes. However, MNCAB is seeking proposals for the services outlined in this RFP.

70. Prior Solution Demonstrations and Market Evaluation
    Has MNCAB previously conducted product demonstrations, market research, or evaluations of commercially available case management solutions for this initiative? If so, could MNCAB share any publicly available findings, identified functional gaps, or lessons learned that would help respondents better align their proposed solutions with the agency's operational requirements?

    MNCAB conducted an RFI related to this initiative to gather information, including market research. No demonstrations or evaluations were conducted.