

# Responses to Vendor Questions for RFP: Juvenile System for Tracking Interstate Compact Events

---

## Section 2: Background

1. **The Business Process Overview section indicates ICJ implemented a web-based application called JIDS in 2012. To confirm – is this RFP to replace that system?**

ICJ: *Correct. This RFP is intended to replace the current web-based, commercial off-the-shelf application.*

2. **If this RFP is to replace the current system (JIDS), what are the reasons for the replacement?**

ICJ: *The Commission surveyed the JIDS user base and found that most users report that the system is not user-friendly or easy to use. Further, there are compatibility issues relating to browser and third-party software interfaces related to our forms that require a solution. Our users want a system that is more like a case management application with integrated capabilities.*

3. **If this RFP is to replace the current system (JIDS), what are the goals that the current JIDS system is unable to accomplish now?**

ICJ: *ICJ needs a system that is user-friendly and reliable. The new system needs to allow for the ability to easily manage user accounts, generate ad-hoc reports, and manage users' work assignments. The workflow capabilities within the current system are inadequate to support the ICJ inter-agency business processes and track cases.*

4. **If this RFP is to replace the current system (JIDS), what improvements are expected in the new system compared to the old system?**

ICJ: *Some examples for improvements include:*

### ***Intuitive Navigation/Difficult to Train***

*The current system requires a certain level of system knowledge in order to accomplish desired goals, as such training is a monumental task. Most users access the system on an infrequent basis and report that the system is "confusing," "not intuitive," and "difficult to navigate." The system is not viewed as user-friendly. One user said, "...it's not smart enough to tell you how to use it." A system that prompts users for next steps is desired so that even after periods of absence, a user can login and complete a task without having to relearn how to use the system or refer to a user manual.*

*There are also many opportunities for timeframes to be misrepresented due to user error, making compliance difficult to assess. Users can accidentally select incorrect workflows or move assignments*

*forward in the timeline without the option to reverse the action. Because a workflow is married to a document, when that document is deleted, the corresponding assignment disappears. In addition, assignments can sit in overdue workflow steps indefinitely, sometimes hindering the other party's ability to complete the assignment. All of these issues affect critical timelines required by ICJ Rules and makes compliance reporting difficult to authenticate.*

### **Home Page**

*The current home page is limited and not effective. A home page needs to be the user's portal to all their work objects. ICJ needs to be able to configure enterprise-level sets of users' home pages that can be associated with a specific user role or user group. The home page should allow for links to any of the user's work objects (workflows, cases, assignments, documents). The configuration options should minimally include the capabilities to:*

- Present and link to all the workflows that a user is assigned to regardless of the status of their particular tasks.*
- Present and link to all the documents associated with the workflows.*
- Present and link to all of the cases currently assigned, regardless of status.*
- Present and link to all communications sent by/received by the user (inbox)*
- Search and filter based on any indexed field (e.g. date, last name, DOB, Case Number, juvenile index number)*

*Users should be able to customize their home pages, create multiple views, and add any work objects that they are privileged to access.*

### **Data Entry – Lack of Data Persistence**

*Many users report time-out issues while typing data on forms, as the current forms-management system does not count time typing data on forms toward active time. As such, a user may be unaware that their session has timed out and they lose data.*

### **3rd Party Integration Limitations**

*The current solution is tightly coupled with particular product versions of 3rd party plug-ins (pdf readers, browsers). This has presented numerous problem reports related to compatibility, as users' desktops can be any variety and combination of operating systems, browsers, or plug-ins.*

### **User Account Management**

*There is no feature for users to unlock their own accounts. Some state administrators are unable to utilize the customized user account feature due to unknown reasons, and as such they must contact national administrators to assist with user password changes and unlocking accounts. State administrators must also contact national administrators to fully deactivate or reactivate user accounts. Our state administrators desire a more user-friendly approach to accounts management and for user's to be able to change and reset their password. Ideally, this would include 2-factor authentication.*

**5. Who owns the source code of the JIDS application?**

ICJ: *Because the current system is a commercial off-the-shelf software product, the software source code is owned by the software company. ICJ owns all juvenile data.*

**6. It appears that this is a custom solution developed for ICJ, owned by ICJ and hosted/supported by an outside vendor. Are you looking for a similar model with the new system?**

ICJ: *The current system is a commercial off-the-shelf forms-management product that a vendor has customized for ICJ. We do not currently have the resources to host the solution on-site. Our current system is hosted by Amazon GovCloud and all hardware is maintained by the vendor at a secure location.*

**7. What is the database used in the JIDS system today?**

ICJ: *The database used today is a SQL database.*

**8. What is the size of the current database?**

ICJ: *As of April 1, 2019, the database backup file was 26,409,669 KB.*

## **Section 3: Description of Work to be Performed**

**9. What record retention rules is ICJ looking to have implemented in this new system?**

ICJ: *The ICJ Rules do not contain a retention schedule for our electronic data system. We have a Technical Guideline that outlines how adjudicating states may request expungement. The national office does not currently purge any records without a request from the adjudicating state. However, we may review and edit this policy in the future. As such, a solution to search, sort, and flag cases for archival or purge (delete, no archive) is required including a process to restore archived cases.*

**10. Do you have a preference or requirement on where the solution should be hosted?**

ICJ: *The only requirement is that the hosting environment is CJIS compliant. A vendor's budget for hosting the solution shall include, "Costs of hardware, software, storage, and security to support and maintain a nationwide application, including the production system and a sandbox." ICJ does not have the resources to host the solution on-site.*

**11. Can the new solution be hosted with other cloud providers such as Microsoft Azure Government?**

ICJ: *Yes, if the vendor can confirm that the cloud-based hosting solution is CJIS compliant.*

**12. Is there a preference between a custom off-the-shelf (COTS) solution or a custom application? Will the preference influence the evaluation?**

ICJ: *We will entertain proposals for both solutions, but we recognize that a COTS will have limitations that will require customizations to meet our specific requirements. While we would like to use this opportunity to move away from an off-the-shelf product that requires customizations or upgrades to fix bugs, we would consider pre-existing software if it meets all of our functional requirements and frees up our current dependence on third-party software or multiple customizations. Therefore, vendors should be specific as to how their COTS would be customized to fully meet our requirements.*

## **Section 5: Approach and Cost**

**13. Under Approach and Cost, you ask for a data migration recommendation, which includes the resources, time, and budget required to provide a data migration recommendation. How many years of data are there to migrate? Are we able to review the current data dictionary in the JIDS system?**

ICJ: *The current system launched in November 2012. As of April 22, 2019 we have 830,000 documents uploaded to the system (mostly PDFs), 4,478 active users, and 8,820 active juvenile files. We do not currently have a data dictionary that a prospective vendor can view but will work with the current vendor to make this available after a contract is signed. The RFP requests that the proposal provide a cost to develop recommendations for data migration.*

**14. Is the selected vendor expected to travel for onsite meetings for this project?**

ICJ: *We expect that the vendor will meet with ICJ for requirements gathering, discovery, and a business processes review session. Please include any travel expenses in your budget. We expect that meetings and team collaboration activities will be a combination of on-site and virtual sessions.*

**15. Is the selected vendor required to provide training onsite for this project? Can the vendor utilize WebEx for training?**

ICJ: *We prefer to have at least one on-site Train the Trainer event for our power-users who will in turn train the Commission's system users via WebEx. While we are not opposed to conducting all training via WebEx, we feel that an in-person training for our trainers would be most beneficial. Because our trainers are located nationwide, we are open to holding this training event at the vendor's office or at the ICJ National Office in Lexington, Kentucky.*

## Section 6: Schedule

**16. The Schedule states that the Contract start date is September 1, 2019. Is there an expected end date for this project?**

ICJ: *ICJ understands that a custom-built solution will take longer to create than a COTS product that requires customizations to fulfill our requirements. This will be taken into consideration when reviewing the vendors proposed timeline. Ideally, the new system will go-live by January 2021.*

**17. What is ICJ's expectation of the completion date for this project?**

ICJ: *See above.*

**18. With respect to the vendor demonstrations slated for June/July, could you please clarify that you are looking for a custom solution that we would build and therefore be unable to showcase a demonstration of a product unless you are looking for a COTS solution?**

ICJ: *A custom solution may be presented as a proof of concept. This may include a mock-up of application screens or features. ICJ does not expect a vendor to create the full solution for the demonstration, but examples of what various aspects of the system might look like (e.g. a user's home page, a state administrator's account management page, a workflow activity sequence page). If you have created a similar solution for another client, a demonstration of that would be desired. In particular, ICJ would like a demonstration of any tools, such as tools used to configure workflows, forms, database management, or configure the dashboard. ICJ does not want to be strongly dependent upon the vendor for subsequent maintenance, configurations, and changes to basic components such as forms design, user and group account definitions, home page changes, etc.*

## Section 7: Administrative Requirements

**19. Under Proposal Presentation and Format Requirements, it states that when printed, each proposal must print clearly in black- and white. Would you prefer graphics, tables, and charts to be in grayscale for easier printing or is color allowed?**

ICJ: *The vendor may use color graphics for the proposal in order to help ICJ visualize a concept. Please ensure that all graphics still portray the intended aesthetic when printed in grayscale.*

**20. Proposals are required to be submitted via email. Please confirm the maximum allowable file size for the email attachment.**

ICJ: *Vendors concerned about file size may submit the proposal documents via a condensed ZIP file or Dropbox.*

**21. In the event that our proposal is larger than the maximum allowable file size, will you accept a printed and mailed proposal?**

ICJ: *Unfortunately, we are not able to accept paper proposals submitted via mail. Our RFP Team members are located nationwide and will be receiving proposals via email to review. Please condense files as much as possible to accommodate our RFP Team's inboxes that may not be able to receive files larger than 10MB.*

**22. Do we include the cost factor/budget as a section within our proposal, or should the cost factor/budget be separated (e.g., Packet 1 - Technical Proposal and Packet 2 - Cost Proposal)?**

ICJ: *The vendor may submit a Cost Proposal document separately, if desired. Please ensure that the costs are itemized.*

**23. There isn't a specific structure for the proposal required, could you confirm that you are leaving this to the vendor's best judgment?**

ICJ: *It would be most helpful for our RFP Scoring Team if the proposal included a table containing our requirements, similar to the format in our RFP Section 8: Requirements. This provides ease of review to ensure that all requirements are clearly addressed.*

## **Section 8: Requirements**

**24. 2.06 – If a user/state is added to a case for third-party surveillance, would [read-only access to the information related to the return of a juvenile] consist of all the information within the case file or just a portion of the information located within the case file? If the latter, how would the system know which information in the case file would be shown versus hidden?**

ICJ: *We envision a juvenile master file containing high-level data about the juvenile that would be viewable by all users (Name, DOB, Race, Gender). Cases for interstate events (transfers of supervision, returns, or travel permits) for that juvenile would be located within a juvenile's master file and would be locked down to only the states involved in each case. If a juvenile has a return case and a state was provided read-only access because they are a third-party airport surveillance state, or the original adjudicating state for an absconder, that state's users should be able to view all data for that return case within the juvenile's master file but, if possible, not be able to edit the case details.*

**25. 2.09 – What types of multi-factor user authentication does ICJ wish to utilize for their new system? Also, would you want this enforced across the board for all users or only for a subset of users whose states require it?**

ICJ: *ICJ envisions multi-factor user authentication for users who are new to the system or are accessing the system on a new device. This may include an email, text, or phone call (users' choice) containing a code that authenticates and registers the user's device.*

**26. 2.14 – What specific steps would ICJ expect a user to follow to reset their own password? For example, if the user answers security questions, would ICJ still want them to receive an email containing a password reset link?**

ICJ: *We would like options for a user to request a password reset via email or by answering security questions on the screen. Oftentimes our users do not receive password reset emails due to email policy.*

**27. 3.05 – What data elements would be used to determine/qualify a record as a duplicate? For example, can we use a combination of first name, last name and date of birth to qualify as a duplicate? Or would more robust logic be needed?**

ICJ: *The high-level PII that all users can view on a juvenile's master file should be used to identify potential duplicate cases. Because a juvenile may have different interstate cases involving different states, this data should include first and last name, DOB, Race, and Gender. Logic for partial matches (e.g. wildcards) should be included for spelling errors.*

**28. 3.07 – Please provide an example of the types of “advanced search functions” ICJ is looking for in this requirement.**

ICJ: *The search feature should allow users to search files and cases by a juvenile's name, DOB, case type (transfer of supervision, return, travel permit), status (probation, parole, or non-delinquent runaway), and states involved. Ideally, the search feature will include Soundex indexing.*

**29. 3.10 – Does ICJ also want the author to be able to delete their own comments?**

ICJ: *Yes, comment authors should be able to delete their own comments.*

**30. 3.10 – What rights (if any) would system administrators/the national office have?**

ICJ: *System administrators should be able to edit/delete comments.*

**31. 4.02 – Is this signature requirement for ICJ system users (ICJO/JPO/JPS users) or for users external to the system (juveniles, judges, guardians, etc.)?**

ICJ: *All system users should be able to store an electronic signature. Non-system users should be able to electronically sign forms either by touch-screen or via an electronic signature service.*

**32. 4.02 – Are there differing signature requirements for ICJ system users versus users external to the system? If so, please describe what roles would need what types of signature capabilities.**

ICJ: *All system users would require the same signature capabilities. If the solution to obtain signatures from non-system users is via a third-party service, please include an estimated cost.*

**33. 4.02 – Will all participants who sign documents be required to setup an account in order to store a signature “stamp” to be used or will a mouse/finger signature be required?**

ICJ: *We are open to the option of providing courts with an account that would allow them to electronically sign documents for files they have been assigned. Alternately, the best option may be to provide juveniles and courts the ability to sign forms via touch-screen, when a user has access to a compatible device. Some users will still print out ICJ forms and obtain physical signatures to be uploaded as a case document.*

**34. 4.04 – Would these extensions be acceptable? (.doc, .docx, .xls, .xlsx, .pdf, .csv, .tif, .jpeg and .png)**

ICJ: *Yes.*

**35. 5.07 – Does ICJ want the user that is out of the office to designate who should perform work in their absence? Or does ICJ expect the system to designate/make these assignment changes automatically?**

ICJ: *The system is not expected to automatically reassign cases. At the state compact office level, all ICJO users should have access to the same files even if they are not currently assigned to that user so that if a user designates their status as “out of the office” another user in the same group can perform work on that case*

**36. 5.13 – Does ICJ want the system to also reassign all files that are currently assigned to the out of the office individual to a designee? Or would the system not assign any new tasks to the out of office individual until that individual marks themselves as back in the office?**

ICJ: *We envision that the out-of-office designation would alert users who are completing tasks associated with the out-of-office user’s case load that they are currently unavailable and indicate who to contact instead.*

**37. 5.17 – What does ICJ envision for manual alerts?**

ICJ: *Users should be able to send ad hoc email reminders to other users who are assigned to the same case. For example, ICJO User 1 is monitoring their state’s case assignments and filters active supervision cases to determine which juveniles have a quarterly progress report due in the next 15 days. The view of cases might include an option to submit a notice to the JPS or JPO assigned to the supervision case, for the purpose of reminding them that the quarterly progress report is due in xx days. This activity would be*



*tracked in the system. If the JPS or JPO is not a system user, the notification would go to their email only. If the JPS or JPO is a system user, the user would receive an email notification and an inbox alert, viewable upon login to the system.*

**38. 5.20 – What does ICJ envision seeing for “upcoming tasks”? In cases where a workflow could go in one of multiple directions (either lead to an approval or a denial, for example) what would a manager expect to see as an upcoming task if a determination hadn’t been made yet and it was unclear which path the workflow would follow?**

*ICJ: ICJ envisions “upcoming tasks” to be things like the next quarterly progress report due date for active transfer of supervision cases. If a violation report was submitted, an “upcoming task” might be to follow-up with the supervising officer. If a travel permit was submitted and exceeds 30 calendar days, the “upcoming task” might be to ensure the juvenile has made contact with their supervising officer.*

*If a determination has not yet been made and a case may have multiple outcomes, such as a juvenile is awaiting a hearing in the holding state, the home/demanding state’s “upcoming task” for that case might be to follow-up with the holding state when the hearing report is due.*

*The main idea of this requirement is for users to have the ability to quickly and easily know where a case is in any given process so they can follow-up with necessary parties and manage their due dates.*

**39. 5.27 – Does this mean that for each step of the workflow, ICJ would like the notifications received by the states to be customized for each state? For example, Texas would receive different content in their notifications than Nebraska?**

*ICJ: This means that some states might have internal policies that require notifying their JPS or JPO users 10 days in advance of any given due date. State ICJOs want the ability to send email notifications independent of regularly configured notifications.*

**40. 6.01 – What other methods of delivery would ICJ expect to see included in “etc.”?**

*ICJ: One case management system utilized by some states for intrastate supervision cases includes the ability to notify via phone message. We are open to creative solutions for notifications.*

**41. 7.05 – Can ICJ provide more information on what they would want redacted in a report as well as the retention requirements of redacted reports?**

*ICJ: Personal identifiable information (PII) should be redactable, including first and last name and DOB. We do not use juvenile’s Social Security Numbers in our system.*

**42. 7.06 – Would a reporting tool that provides the following meet this requirement? (1) provides a way for a user with access to reports to start with predefined set of data and then (2) choose which columns are displayed, (3) which parameters are included, (4) how the data is grouped, and (5) the ability to save the ad hoc report configuration to their profile for future use.**

ICJ: Yes, that is a good description of our ad-hoc reporting requirement. Regarding parameters used, users should be able to run reports for all active or closed cases [supervision, return, or travel permit] where their state is either the sending/home/demanding state, receiving/holding state, or third-party surveillance state, when the date the case was entered/submitted/closed is between dates x and x. Users also want the ability to run a report to determine how many home evaluations, quarterly progress reports, violation reports, absconder reports, or travel permits were submitted by their state or to their state in a certain date range.

**43. 7.07 – Would dashboard reports be developed for all current ICJ reports referenced in 7.10?**

ICJ: While we desire all current reporting capabilities, they do not all have to be on a dynamic reporting dashboard. User or workflow reports, for example, might not be appropriate for a dashboard. A reporting dashboard would focus on our compliance reports that measure a state's compliance with certain [ICJ Rule-based standards](#), such as submitting home evaluation reports with 45-calendar days, or submitting supervision referral documents within 10 business days of issuing a travel permit for a sex offender to relocate to the receiving state prior to acceptance of supervision.

**44. 7.07 – Would ICJ need anything not currently in a report to display on this dashboard? If so, what?**

ICJ: The answer to this question may depend upon the proof of concept delivered for a reporting dashboard. However, no additional requirements outside of the RFP will be expected upon delivery.

**45. 7.07 – Would ICJ need to be able to print/export the things displayed on this dashboard?**

ICJ: Yes.

**46. 7.07 – Do both dashboards and reports need to be based on real-time data?**

ICJ: Please provide a cost to use real-time data. ICJ understands there are pros and cons to having the reports use live-data. As such, this may be an area we negotiate in the contract.

**47. 7.07 – Would this requirement be met by providing a tool that displays dashboard data as a series of widgets, where data in each widget can be sorted or selected so that it launches into the selected case data?**

ICJ: ICJ is open to this option and interested in the concept.

**48. 7.07 – Do the dashboards only need to consider one data source, or do they need to aggregate data from different sources?**

ICJ: *The reporting dashboard will use data contained within the proposed system.*

**49. 8.08 – Does the system need to be able to integrate with an encrypted email provider or does the system’s messaging need to avoid including PII and sensitive information in email notifications and instead just link to the file?**

ICJ: *Options for email encryption is required.*

**50. 8.13 – Can ICJ share the most commonly used browsers and operating systems across your user base?**

ICJ: *The majority of our users are on Windows 7, 8 or 10 machines, but some also access on a Mac. Browsers used include Google Chrome, Internet Explorer 11, and Mozilla Firefox. In addition to those browsers, we would like the new system to be compatible with Microsoft Edge and Safari.*

**51. 9.01 – Would the vendor be expected to create these integrations inside the case management systems?**

ICJ: *No, the vendor will be required to provide a standard mechanism (API or web service) for ICJ staff or case management vendors to develop integrations with the proposed solution. Additionally, ICJ staff needs the capability to extract data and provide it in other formats (e.g. XML, CSV, etc.)*

**52. 9.01 – How many different case management systems need to be integrated, and the level of integration?**

ICJ: *The vendor will be required to provide a standard mechanism that case management vendors will need to comply with in order to share information between their case management system and the proposed solution.*

**53. 9.01 – Which Case Management Systems would be expected to integrate with this solution?**

ICJ: *In a 2017 survey, our users indicated Odyssey and CaseLoadPro (Tyler Supervision) as their current case management systems. Some states have built their own CMS; it would be up to the states to implement the integration with the toolkit or API that is created.*

**54. Under 9.01 (Interface) it states, "The proposed solution should provide web services or other application program interfaces (API) to allow users to send and receive information to and from state case management systems." Is this web service available? If yes, what are the specifications? If not, who is responsible for developing these specifications?**

ICJ: *There is currently not a web service available to support an API. The current system does not have any integrations with other CMS products. The vendor would be responsible for creating a standard API or web service for states to utilize for data sharing.*

**55. Under 9.01 (Interface) it states, "The proposed solution should provide web services or other application program interfaces (API) to allow user to send and receive information to and from state case management systems." Are we expected to coordinate with other state case management system vendors during the course of this project implementation?**

ICJ: *No, the expectation is that the vendor will create the API or web service which will be offered to states. It will be up to states to implement the solution for data sharing. Any assistance required for states to connect with our system would be managed outside of the RFP.*

**56. It is expected that the selected vendor provide a feature that would include maps?**

ICJ: *There is no requirement for an integrated map, but this is a feature that could be helpful, possibly on the dashboard.*

## Section 10: Vendor Profile

**57. Would you be open to a Canadian firm that does work with a lot of clients in the States?**

ICJ: *ICJ has no requirements relating to the vendor's physical location. Our expectation is that the vendor is available during business hours Eastern Time. All communication, written or verbal, will be in English.*

## Section 14: Proposed Scoring Criteria

**58. Under Approach and Cost, the itemized major system components are listed as: 22 workflows, 18 forms, 26 reports, and an analytics dashboard. Can the assumption be made that the scope will not include additional workflows, forms, and/or reports?**

ICJ: *That is a correct assumption. We expect our current workflows, forms, and reports to be replicated or potentially combined in the new system. We understand that our 22 workflow processes may not translate to 22 workflow processes in the new system. After a business process review, the vendor may propose combining and streamlining our processes which would result in fewer workflows or reports; alternatively, it may be more prudent to develop finer-grained workflows or reports. The new system must provide at least the same level of functionality as the current system.*

**59. For Criterion 4: Approach and Cost Factor, the total is equal to 25 points. What is the points allocation for each of these factors separately?**

ICJ: *Each item below will receive equal weight in the Approach and Cost Factor portion of our RFP Scoring, normalized to represent 25% of the total score, or 25 points out of 100.*

- a. *Software design and development – cost to gather and validate requirements and develop a system to meet the requirements*
- b. *Project management services – cost for the selected vendor's project manager*
- c. *Hosting services – hardware, software, storage and security to support a nationwide application and a sandbox*
- d. *Extract-Transform-Load (ETL) - cost to develop a recommendation to migrate data from JIDS to the new proposed solutions*
- e. *Training – ICJ requires system training for select system administrators and ICJO users – who will train additional users*
- f. *Total cost of ownership for five years*

## Section 15: Evaluation Process

**60. If ICJ had to choose one, do you prefer an RFP response that meets all your requirements or one that meets your budget?**

*ICJ: It is the intention of this RFP to obtain proposals that meet both the requirements and budget. The RFP Team will carefully consider each vendor's itemized budget to assess which requirements exceed the budget and may choose to prioritize budget over requirements.*

## Section 16: Additional Information

### ICJ FORMS

**61. Are samples of the different forms that are expected in this system available for review?**

*ICJ: All ICJ Forms are available in PDF on the Commission's website:  
<https://www.juvenilecompact.org/forms> The current system offers these as Adobe, paper-like forms.*

**62. On the website [www.juvenilecompact.org/forms](http://www.juvenilecompact.org/forms), there are forms in English as well as in Spanish. Do you require a bilingual or multi-lingual system?**

*ICJ: We do offer some ICJ Forms in Spanish; however, our current system does not incorporate Spanish forms aside from allowing users to upload the PDF forms from the ICJ Website. We do not currently require that the system is bilingual; however, this may be an opportunity.*

### REPORTS

**63. Are samples of the different reports that are expected in this system available for review?**

*ICJ: We have a few examples on the JIDS Helpdesk: <https://support.juvenilecompact.org/hc/en-us/sections/204069007-Report-Descriptions>*

## Appendix A: Data Discovery

**64. Should our response include a data migration recommendation and the resources, time and budget to complete the data migration? Or just the resources, time and budget to provide a recommendation?**

*ICJ: The budget should include the resources, time, and budget to provide a recommendation of various options (e.g. data conversion and migration, parallel environments for some period of time, manual entry of active cases only). ICJ will make a final decision based upon the findings of the vendor's recommendation but will be considered part of the total budget.*

**65. Would reports and dashboards need to include migrated/legacy data?**

*ICJ: If the legacy data is migrated into the new system then it will be included.*