

Illinois Courts Statewide E-Filing RFI - Electronic Filing Manager		
Questions and Answers - as of March 8, 2016		
Questions	Answers	
1	Does the state plan on releasing a subsequent RFP or will they award the EFM from the RFI?	The intent is to move from the RFI proposals to a contract (sample online) with the selected EFM vendor (no additional RFP).
2	Will there be a RFI/RFP process for EFSP's or will the state be doing a certification process similar to what occurs in Texas and Indiana?	A specific EFSP certification process has not been established yet, although as indicated in the RFI, the EFM will need to confirm that an EFSP (and case management system) meets the requirements for security, exchange standards, and integration with the EFM. The RFI asks that the EFM proposals describe a process to manage both EFSP and CMS integrations. to ensure the secure and successful exchange and filing of court documents and information.
3	Will the proposals and responses to the RFI be made public?	The e-Filing / EFM proposals will be kept private and not made public. The selected vendor will enter into a contract with the AOIC, which will be made public and posted with the Illinois Comptroller's office.
4	Will the EFM be used by the Trial Courts to receive electronically filed documents or to send documents to the reviewing courts?	Both. The EFM is to be a single service which facilitates the electronic filing of court documents throughout the Illinois Judiciary (receipt of e-Filed documents into each court's CMS from the filer). As well, the EFM is to facilitate the transmission of records on appeal from the trial courts to the reviewing courts and among the reviewing courts.
5	Will the EFM be responsible for an electronic content management solution (ECM)?	Although the EFM is to provide a means for judges, clerks, parties to exchange court documents (in addition to e-Filing), the scope does not include a full document or content management service.
6	What is the status of the Reviewing Courts (Supreme and Appellate Court Districts) case management system?	The Supreme Court has approved the implementation of Thomson Reuter's C-Track case management system (CMS). This CMS is being implemented in the Supreme Court, and each Appellate Court District. The implementation of the CMS is expected to be consistent with the e-Filing time line.
7	What are the plans / next phases of e-Filing, i.e., Criminal cases?	Juvenile cases are not currently included in the Supreme Court's e-Filing Order. Criminal cases have to be vetted to discuss privacy issues, personal information. Key stakeholders will need to meet to discuss issues.
8	Automated Clearinghouse (ACH) services. Can you provide additional specifications regarding a preferred and available ACH services?	The RFI leaves open to the EFM vendor the integration and use of an ACH service. The proposals are to describe the use of ACH services, which might include the Illinois Treasurer's e-Pay service, existing ACH services used by a local court, or new ACH services which the EFM has successfully implemented.
9	Are there known ECF 4 extensions or IEPD's which the EFM will need to support and do existing e-Filing implementations support the ECF standards.	The Court's existing standards for e-Filing do not require support for ECF. However, some existing e-Filing implementations do support ECF 4 standards. The EFM vendor is asked to define the integration and e-filing standards which will integrate the central EFM with the case management systems and EFSP service providers.
10	Electronic Record on Appeal: Are there known standards for the electronic record on appeal and what functions are required to support this?	Document standards are being documented so that all electronic records on appeal are packaged the same and look similar (i.e., page number, text searchable, indexes, etc.). The electronic records on appeal are large documents, which may require transmission standards to acknowledge and deliver them to the reviewing courts. A local court may choose to use an EFSP or the basic EFSP service provided by the EFM to transmit their records on appeal.
11	Can you describe more about the free, basic Electronic Filing Service Provider (EFSP) which is to be included with the EFM?	Included with the EFM services is the provision of a free EFSP service which supports the existing standards to integrate EFSP's with the EFM. The free EFSP service is to provide basic functionality to support the electronic filing of court documents and the transmission of electronic records on appeal. This service is intended to be available for used by Pro Se filers, government entities, or by the courts in making a kiosk / walk-up computer available within the courthouse. Typically EFSP service providers will include functionality and value with their services to warrant payment by the filer, where the cost of the basic EFSP is born by the Supreme Court with its EFM costs.
12	EFM functionality	The EFM is expected to provide party access to documents made available by the local court. These documents may have been e-Filed or generated by the Clerk's office for distribution to parties. These documents will be in electronic format and the EFM is not expected to scan or digitize paper documents.
13	EFM Portal - Can you expand upon the court-specific EFM portal which segregates e-filing activity for each trial and reviewing court?	The EFM is to provide a portal which allows each local court (trial court / county or reviewing court) access to manage their e-filings. The portal would also be a location where documents can be distributed, activity and audit reports can be generated, or other court e-filing related functions.
14	Can a multi-tiered pricing model be proposed to reflect the implementation of the 15 counties which have deployed a local e-Filing system and are anticipated to integrate with the central EFM?	Yes - the EFM vendor should clearly define the pricing model for the EFM to support e-Filing with the initial 87 counties, trial and reviewing court records on appeal (all counties), and that which reflects e-Filing with the remaining 15 counties integrated with the central EFM.
15	Can you provide a breakdown of caseloads by county?	The caseloads by county are in the Annual Statistical Reports on the Court's website: http://illinoiscourts.gov/SupremeCourt/AnnualReport/2014/StatsSumm/default.asp
16	Do you have an estimate of the average number of subsequent filings to an existing case (after case initiation)?	The Supreme Court's Order mandates e-Filing for all civil case types, which differ dramatically in terms of filed discovery and motion practice, etc., the average number of subsequent filings is difficult to estimate.
17	What is the current number of registered attorneys in Illinois?	The 2014 Annual Report of the Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission states that there are 92,756 attorneys registered in Illinois.
18	Can you provide a list of court case management systems in your state?	There are approximately 13 different case management systems in the trial courts. The reviewing courts (Supreme Court and 5 Appellate Court Districts) are in process of consolidating to Thomson Reuters' C-Track case management system. See below for more detail.
19	Do you have a preferred pricing model?	The RFI intentionally left the pricing models up to the EFM vendor's discretion.

Illinois Courts Statewide E-Filing RFI - Electronic Filing Manager

Questions and Answers - as of March 8, 2016

Questions		Answers
20	The RFI indicates the EFM is to provide notice to parties. Is this notice from a legal service process or notice to parties for purpose of acknowledgement of e-Filing?	The notice to parties required by the EFM is to acknowledge the filing of documents or status of case.
21	If legal service notices are included in this RFI, is it the intent of the RFI, for the vendor, to provide self-represented parties and the legal community a choice of service providers?	N/A (response to Question 20 above).
22	What level of security access to court documents is expected from the EFM?	Access to and security for court documents is expected to be managed exclusively by the EFM. Parties to a case are allowed access to documents e-Filed or uploaded by the clerk for that case. As well, judges and court officials will have access to documents uploaded for distribution by the clerks in their respective courts.
23	What is the expectation regarding reconciliation of fees and filing data?	The expectation is that fee reconciliation includes itemizing transactions and providing an audit and logging of transactions related to a user, case, and court over a period of time.
24	Is the transmission of records on appeal to include NOA's, mandates, and the actual CLR, ROP, etc.?	Yes. The record on appeal is to include all of the components required in a record on appeal, with the exception of exhibits which cannot be digitized.
25	Is it mandatory to use ECF standards to integrate with each Court CMS and EFSP partner?	Yes. The ECF 4.0 industry standards are minimum standards for the e-Filing EFM and are expected to be used to interface and connect the EFM with all court case management systems and EFSP services.
26	Is it the intent for the EFM registry web service to manage the users on behalf of other EFSP providers and then authenticate them using a Single-Signon service or is the EFM to authenticate the EFSP providers for filing and then validate their own users?	The EFM is to provide a single registry for authentication and access to the e-Filing system (for web services and the portal), regardless of the EFSP or CMS. However, the EFM's online registry is not anticipated to be a single sign-on to manage access to services / functions provided by the local court systems / services, should the EFSP or other entities be engaged in those services.
27	What is the retention time frame for e-filed documents for the EFM to provide for parties to access stamp/filed copies?	At minimum, e-filed documents should be available until a case is disposed.
28	Should e-notifications be an EFSP feature and not an EFM feature and how will the courts communicate (through their respective CMS) with the EFM to provide status of a case? What is to be included in the 'status of case' notifications.	The EFM should have the ability to support electronic notification (not e-Service) so parties are notified of the electronic filing of documents and the status of a case. E-notification should include updates on the status of an e-filing (i.e., accepted or rejected), fee payment information, or other notifications as to case status. The RFI allows that an EFM vendor can describe in their proposal their existing EFM system and the notification features it provides, as well as how the EFM interfaces and exchanges data with the EFSP and CMS.
29	With regard to the distribution of trial court records on appeal, how will documents be distributed?	The RFI describes two EFM processes related to the record on appeal; 1) the EFM will facilitate the transmission of the record on appeal, and 2) the EFM will provide the functionality allowing the local court to distribute documents, including the record on appeal to intended officials. The EFM should integrate with any EFSP to allow the trial courts to transmit a properly compiled record on appeal to the respective reviewing court. As well, the reviewing court, for example, may want to distribute the record on appeal or a portion of it to judges or officials in their district. This may also apply to trial courts should they want to use the EFM to make court documents available to judges in a circuit. Documents available on the EFM portal would be copies of the official court documents in each court's CMS.
30	With regard to the retention of documents on the EFM, can the EFM purge documents after 90 days, since the EFM will not know when a case is disposed? Does the EFM host court documents or link to them through EFM and where they remain on the local courts case management or document management system?	As indicated in question 27, E-Filed documents should, at minimum, be retained by the EFM until a case is disposed. The EFM is intended to host a copy of court documents and not directly access official court documents on a court's case management or document management system.
31		
32		
33		

**Illinois Trial Court 2014 Data
Case Management System by Case Category**

Case Management System (CMS)	Total Cases Filed	Percent of Total	Civil Cases Filed	Criminal Cases Filed	Traffic, Conservation, & Ordinance Cases Filed	Juvenile Cases Filed	Number of Counties
In-House	1,715,849	58.55%	346,715	218,829	1,140,118	10,187	6
Goodin / JIMS	498,822	17.02%	100,511	52,061	340,500	5,750	79
Jano	477,355	16.29%	94,143	42,516	337,178	3,518	8
Justice	73,040	2.49%	16,189	8,986	47,037	828	1
ISS	64,089	2.19%	10,116	4,753	48,909	311	1
Tyler	43,904	1.50%	10,247	4,101	28,726	830	1
Sustain	32,152	1.10%	6,734	4,690	20,393	335	6
CourtView	25,464	0.87%	6,119	2,377	16,669	299	1
	2,930,675		584,655	335,936	1,962,861	21,759	102

