BID 26-08-4284SB

Addendum No. 4 – November 19, 2026

Request for Proposals for Software and Implementation Services for a Court and Justice Partners Case Management Software Systems Environment

Due Date and Time:
December 11, 2026, at 4:00 pm local Window Rock, AZ time (MST)

This Addendum No. 4 (together with Addenda No. 1 – No. 3) provides responses to all proposer questions received by NNJB by the questions deadline of October 15, 2026. NNJB reserves the right to issue additional addenda as needed prior to the proposal due date to provide further clarifications, supplemental information, or other procurement-related communications. Proposers are responsible for reviewing and incorporating all issued addenda into their proposal submissions.

The proposal submission deadline has been extended to **Friday, December 11, 2026, at 4:00 p.m. local Window Rock, Arizona time (MST)**. All references in the RFP and previously issued addenda to an earlier proposal due date shall be deemed amended accordingly.

Procurement, Proposal, and Contract Requirements:

1. Attachment A, Tab 13, Item II - Deviations/Exceptions to RFP Terms and Conditions as Proposed by the NNJB: Can the NNJB provide the terms and conditions for vendors to review?

   NNJB Response: The applicable contractual requirements currently available to Proposers are included in Section 4, General Requirements, Section 5, and the associated RFP attachments. Proposers should identify any requested exceptions or proposed changes in Attachment A, Tab 13.

2. Will the NNJB accept proposals that have been signed digitally (i.e., through DocuSign)?

   NNJB Response: NNJB will accept electronic or digitally applied signatures, including signatures applied through DocuSign or a comparable service, on proposal documents requiring signature, provided the signature is applied by an authorized representative of the Proposer. This does not change the proposal delivery requirements. Proposers must still submit the required hard copies and electronic media, and emailed proposals will not be accepted.

3. Has NNJB established an anticipated budget or funding range for the overall implementation, including software licensing, configuration, customization, data migration, integrations, hosting, and

ongoing support? If available, please provide the anticipated budget and confirm the target implementation schedule.

NNJB Response: NNJB will use proposal submissions to inform final budget development. Proposers shall provide complete five-year and ten-year pricing and plan to complete the implementation within five years after contract execution.

4. Please confirm the controlling solicitation number for all questions and proposal materials, as the cover page identifies BID #26-08-4284SB while the remaining RFP sections identify BID #26-02-4284SB.

   NNJB Response: BID No. 26-08-4284SB is the controlling solicitation number.

5. Which bid number should we use on the sealed envelope and all forms: 26-08-4284SB or 26-02-4284SB? The cover page and Addendum No. 1 use 26-08-4284SB. The Scope of Work and the envelope label in Section 2.B use 26-02-4284SB.

   NNJB Response: See response to question 4 above.

6. What types of insurance and what minimum limits must our Certificate of Liability Insurance show? Must we name the Navajo Nation or NNJB as an additional insured? The RFP asks for the certificate but does not list coverage types or limits.

   NNJB Response: The RFP requires a Certificate of Liability Insurance but does not state minimum coverage types or limits. NNJB will provide the applicable insurance requirements during contract negotiations. Proposers should submit evidence of their current coverage with the proposal and identify any exception or limitation.

7. Must a business based outside the Navajo Nation register with the Navajo Nation Business Regulatory Department before it submits a proposal? Or only if it wins the award? The Transmittal Certification asks us to confirm we are licensed or qualified to do business with the Navajo Nation.

   NNJB Response: Proposers must be eligible and qualified to contract with the Navajo Nation. Any registration or licensing required as a condition of contract award must be completed before contract execution unless Purchasing directs otherwise. Proposers shall disclose their current registration status and any remaining steps in the proposal.

8. If a partnership submits a proposal, must the Prime Vendor hold Navajo Nation Priority 1 or Priority 2 certification for the proposal to receive preference? Or can a certified partner or subcontractor qualify the proposal?

   NNJB Response: Questions regarding Navajo Nation Priority 1 or Priority 2 qualifications can be addressed to the Navajo Nation Business Regulatory Department at (928) 357-6643.

Language and Translation:

Note: The NNJB has provided one response to all questions regarding language and translation functionality below.

9. Does the system need to fully support Diné characters (such as ą, ę, į, ǫ, and the glottal stop ’) everywhere data is entered, stored, displayed, and searched, including party names, docket

entries, and file names? Or is Diné character support only required for public-facing content, such as notices, forms, and the user interface?

10. Is Hopi language support required at go-live, or would a phased rollout (English/Spanish at launch, Diné and Hopi as a near-term follow) be acceptable?

11. Who will supply the actual translated content (UI strings, form text, notices) for Diné and Hopi? Is that a vendor deliverable or does the NNJB provide/approve translations?

12. POR.22 requires a multilingual interface including Diné and Hopi. Does this apply to the public portal only, or also to internal staff screens?

13. For Requirements POR.22, POR.25, POR.26, and PM.43, please clarify the required language-support capabilities and the languages applicable to each function, including English, Diné, Spanish, and Hopi as referenced in the solicitation. Please specify whether the requirements include translated user interface text, standardized forms and templates, user-generated content, document generation, and/or automated translation of free-text content. Please also clarify who is responsible for supplying, translating, reviewing, and approving language content, including specialized legal and Peacemaking terminology, and whether professional translation and validation services must be included in the proposed scope and price.

14. Will NNJB supply the Diné and Hopi translated text for the public portal, notices and forms? Requirement POR.25 asks for "local translation" of portal menus and messages.

15. About how many court forms, notices and letter templates does NNJB use today? How many must be available in both English and Diné at go-live?

    NNJB Response: NNJB is clarifying the language and translation requirements in the RFP and Attachment B. For purposes of proposal development, **Diné is the only language, in addition to English, for which specific language-support capabilities are required**. Spanish and Hopi language support are no longer required and should not be included as mandatory functionality or in pricing assumptions.

    The proposed solution must support the entry, storage, display, retrieval, search, export, printing, and preservation of Diné characters and diacritics through Unicode or an equivalent standards-based approach wherever Diné-language information may reasonably occur. This includes party and participant names, case and docket information, case notes, document titles and file names, uploaded filings, generated documents, forms, notices, reports, and other free-text fields. This requirement concerns the system's ability to accurately accept and preserve Diné-language content and does not mean that all system screens or content must be translated into Diné. This is consistent with Attachment B's requirement that the system permit Diné characters in relevant case-management fields.

    NNJB also requires the system to support documents submitted in Diné as part of the official electronic case record. Filers must be able to upload documents containing Diné-language content without alteration or loss of characters or diacritics, and authorized users must be able to store, retrieve, view, download, and otherwise manage those documents in the same manner as English-language filings. The system is not required to automatically translate filings, briefs, judicial records, case notes, or other free-text content between English and Diné. Real-time or machine-generated translation is not a requirement of this procurement.

For the public-facing web portal and other public-facing functionality, NNJB intends to provide targeted Diné-language access rather than require translation of the entire application. The solution should therefore provide configurable capabilities that allow NNJB to present selected portal navigation, instructions, help text, warnings, notices, forms, templates, and other designated public-facing content in English and Diné. The system should support a practical method for users to access or select Diné content where such translated content has been configured. NNJB does not require every public-facing page, every authenticated portal function, or the internal staff user interface to be translated into Diné. Attachment B currently includes multilingual interface and configurable translated-content requirements; these requirements should be interpreted consistent with this clarification.

Similarly, NNJB requires the system to support English- and Diné-language versions of designated standardized documents and templates, including Peacemaking forms and other notices, forms, correspondence, instructions, or templates identified by NNJB during implementation. Attachment B specifically requires Peacemaking forms in English and Diné and the ability to identify parties with Diné-language needs or preferences. The exact number and type of materials to be made available in Diné, including those required for initial go-live, have not yet been finalized and will be determined during implementation planning.

NNJB has also not yet determined the person or organization that will perform authoritative English-to-Diné translation of legal, judicial, Peacemaking, portal, or other content. Proposers should therefore not assume responsibility for creating authoritative Diné translations as part of the base proposal unless such services are expressly proposed. The selected Proposer will be responsible for providing the technical and configuration capabilities necessary to load, maintain, display, test, and update approved translated content. NNJB will be responsible for ensuring that content delivered to the selected Proposer for implementation has been appropriately reviewed and approved, whether translation services are ultimately performed by NNJB personnel, another Navajo Nation resource, a third-party language specialist, or separately contracted services.

Users and User Count:

Note: The NNJB has provided one response to all questions regarding user and user counts below.

16. For the 250 estimated users in Section 3.H, please provide a breakdown by department and role (e.g., judges, clerks, attorneys, investigators, victim advocates, officers, administrative staff), and indicate which users are expected to work in the system daily versus occasionally or in view-only mode. Please also confirm whether the 250 are named users or concurrent users, and how the six floating licenses are intended to be used.
17. Section 3.B notes that Public Safety departments currently have read-only access. Are law enforcement users, non-judicial Peacemakers, contract or conflict counsel, and pro bono attorneys included in the 250 users, or should they be treated as external portal users? Please estimate the number in each group.
18. Please estimate external portal usage for pricing purposes: the number of registered attorneys and law firm staff, law enforcement officers, individuals under probation supervision, and treatment or program providers expected to log in, and the expected number of e-filings per month.

19. What growth in internal users, external users and case volume should Proposers assume over the 10-year cost horizon?

20. Please confirm the anticipated user counts by department and user role, including the number of Public Safety users requiring read-only access. Where available, please distinguish between named users, concurrent users, occasional users, and external or partner users. Please also clarify whether proposers may offer their standard licensing model and how licensing costs will be evaluated when proposed models differ.

21. Will police and other public safety staff keep the read-only access they have today? If yes, about how many people need it?

    NNJB Response: For proposal-planning and pricing purposes, Proposers shall assume 250 named internal users of the proposed system, as identified in Section 3.H of the RFP. These users represent NNJB and other authorized internal personnel expected to perform operational functions within the system. Of the 250 named users, the six floating licenses referenced in the RFP are intended to provide NNJB flexibility for onboarding or other changing staffing needs. NNJB has not established a breakdown of the 250 users by role. Final user roles, permissions, access patterns, and licensing assignments will be validated with the selected Proposer during implementation planning.

    The estimate of 250 named users does not include external public users, e-filers, or users whose interaction with the system will occur primarily through public-facing or partner-facing portal functionality. NNJB does not currently have validated counts or usage volumes for these external user populations, including the number of registered attorneys and law firm staff, law enforcement users, individuals under probation supervision who may access a portal, treatment or program providers, or anticipated monthly e-filing volumes.

    Proposers may propose their standard licensing model, including named-user, concurrent-user, enterprise, module-based, role-based, usage-based, portal, or other licensing approaches. To allow NNJB to evaluate differing licensing models on a comparable basis, Proposers shall clearly identify:

    - Which user populations are included within the proposed licensing model;
    - Which users require paid licenses and which may access the solution without an individually assigned license;
    - Distinctions among full-use, occasional, read-only, external, portal, and public users;
    - Any concurrent-user assumptions or limits;
    - Any thresholds applicable to portal accounts, registered users, e-filings, transactions, storage, or other usage-based measures;
    - The ability to add, remove, or reassign licenses as NNJB's staffing and usage patterns change;
    - Costs associated with growth above proposed user or usage thresholds; and
    - Any differences between the licensing assumptions used for the five-year and ten-year pricing requested by the RFP.

    NNJB does not currently have a validated projection for growth in internal users, external users, e-filing activity, or case volume over the ten-year pricing horizon. For purposes of establishing

comparable base pricing, Proposers shall use the 250 named internal-user assumption and the other planning information provided in the RFP and addenda. Where pricing is affected by user counts, transaction volumes, external accounts, concurrency, case volume, storage, or similar consumption measures, Proposers shall clearly identify the applicable assumptions and thresholds and explain how pricing would change if actual usage differs from those assumptions.

Finance and Transactions:

22. Could you please provide an estimate of the annual volume of payment transactions processed by the court, broken down by type (e.g., fines, fees, bail payments, restitution)?

    NNJB Response: NNJB does not currently have validated volume information available for this addendum. Proposers should use the planning information published in the RFP, identify any assumptions and pricing thresholds, and describe how pricing would change if actual volumes differ materially during discovery.

23. How many payment transactions does the court process annually?

    NNJB Response: NNJB does not currently have a validated count of individual payment transactions. For additional proposal-planning information, available financial records reflect total payment amounts of $589,972.19 in 2023, $472,996.08 in 2024, and $607,722.59 in 2025. Available records also identify bond amounts of $78,761.10 in 2023, $63,238.54 in 2024, and $85,246.62 in 2025. These figures represent dollar amounts and should not be interpreted as transaction counts or average transaction values.

24. What payment methods should be accepted (cash, check, credit/debit card, ach, online payments)?

    NNJB Response: The solution shall support check, money order, credit card, and debit card payments as stated in Attachment B, and the portal shall support credit/debit and ACH/eCheck subject to court policy. Proposers should identify supported in-person and online payment methods, required processors or third parties, hardware, fees, and assumptions.

25. What is the average transaction amount?

    NNJB Response: NNJB does not currently have validated transaction amount information available for this addendum.

26. Would the NNJB like the option for customers to be able to pay at the counter?

    NNJB Response: Yes. NNJB requires in-person counter payment capability as part of cashiering. Proposers should describe supported point-of-sale and cashiering hardware and separately price optional hardware in Attachment C.

27. If the court would like the ability to pay at the counter, we are happy to provide the NNJB with point of sale (POS) devices. Please list how many POS devices are needed per location.

    NNJB Response: Proposers should assume at least one POS device per court location to support in-person payment processing. The final number and placement of POS devices at each location will be confirmed during implementation planning based on cashiering needs, transaction volumes, and the operational configuration of each location.

28. Should court financial transactions (receipts, disbursements, general ledger) post to a Navajo Nation financial system? If so, which system, and should it be added to the interface list?

    NNJB Response: NNJB is not contemplating an interface between the proposed solution and a Navajo Nation financial system at this time. Accordingly, Proposers should not include such an interface as part of the base scope or pricing, and no additional financial system will be added to the Interfaces tab for purposes of this procurement.

29. Please clarify whether NNJB expects the proposed system to independently manage court financial transactions, including trust accounts, bonds, restitution, and financial reconciliation, or whether these functions may be supported through integration with an existing NNJB financial management system. If integration is acceptable, please identify the system.

    NNJB Response: See response to question 28.

30. Does NNJB have a payment processor and merchant account for card payments today? Or should the vendor supply one? Who will pay card processing fees and text message (SMS) charges?

    NNJB Response: The vendor is expected to provide payment processing functionality. The consumer is expected to be responsible for paying card processing fees and SMS charges.

Data Conversion, Migration, and Legacy Systems

Note: See below for a consolidated response to questions regarding data conversion scope.

31. Section 3.C, Attachment A, Table 5-03: Will NNJB or its JustWare support provider make available the database schema, data dictionary, file layouts, data mapping documentation, and representative sample data extracts necessary to assess and perform data migration? Please clarify which materials are available, any applicable access restrictions, and when they will be provided relative to contract award or prior submission.

32. Please identify the organization currently supporting JustWare and clarify the responsibilities of the incumbent support provider and the selected vendor for legacy data extraction. Please also identify any available extraction tools, supported export formats, technical assistance, access requirements, and fees or other costs associated with extraction.

33. Please clarify the required scope of historical data migration, including whether all historical case records, associated documents, attachments, audit history, and related records must be converted into the new system. Would NNJB accept an alternative approach in which designated historical records are retained in a secure, searchable, read-only archive? If so, please identify the minimum access, search, reporting, retention, and retrieval capabilities required for archived records.

34. Section 3.C, pages 6–7, identifies approximately 1.22 TB of data in an external document repository. Please clarify how documents in this repository are associated with JustWare case records, including whether associations are maintained through database references, file paths, folder structures, case numbers, or another method. Please also provide any available estimates of the total document count, the number of documents that cannot be reliably associated with a case record, and any known duplicate, corrupted, or orphaned documents. Please clarify whether resolving unlinked documents is within the vendor's migration scope.

35. Will NNJB provide the complete JustWare database schema, including table structures, column names, data types, primary and foreign keys, relationships, data dictionaries, lookup values, and custom fields, to support migration planning and field-level mapping?

36. Please confirm whether all historical closed cases and associated documents from JustWare must be migrated into the new case management system, or whether NNJB would accept migrating active cases while retaining historical closed cases in a secure, searchable archive accessible to authorized users.

37. Will NNJB provide database extracts or API access, sample datasets, existing field mappings, and documentation of customizations? Please clarify whether NNJB or the selected vendor will be responsible for data extraction, cleansing, deduplication, source-to-target mapping, reconciliation, and final migration validation and sign-off.

38. Please clarify whether historical audit records, case event history, and document version history from JustWare must be migrated into the operational case management database, or whether these records may be preserved in a secure, searchable historical archive.

39. Please confirm whether NNJB, in coordination with its incumbent vendor, will provide complete, structured data extracts from JustWare, including associated documents and metadata, or whether the selected vendor will be responsible for extracting data directly from the legacy system.

40. Should the base proposal assume conversion of all 66,406 open cases, 702,800 closed cases, 565,741 person records, and the full 1.22 TB document repository? Please also confirm what database backups, schemas, document-link mappings, extraction utilities, and incumbent or NNJB subject-matter support will be provided.

41. Will NNJB's current JustWare support provider be available to help pull data out of JustWare for conversion?

    NNJB Response: For proposal-planning and pricing purposes, Proposers shall assume that the selected solution will require conversion of the existing JustWare data and associated electronic document repository identified in the RFP, including the approximately 66,406 open cases, 702,800 closed cases, 565,741 person records, and approximately 1.22 TB electronic document repository referenced in the solicitation materials. The base proposal should assume conversion of historical as well as active case data and associated electronic documents necessary to preserve usable case histories and case-document relationships.

    The exact tables, fields, records, document types, metadata, case-document relationships, historical information, audit data, document-version information, retention requirements, and other conversion elements will be validated with the selected Proposer during discovery and implementation planning. Proposers shall clearly identify any assumptions, exclusions, dependencies, or limitations used in developing their proposed conversion scope and price.

    NNJB, working with its current JustWare support provider, will be responsible for coordinating extraction of data and documents from the existing JustWare environment and for costs charged by the incumbent provider for legacy-system extraction or related legacy-vendor support. Proposers should not assume that the selected vendor will be independently accessing the JustWare production environment and extracting legacy data. To the extent available, NNJB will provide the selected Proposer with legacy data extracts, schema information, file layouts, document-link or relationship information, data dictionaries, representative data, and other

technical documentation necessary to support conversion. These materials should not be assumed to be complete or available prior to proposal submission. Additional information will be provided and validated during discovery to the extent available. Proposers shall identify required source formats, file structures, metadata, extraction frequencies, data-delivery methods, documentation, and other prerequisites so that NNJB and its incumbent provider can plan the extraction process.

The selected Proposer will be responsible for the conversion activities, including conversion planning and coordination; analysis of source data; source-to-target mapping; transformation; loading into the proposed system; identifying, handling, and reconciling data-quality issues; conversion testing; validation support; and correction of conversion-related issues within the scope of the Proposer's responsibilities. NNJB does not currently have validated information regarding the number of duplicate, corrupted, orphaned, or unlinked documents contained within the existing repository or the extent to which all document relationships can be reliably derived from currently available legacy information. Proposers should describe their methodology for handling these records and documents and clearly identify which remediation activities are included in the base proposal.

Proposers may separately propose an alternative migration approach under which designated historical records are retained in a secure, searchable, read-only archive rather than converted into the operational database of the new system. Any such alternative should be clearly distinguished from the base proposal and should identify:

- The records proposed for archival rather than operational conversion;
- Proposed cutoff criteria;
- Search, retrieval, viewing, printing, and reporting capabilities;
- Security and role-based access controls;
- Preservation of case and document relationships;
- Retention and disposition capabilities;
- Hosting, storage, licensing, and support requirements;
- Accessibility to authorized NNJB users;
- Any dependencies on continued operation of JustWare; and
- The resulting change, if any, to implementation cost, schedule, migration effort, and ongoing costs.

NNJB will determine during implementation planning whether any proposed archival approach is appropriate based on operational, legal, records-retention, access, and technical requirements. Proposers should therefore price the full-conversion approach as the base proposal and present any archival strategy as a separately identified alternative.

42. Does NNJB have a records retention schedule for closed cases? Must all 702,800 closed cases move into the new system, or may cases closed before a cutoff date move to a read-only archive that staff can search?

NNJB Response: NNJB has not provided a records-retention schedule for purposes of this procurement. Proposers should not assume that historical records are eligible for destruction, exclusion from conversion, or archival based solely on case age or closed-case status.

For base proposal pricing, Proposers shall assume conversion of the historical and active JustWare data and associated electronic documents identified in the RFP. As described above, Proposers may separately propose an alternative approach in which designated historical records are maintained in a secure, searchable, read-only archive.

43. Does NNJB intend to retain JustWare in read-only operation following production cutover? If so, please specify the required retention period, expected user access, availability and support requirements, data-retention obligations, and responsibility for hosting, licensing, maintenance, and associated costs. If continued access is not required, please clarify the requirements for archival retention of the legacy data.

    NNJB Response: Because NNJB anticipates a phased implementation, JustWare is expected to remain operational for courts, locations, case types, or functional areas that have not yet transitioned to the new solution. Once an applicable scope has successfully completed conversion and cutover, the new system is expected to become the system of record for that transitioned scope. Continued read-only access to JustWare may be necessary during the transition for conversion validation, reconciliation, and historical reference. The specific duration of such access and the eventual JustWare retirement approach will be established during implementation planning. NNJB will remain responsible for its JustWare contract and associated legacy hosting, licensing, maintenance, and support costs; Proposers should not include those legacy-system costs in their pricing.

Interfaces and Integrations

44. Interfaces Req. #2 and #3 identify the target systems as TBD (Jail Management, e-Citation), and Req. #1 and #8 name a Motorola CAD/RMS. Please clarify whether the TBD systems have been selected and, if so, identify the third-party vendors. Please also clarify who will provide interface specifications, API or other technical documentation, test environments, credentials, third-party coordination, and any required interface licenses or fees. How will changes to interface requirements resulting from later system selection be handled with respect to scope, schedule, and cost?

    NNJB Response: The systems identified in Attachment B include a combination of existing, planned, and prospective interfaces. To the extent available, NNJB will provide the selected Proposer with existing interface documentation, technical information, and applicable points of contact during implementation.

    The selected Proposer will be responsible for designing, developing, testing, implementing, and supporting the interface components required on the proposed solution's side of the integration. The owner of the third-party system, or its designated vendor, will be responsible for designing, developing, testing, implementing, and supporting any interface components required on the third-party system's side of the integration.

    Proposers should assume responsibility for the costs associated with establishing and maintaining connectivity from their proposed solution to third-party systems. Any costs associated with modifications, development, licensing, support, or services required by the third-party system owner

or vendor will generally be the responsibility of the applicable third-party organization unless otherwise negotiated separately between the parties.

During implementation, the selected Proposer will be responsible for coordinating interface requirements with NNJB, Navajo Nation DIT, and the applicable system owners and vendors, including validating business requirements, technical specifications, data mappings, message formats, testing requirements, and deployment procedures.

Because certain interface endpoints, products, or technical requirements may not be fully defined until later phases of the project, detailed interface specifications will be validated during discovery and design. If future system selections or subsequently identified requirements materially change the scope of an interface beyond the assumptions documented in the Proposer's response, any resulting impacts to scope, schedule, or cost will be addressed through the project's change-control process.

45. Attachment B, Requirement GT.113, references system integration requirements. Does Navajo Nation DIT currently operate an enterprise integration platform, API gateway, message broker, or other middleware that the proposed solution must use to exchange data or publish system events? If so, please identify the applicable platform, technical standards, connectivity requirements, and documentation available to proposers. If no existing platform is available, should proposers include the required integration infrastructure and associated licensing, hosting, configuration, and ongoing support in their proposals.

    NNJB Response: Although the question references GT.113, NNJB assumes the question to relate generally to the integration requirements described in GT.112 and GT.113. Navajo Nation DIT does not currently have a designated enterprise integration platform, API gateway, or message broker for this project at this time. Vendors shall include all required integration infrastructure, licensing, hosting, configuration, maintenance, and ongoing support costs in their proposals. Vendors must provide system architecture, API specifications, network and security requirements, integration testing results, and technical documentation.

46. Please tell us about the police dispatch and records system (Motorola), the jail system and the e-citation system. What product and version does each use today? Does each have a documented interface? Will the jail and e-citation systems be in place by late 2028? Who will pay the other vendors for their side of each interface?

    NNJB Response: There is no current electronic interface or automated data exchange between the NNJB courts and police systems. The RFP identifies the police CAD/RMS environment as Motorola; however, detailed product versions, interface specifications, and technical requirements have not been provided for purposes of this procurement. The Jail Management and e-Citation systems remain to be determined, and NNJB cannot confirm the specific products, versions, or implementation dates for those systems at this time.

47. Are any data exchanges needed that are not on the Interfaces tab? For example, with Arizona, New Mexico or Utah courts, federal crime databases, a national protection order registry, or the Navajo Nation's financial system.

    NNJB Response: The Interfaces tab identifies the external system interfaces currently contemplated for proposal-planning and pricing purposes. NNJB is not identifying additional required interfaces with Arizona, New Mexico, or Utah courts; federal criminal justice databases; a

national protection order registry; or the Navajo Nation financial system as part of the base scope at this time.

48. Regarding the listed interfaces, can the Navajo Nation Judicial Branch specify both the file type(s) and desired frequencies (real-time vs. batch upload) involved in these exchanges?

    NNJB Response: The required data-exchange format and frequency will depend on the type of data being exchanged, the underlying business need, and the technical capabilities and operational needs of the participating agency and system. NNJB is therefore not prescribing a single file format, integration method, or exchange frequency across all interfaces. These will be defined during discovery and interface design in coordination with NNJB, Navajo Nation DIT, and the applicable participating agencies and system owners.

49. For the external systems identified in Attachment B - Interfaces, please confirm whether NNJB will provide the available API specifications, interface documentation, supported data exchange formats, sample payloads, and technical contacts for the respective system owners to support integration design and implementation.

    NNJB Response: Attachment B identifies prospective interfaces intended to support the future-state environment. Many of the interfaces identified in Attachment B are not currently implemented and are included for planning and pricing purposes.

    To the extent available, NNJB will provide the selected Proposer with existing interface documentation, available specifications, technical information, and applicable points of contact during implementation. The selected Proposer will be responsible for working with NNJB, Navajo Nation DIT, and applicable third-party system owners to analyze interface requirements, validate business and technical needs, identify available integration methods, and develop detailed interface specifications during discovery and design activities.

IT Functionality, Infrastructure, and Security

50. Does the portal need two-step login verification (like a text code) for outside users right from the start, or could that be added a bit later, after the system first launches?

    NNJB Response: The proposed solution shall support configurable multi-factor authentication (MFA) and other appropriate login verification capabilities for external portal users. This functionality shall be available at pilot go-live so that NNJB can configure, test, and validate the applicable authentication and identity-verification processes as part of the pilot.

    The specific login verification requirements and processes, including the authentication methods to be used, the user types or activities for which additional verification will be required, and whether different levels of verification will apply based on user role or risk, have not yet been determined. These requirements will be defined during implementation in coordination with NNJB and Navajo Nation DIT and validated through pilot testing prior to broader deployment.

51. Should filer role assignment be self-service, where users select a role at eFiling registration, or should every non-public role require Court staff approval, as several of the account-type requirements seem to imply?

    NNJB Response: Non-public, professional, agency, or privileged roles shall require NNJB approval before the associated permissions are activated. The proposed solution should support

configurable registration, verification, approval, rejection, renewal, suspension, and role-change workflows.

52. Please clarify NNJB's current identity architecture, including whether it uses on-premises Active Directory, Microsoft Entra ID, or a hybrid configuration with directory synchronization. Please identify the required authentication protocols and capabilities, including single sign-on, multifactor authentication, and automated user provisioning and deprovisioning. If automated provisioning is required, please clarify whether SCIM or another specific protocol must be supported and whether role or group synchronization is required.

    NNJB Response: NNJB currently operates a hybrid identity environment utilizing on-premises Microsoft Active Directory synchronized with Microsoft Entra ID. The proposed solution must support Microsoft Entra ID integration for Single Sign-On (SSO), Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA), and identity management. Proposers should describe any support for automated user provisioning and deprovisioning, including SCIM or other industry-standard provisioning methods, and identify support for user, role, and group synchronization. Final identity and access management requirements will be validated with Navajo Nation DIT during implementation.

The NNJB has provided one response to questions 53 to 57. See below:

53. Given NNJB's connectivity and power challenges in remote locations, what is the expected operating model during an outage? Is offline case processing or data entry required, or are alternate/paper procedures acceptable until service is restored?

54. Given the connectivity challenges described, is offline data entry in the system required, or is a paper fallback with later entry acceptable?

55. The RFP identifies unreliable power and internet connectivity as operational challenges. Please clarify the required system behavior during intermittent or unavailable connectivity, including whether users must be able to perform case management functions offline, access locally cached information, or continue operating over low-bandwidth connections. If offline operations are required, please identify the functions that must remain available, the expected duration of offline operation, and the requirements for synchronization, conflict resolution, security, and recovery when connectivity is restored. Please also clarify how these capabilities will be evaluated.

56. Given the connectivity challenges identified in the RFP, please clarify whether offline data entry and case processing are required and, if so, which specific business functions must remain operational during internet outages and subsequently synchronize with the central system.

57. Given the identified internet and power outages, what specific functions must remain available during an outage, what maximum outage duration should the solution support, and does NNJB require native offline data entry and synchronization or only documented operational continuity and queued processing?

    NNJB Response: Offline case processing or offline data entry is not established as a mandatory requirement. NNJB currently uses alternate or paper-based procedures during internet or power outages. Proposers shall describe solution availability, browser and network requirements, resilience options, mobile or offline capabilities, recovery procedures, data-synchronization controls, and recommended continuity procedures for remote locations. Any optional offline capability should be separately identified and priced.

58. Attachment B, Requirement GT.112, indicates that custom interfaces require a Navajo Nation Department of Information Technology (DIT) cybersecurity review. Please identify the office responsible for conducting the review, the applicable security standards and submission materials, and the stages at which review and approval are required. Please also provide the expected review and approval timelines, any associated fees, and the process for addressing findings or required remediation. Should proposers include this review and approval process as a dependency in the implementation schedule?

    NNJB Response: Navajo Nation DIT's Information Security Officer and Network Services team will coordinate the technical and cybersecurity review of custom integrations and interfaces. Vendors should provide system architecture, network diagrams, API specifications, data flows, and security documentation. Reviews should occur during system design and before production implementation. Any identified security issues must be addressed before final approval. Review timelines and any associated fees will be determined based on the scope and complexity of the integration. Vendors should also include Navajo Nation DIT review and approval as a dependency in their implementation schedule.

59. Attachment B, Requirement GT.12, requires hosting that meets FedRAMP Moderate. Please confirm whether the proposed hosting environment must have an active FedRAMP Moderate authorization at the time of proposal submission, contract award, or production deployment. If FedRAMP Moderate authorization is mandatory, please clarify any applicable authorization boundary or cloud service requirements. If alternative hosting arrangements may be considered, please identify the specific authorizations, assessments, or security controls that would be acceptable and the approval process for determining compliance.

    NNJB Response: Navajo Nation DIT does not require the proposed solution or vendor to hold a FedRAMP Moderate authorization. Consistent with Attachment B, Requirement GT.12, the proposed cloud hosting environment must meet FedRAMP Moderate or equivalent NIST-based security standards and applicable Navajo Nation cybersecurity and data-protection requirements. Proposers should identify the security standards, certifications, assessments, and controls applicable to the proposed hosting environment and explain how the proposed solution satisfies GT.12. The proposed environment will be subject to Navajo Nation DIT technical and cybersecurity review and approval.

60. For a SaaS deployment, please clarify whether NNJB requires integration with its existing reporting tools through direct read-only database access, a reporting replica, ODBC, APIs, data exports, or another supported mechanism. Please identify any required reporting tools, data refresh frequency, historical data access, and security or access-control requirements. If direct database access is required, please clarify whether a separate reporting database or replica is acceptable and whether the vendor is responsible for providing and maintaining it.

    NNJB Response: NNJB has not established a required reporting platform or reporting architecture for SaaS deployments. Proposers should describe the reporting and analytics capabilities included with their solution and identify available options for data access, reporting, and integration. Direct access to the production database is not required. Alternative methods, including APIs, reporting databases, reporting replicas, data exports, or other reporting tools, are acceptable provided they meet NNJB's reporting, security, auditing, and operational requirements. The vendor will be responsible for supporting and maintaining any reporting capabilities included in the proposed solution.

61. Will staff from the Navajo Nation Department of Information Technology join the project team for single sign-on, network setup and interface testing? About how many hours can they give?

    NNJB Response: Yes. NNJB is open to reviewing proposing vendors' best practices for resource allocation. Refer to Attachment A, Tab 3, Table 3-01.

62. Attachment A requests evidence of SOC 2 Type II compliance. Would NNJB accept a SaaS solution hosted on an independently SOC 2 Type II-audited cloud infrastructure provider, such as AWS or Microsoft Azure, with appropriate application-level security controls and supporting security documentation, in lieu of a separate SOC 2 Type II attestation for the application provider?

    NNJB Response: NNJB will consider alternative security documentation where a separate SOC 2 Type II attestation for the application provider is not available. Proposers must provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate the security of the complete solution, including the application, hosting environment, and supporting services. A cloud provider's SOC 2 Type II report may be submitted as supporting documentation; however, NNJB and Navajo Nation DIT will evaluate the overall security posture of the proposed solution and determine whether the information provided satisfies the RFP requirements.

63. Question GT.73 in the General Technical tab of Attachment B states that vendors shall provide evidence of compliance, including SOC 2 Type II certification, and complete Navajo Nation Department of IT cybersecurity assessment questionnaires as part of the vendor evaluation process. Can the Navajo Nation please clarify whether the cybersecurity assessment questionnaires are required to be completed and submitted with the proposal response, or whether they will be provided separately and completed at a later stage during the evaluation process? Additionally, if submission is required with the proposal, can the Navajo Nation identify where the assessment questionnaires may be obtained?

    NNJB Response: See response to question 62 above. Navajo Nation DIT cybersecurity assessment questionnaires are not required with the initial proposal submission. NNJB and Navajo Nation DIT may provide applicable questionnaires or additional security review requirements during the evaluation process or prior to implementation. Vendors should submit all security and compliance documentation otherwise requested in the RFP.

64. For a cloud subscription solution, will you accept the hosting provider's SOC 2 Type II report as the security evidence that requirement GT.73 asks for? A SOC 2 Type II report is an independent audit of security controls.

    NNJB Response: See response to question 62 above.

65. Must our staff pass a background check or fingerprint check before they can see NNJB data? If yes, which check, who runs it, and how long does it usually take?

    NNJB Response: Yes. Vendor personnel who will have access to NNJB data will be required to complete applicable background and/or fingerprint checks. The specific screening requirements, process, responsible party, and anticipated processing timeframe will be coordinated with the selected vendor during contract negotiation and implementation planning.

Artificial Intelligence:

66. Some providers price AI features and text messaging by usage. Please estimate expected volumes, such as AI-assisted reports drafted per month (PB.146–147) and text message notifications sent per month.

    NNJB Response: NNJB does not currently have validated estimates for the anticipated volume of AI-assisted reports, text message notifications, or other usage-based services. Proposers should identify any assumptions, usage thresholds, licensing models, transaction-based pricing, or volume-based pricing included in their proposals.

67. Does NNJB or the Navajo Nation have applicable AI governance policies, security standards, or other guidance governing the use of artificial intelligence, including generative AI, with judicial, case-management, or other sensitive information? Please identify any prohibited or restricted AI use cases and any requirements regarding human oversight, data retention, model training, external AI services, disclosure of AI-generated content, auditability, and data residency or processing location. Please also clarify whether AI capabilities are mandatory, optional, or subject to approval before use in production.

    NNJB Response: NNJB and the Navajo Nation are currently evaluating and developing guidance regarding the use of artificial intelligence technologies. AI capabilities are not required as part of this procurement and are considered optional unless specifically proposed by the vendor.

    Any use of AI involving judicial, case-management, or other sensitive information may require review and approval by NNJB and Navajo Nation DIT prior to production use. NNJB reserves the right to establish additional AI governance requirements during implementation. Proposers shall identify AI or generative AI functionality that is included in a proposed solution.

The NNJB has provided one response to questions 68 to 70. See below:

68. Please clarify the intended functionality and operational scope of Requirement PB.146. Specifically, what AI-assisted capabilities are required or contemplated, what outputs must the system generate, and which user roles are expected to use those capabilities? Please clarify whether the requirement encompasses drafting hearing comments, generating pre-trial or pre-sentencing recommendations, other forms of decision support, or a defined subset of these functions. Please also identify any applicable accuracy, explainability, human review, and approval requirements.

69. For Requirements PB.146 and PB.147 and Attachment A, Tab 2, please clarify the required controls for reviewing, approving, correcting, and documenting AI generated outputs before they are used, finalized, or incorporated into official case records. Are there specific requirements for human approval, attribution or disclosure, audit logging, retention of prompts and outputs, or restrictions on using AI-generated recommendations in judicial or other substantive decision making processes?

70. What tasks do you want artificial intelligence (AI) to help with in Probation? Requirements PB.146 and PB.147 ask for AI features for reports and trend analysis.

    NNJB Response: The Navajo Nation is continuing to evaluate the appropriate use and governance of AI technologies, and NNJB has therefore removed AI-specific requirements for probation functionality from the scope of this RFP (PB.146 and PB.147 in Attachment B). Any potential future use of AI will be subject to applicable Navajo Nation policies, approvals, and governance requirements in effect at that time.

Implementation Approach, Staffing, and Rollout:

71. Please clarify whether the e-filing portal must support complete electronic filing and service for all case types at initial go-live, or whether NNJB anticipates introducing e-filing for selected case types and expanding coverage through subsequent implementation phases.

    NNJB Response: The scope and phasing of e-filing functionality, including the case types to be supported at initial go-live, are to be determined during implementation planning with the selected vendor.

72. About how many hours a week can NNJB functional leads and subject matter experts give to the project during design, testing and data cleanup? Section 3.G says staff will not work on the project full time.

    NNJB Response: NNJB intends to provide functional and technical resources but does not anticipate dedicating all personnel full time. Proposers shall provide estimated hours of the NNJB team by project task in Attachment A.

73. Will NNJB assign a dedicated project manager and system administrator for the implementation?

    NNJB Response: NNJB intends to have functional and technical resources available during Project implementation, though it is noted that NNJB does not anticipate dedicating staff full-time to the implementation in addition to managing their core job responsibilities. This applies to both functional resources as well as technical resources internal to NNJB. It is anticipated that some functional leads will serve as the functional lead, or as a subject matter expert, across one or more modules during the implementation process.

74. Who will make design decisions for the Prosecutor's Office and the Public Defender's Office? These offices are part of the Navajo Nation Department of Justice. Will they give subject matter experts on the same terms as NNJB? Section 3.K says NNJB will fund one-time and recurring costs. Does that include the Prosecutor and Public Defender modules?

    NNJB Response: The Prosecutor’s Office and Public Defender’s Office are expected to be active participants in the configuration and implementation process for the portions of the solution supporting their respective business functions. Representatives and subject matter experts from these offices will participate in requirements validation, workflow and configuration decisions, testing, training, and other implementation activities affecting their operations. Funding for the project will be provided by the Navajo Nation. Additional details regarding internal funding arrangements or allocations are not applicable to proposer responses.

75. Is rollout to all eleven Judicial Districts and the Supreme Court part of this contract, within the five-year term in Section 1.B?

    NNJB Response: Yes. Implementation and rollout of the selected solution to all eleven NNJB Judicial Districts and the Navajo Nation Supreme Court are included within the scope of this contract and are expected to be completed within the initial five-year contract term identified in Section 1.B.

76. About how many rule-driven changes does NNJB make in a typical year? Examples are new fees, sentence templates and reports. Tab 12 asks the vendor to make these changes within one month before they take effect.

NNJB Response: NNJB makes minimal rule-driven changes in a typical year.

77. Does NNJB require parallel testing, where staff enter the same work in JustWare and the new system for a period before go-live? If yes, for how long?

    NNJB Response: NNJB has not established a requirement for formal parallel testing in which users are required to enter the same transactions into both JustWare and the new system for a defined period of time. Proposers should describe their recommended approach to system testing, user acceptance testing, cutover validation, and go-live readiness activities based on their implementation methodology.

    As described in the RFP, NNJB anticipates a phased implementation and rollout approach. As a result, JustWare is expected to remain operational for courts, locations, case types, or functional areas that have not yet transitioned to the new system. During the rollout period, both systems may be in use concurrently; however, once a court, location, case type, or functional area has transitioned to the new system, the new system is expected to become the system of record for that transitioned scope.

    Proposers should identify any recommended parallel-testing activities, duration, resource requirements, risks, dependencies, and assumptions associated with their proposed deployment approach. Final testing, cutover, and transition requirements will be validated during implementation planning.

Court and Business Functionality:

78. Can the NNJB provide case filing numbers for 2025?

    NNJB Response: NNJB has provided the case-filing information currently available in the RFP. NNJB does not have a validated 2025 filing count available for inclusion in this addendum. Proposers should use the published information for proposal-planning purposes and clearly identify any volume assumptions used in their proposals.

79. Is there an existing records-request intake process today that the portal needs to replace, or is this brand-new functionality for the NNJB?

    NNJB Response: The records-request functionality contemplated by the RFP should be considered net-new functionality for proposal planning purposes. NNJB does not currently operate a centralized electronic records-request intake solution that the proposed system must replace or replicate. Final business processes, workflow requirements, user roles, approval requirements, and records-access policies will be validated during discovery and implementation planning.

80. The RFP notes that referrals may come from courts, prosecutors, schools, agencies, or community members and may involve family, community, juvenile, and civil matters. To help clarify the expected workflow and scope, could the NNJB confirm which court case types are eligible for referral to the Peacemaking Program?

    NNJB Response: All case types may be referred to Peacemaking. However, Peacemaking cases do not arise exclusively through referral from another NNJB court or case. Matters may also originate directly within the Peacemaking Program without a corresponding court referral.

The proposed solution shall therefore support both court-referred Peacemaking matters and Peacemaking matters initiated independently, including the ability to establish and manage a Peacemaking case when no originating court case exists. When a Peacemaking matter results from a court referral, the solution should support appropriate relationships between the originating case and the Peacemaking matter while maintaining applicable access and confidentiality controls.

81. Can the NNJB provide the annual probation participant numbers for 2024 and 2025?

    NNJB Response: Available NNJB statistics reflect 1,981 newly filed probation matters in 2024 and 2,301 newly filed probation matters in 2025.

82. Is digital evidence (e.g., body-worn camera video) expected to be stored in the new system, or integrated from an existing evidence system? If the latter, which system?

    NNJB Response: Digital evidence associated with prosecution matters may be uploaded and managed within the proposed solution and/or received from law enforcement through the anticipated interface with the Navajo Nation Police Department's Motorola Computer-Aided Dispatch/Records Management System (CAD/RMS). The interface is anticipated to support the receipt of law enforcement documentation and related information, including evidence and chain-of-custody data. Specific requirements regarding the transfer, storage, linking, and management of digital evidence, including body-worn camera video, will be further defined with the selected vendor during interface and implementation planning.

83. Which specialty courts operate today, such as wellness, veterans or juvenile drug courts? In which districts?

    NNJB Response: NNJB currently operates a Special Division within the Window Rock Judicial District. Other diversion programs may also be administered across NNJB; however, these programs are not formally established as separate specialty courts. The proposed solution should support functionality to track and manage participants, activities, requirements, outcomes, and related case information for diversion programs, as applicable. Specific configuration and workflow requirements will be further defined with the selected vendor during implementation.

84. Do requirements RP.81 to RP.83 mean staff will log their time in the system, or does NNJB want reports on how staff use the system? RP.83 asks for "staff time spent working in the CMS."

    NNJB Response: The intent of RP.81 through RP.83 is to support reporting on work effort associated with cases and case types rather than employee activity monitoring or workstation tracking. NNJB is interested in the ability to report on staff effort, workload, and resource utilization by case, case type, and staff role. The requirements may be satisfied through system-generated activity records, workflow metrics, or another vendor-supported approach that enables reporting on staff effort and case-related work. NNJB is not specifically requiring employee-monitoring capabilities that measure keyboard activity, screen time, log-in duration, or other forms of user tracking.

85. About how much audio and video evidence do the Prosecutor and Public Defender offices store each year? Do they use a separate digital evidence system today?

    NNJB Response: NNJB does not currently have validated information regarding the annual volume, file counts, or storage size of audio and video evidence maintained by the Prosecution or Public Defender offices. NNJB does not currently utilize a dedicated digital evidence management

system for these functions. Audio, video, and other electronic evidence may be maintained through a variety of existing methods, including shared network storage and local file repositories.

Proposers shall describe how their proposed solution supports the storage, management, organization, retrieval, sharing, retention, security, and auditing of digital evidence, including large audio and video files. Proposers should also identify any assumptions, limitations, storage requirements, licensing considerations, and ongoing costs associated with digital evidence management. If Proposers believe that there are simpler, more cost effective electronic evidence storage methods, even if outside their proposed solution, they are free to include that information.

Additional information regarding evidence-management practices, volumes, retention requirements, and future-state operational needs will be validated during discovery and implementation planning

Addendum 4

Respondents are instructed to return a copy of this addendum form signed by an authorized firm agent as part of the proposal responses.

_____

SIGNATURE

_____ _____

COMPANY DATE