Addendum No. 3 – November 6, 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)

NNJB is continuing to receive, review, and respond to proposer questions related to this solicitation. Questions and responses are being issued on a rolling basis. Additional addenda containing responses to outstanding questions, clarifications, corrections, and supplemental information will be issued as they become available. Proposers are responsible for monitoring the procurement posting location and incorporating all issued addenda into their proposal submissions.

To provide proposers additional time to review the information provided through the addenda process and prepare responses, the proposal due date 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 earlier proposal due dates shall be deemed amended accordingly.

1. Attachment A, Tab 11 – Cost Narrative: This section requests items be provided as part of the "Price Proposal", however the Price Proposal detailed on page 16 of the RFP only includes the Excel version of Attachment C – Cost Worksheets. Can the NNJB confirm whether all cost information should be provided in the Price Proposal, or in line with the Cost Narrative in Attachment A?

   NNJB Response: Proposers shall include the completed Cost Narrative required by Attachment A, Tab 11, within the Technical Proposal. The separate Price Proposal shall consist of the completed Attachment C Cost Worksheets in Microsoft Excel format. Attachment C shall not be modified. Proposers should not duplicate the Attachment C worksheets within the Cost Narrative unless needed to explain assumptions, exclusions, or the basis of pricing.

2. How many court locations does the NNJB have?

   NNJB Response: The NNJB court structure includes eleven Judicial Districts and the Navajo Nation Supreme Court. There is twelve court locations for the Judicial Districts, and the Supreme Court is in Window Rock, Arizona. Most court locations also include the Probation and Parole Services program as well as Peacemaking program locations.

3. Can NNJB confirm the time proposals must be received by on 11/18/2026?

   NNJB Response: The proposal due date has been extended to Friday, December 11, 2026. Proposals must be physically received by 4:00 p.m. local Window Rock, Arizona time, Mountain Standard Time. A postmark by the due date does not satisfy the requirement, and late, facsimiled, or emailed proposals will not be accepted.

4. Can a list of pre-proposal conference attendees be provided?

   NNJB Response: The attendee list was provided in Addendum No. 1 and identifies the companies and representatives who identified themselves during the September 29, 2026, teleconference. Proposers should refer to Addendum No. 1 for that information.

5. For standalone e-Service (service without an associated filing), does the NNJB have existing business rules today? For example, how are hearing notices or orders currently served when there's no filing? If so, could you walk us through that workflow?

   NNJB Response: NNJB currently relies on a combination of mail, email, fax, and in-person delivery for notices, orders, and other case-related communications. The future solution should support both service associated with electronic filings and standalone electronic service of court-generated documents, notices, orders, and other case-related communications. Detailed business rules and workflows will be validated during implementation discovery and design.

6. For e-Service, is an electronic certificate of service stored in the case file required, or is the NNJB's current paper/stamped proof of service sufficient?

   NNJB Response: The proposed solution should support creation and retention of an electronic certificate or other auditable proof of service within the electronic case record. The solution should also permit staff to scan or upload paper or stamped proof of service when service occurs outside the electronic process. Proposers shall describe how the solution records the date, time, method, sender, recipient, delivery status, and any failed or returned service.

7. Are escrow accounts, payment plans, and law-firm-level billing (POR.78, 80-83) tied to a trust-accounting system the Judicial Branch uses today, or should we plan to build this functionality as part of the portal?

   NNJB Response: Proposers should assume that the future solution must provide the functionality identified in POR.78 and POR.80 through POR.83. NNJB will validate during implementation whether each function will be performed directly within the portal, within the CCMS financial module, or through an integrated third-party payment or accounting service. Proposers shall describe their recommended operating model, identify any required third-party products, and separately state all assumptions and costs.

8. What's the volume/frequency expectation for payment plans and escrow draws?

   NNJB Response: NNJB does not currently have validated volume information for payment plans or escrow draws available for this addendum. Proposers should identify any pricing thresholds or volume assumptions associated with these functions.

9. Is the list of required account and role types (Peacemaking, Probation, Social Services, Pro Bono, Victim Advocate, Traditional Program Specialist, Juvenile Presenting Officer, etc.) final, or should we expect it to grow during implementation?

NNJB Response: The account and role types identified in the RFP represent NNJB's currently anticipated roles but should not be treated as an exhaustive or final list. The proposed solution shall allow authorized NNJB administrators to configure additional roles, permissions, approval rules, and organizational assignments without vendor-developed code. Proposers shall explain any limits on the number or configuration of roles and identify any pricing effect associated with adding roles.

10. Will Judges and prosectors be probation system users or should they just receive notifications?

    NNJB Response: Probation personnel will be primary users of probation case-management functionality. Judges, prosecutors, defenders, and other authorized justice partners should receive role-appropriate access to probation information, tasks, reports, status updates, or notifications as permitted by workflow rules, policy, and confidentiality requirements. Proposers shall describe whether this access is provided through direct system access, a shared CCMS environment, a portal, notifications, or a combination of methods.

11. Can the NNJB expand or provide examples on what is meant by "Language that differs for juveniles"? (Attachment B - PB 53)

    NNJB Response: PB.53 refers to configurable terminology, labels, instructions, pick-list values, forms, notices, and workflows that may differ between juvenile and adult supervision. Examples include "juvenile" versus "adult probationer," parent/guardian information, school-related fields, juvenile-specific conditions, confidentiality controls, and age-appropriate notices. The requirement is not speaking to a separate user interface, but the solution should ideally allow case-type-based configuration.

12. Attachment B - Functional and Technical Requirements, Item GT 95: Can the NNJB provide the standards vendors must adhere to?

    NNJB Response: Requirement GT.95 is removed from Attachment B and is no longer a requirement of this solicitation. Proposers should define their proposed severity classifications, support hours, initial response targets, restoration/workaround targets, resolution targets, escalation procedures, communications, and remedies or service credits in Attachment A, Tab 12. NNJB has not established separate mandatory numeric response and resolution times in the RFP. The proposed commitments will be evaluated and finalized during contract negotiations.

13. NNJB identifies a pilot consisting of one small, medium, and large court together with Prosecutor, Probation, Peacemaking, and Public Defender functionality, ideally beginning with criminal cases. Please identify the anticipated pilot locations and confirm which functional areas must be operational for the initial pilot go-live versus subsequent phases.

    NNJB Response: NNJB has not yet selected the specific pilot locations. The pilot is expected to include one small, one medium, and one large court, together with Prosecutor, Probation, Peacemaking, and Public Defender functionality as well as the Supreme Court. NNJB anticipates beginning with criminal cases to test the technology environment and information exchange among justice partners. Proposers should recommend pilot-site selection criteria, sequencing, readiness activities, dependencies, and the functional capabilities required for a viable pilot. Final pilot locations and the detailed go-live scope will be established during implementation planning.

14. Please describe NNJB's anticipated rollout following the pilot, including whether the selected Proposer should price implementation to all eleven Judicial Districts and the Supreme Court within the initial proposal and five-year contract deliverable period.

NNJB Response: Proposers shall price and plan for implementation across all eleven Judicial Districts, the Navajo Nation Supreme Court, Peacemaking and Probation and Parole Services programs, including the applicable court and justice-partner functional areas identified in the RFP. The implementation must be completed within five years after contract execution. Proposers shall recommend the post-pilot rollout sequence, deployment waves, estimated schedule, NNJB and vendor resource requirements, training approach, data-conversion approach, and assumptions. Final sequencing will be negotiated with the selected Proposer.

15. Should Proposers assume the full ~1.22 TB legacy document repository will be migrated, or will some historical documents remain in a read-only archive?

    NNJB Response: For proposal-pricing purposes, Proposers should provide a base price assuming migration of the full existing electronic document repository, currently estimated at approximately 1.22 TB, together with all associated case-document relationships. Proposers may also identify a clearly described alternative approach and associated cost adjustment for retaining a defined portion of historical documents in a searchable, read-only archive. Final migration scope, retention rules, data quality, and archival strategy will be validated during discovery.

16. Will NNJB evaluate both five-year and ten-year total cost of ownership, or will one period be the primary basis?

    NNJB Response: NNJB may evaluate both a fully loaded five-year and a fully loaded ten-year total cost of ownership. Proposers shall provide all pricing requested in Attachment C and clearly identify recurring costs, escalation assumptions, optional costs, third-party costs, hardware costs, implementation costs, and any pricing assumptions necessary to calculate both periods.

17. Does “without a file size limitation” in DM.14 mean truly unlimited document size, or will NNJB accept a configurable maximum that still meets the minimums in POR.62 through POR.65?

    NNJB Response: The specific file-size limits identified in the Portal Requirements (POR.62, POR.64, and related requirements) govern e-filing submissions and portal-based document uploads. The requirement in DM.14 is intended to indicate that the document management capabilities of the system should be able to accommodate large documents and electronic records and should not be subject to an artificially restrictive system-wide maximum file size.

    NNJB assumes that different file-size limits may apply to different functions, including e-filing and internal document management. Where file-size limits exist, the system shall ideally allow those limits to be configured by authorized administrators.

    Unless otherwise specified, file-size limits in the Portal Requirements apply to individual uploaded files rather than the aggregate size of all documents associated with a filing or submission. Proposers shall identify any limitations regarding individual file size, total submission size, supported file types, storage architecture, performance considerations, and recommended practices for large document uploads. Proposers shall describe recommended methods for handling files that exceed configured upload limits.

18. Please confirm whether the 6% Navajo Nation Sales Tax should be included within the prices entered in Attachment C or separately identified outside the stated pricing totals.

    NNJB Response: Proposers shall separately identify the 6% Navajo Nation Sales Tax applicable to work performed and services provided within the territorial jurisdiction of the Navajo Nation. Proposers should not assume the tax applies to all software, subscriptions, or off-Nation services;

they shall state their tax assumptions and identify tax separately from base pricing. Final tax applicability will be determined under Navajo Nation law and contract review.

19. Please clarify whether the requested 20% retainage would be released upon acceptance of each implementation phase/module or only upon final acceptance of the entire enterprise project.

    NNJB Response: NNJB prefers that twenty percent (20%) of each invoice for the implementation service costs will be retained (as a “holdback”) until successful completion, and NNJB’s written acceptance, of the Project. NNJB reserves the right to discuss during contract negotiations.

20. Attachment A Tab 14 defines "Future" functionality as functionality available by January 1, 2027, while Attachment B defines "Future" as functionality available by July 1, 2028. Please confirm the controlling date Proposers should use when responding with an "F" indicator.

    NNJB Response: For purposes of responding with an “F” indicator, Proposers shall use July 1, 2028, as the controlling date. Attachment A, Tab 14, will be deemed corrected accordingly. Proposers shall identify the planned general-availability date, dependencies, and any cost or implementation effect for each response marked “F.” Functionality that will not be generally available by July 1, 2028, should not be marked “F.”

21. Can the NNJB please provide a list of mandatory integrations for go live?

    NNJB Response: The Interfaces tab identifies prospective exchanges for proposal planning. Where the proposed solution provides Court, Prosecution, Public Defender, Probation, or Peacemaking functionality natively within an integrated platform, Proposers may identify the applicable exchange as satisfied through native integration rather than price a separate external interface. For external systems, Proposers should describe the recommended interface method, frequency, dependencies, third-party coordination, assumptions, and one-time and recurring costs. Final specifications, sequencing, and responsibilities will be validated during implementation.

22. Attachment C, Subscription Cost Sheets (5-year and 10-year): cells B17 (Court) and C17 (e-File & Web Portal) contain a fixed value of 0 instead of a sum formula. As a result, one-time costs entered for these two modules are excluded from the Total Five/Ten Year Investment. Will NNJB issue corrected worksheets, or may Proposers correct these two formulas?

    NNJB Response: See Revised Attachment C posted with this addendum.

23. Attachment A (Tab 5) and Attachment C refer to a “Data Conversion” tab in Attachment B, but Attachment B has no such tab. Please provide it or list the legacy data sources in scope (including any Excel or Access data).

    NNJB Response: Refer to the RFP Specifications document Section 3. C for all data conversion information.

24. Attachment B, GT.95 states the vendor must meet “the following standards for issue resolution,” but no standards are listed. Please provide the required severity levels and response/resolution times.

    NNJB Response: See response to question 12 above.

25. Attachment B (GT.88–GT.89) requires an RTO under 4 hours and an RPO of 15 minutes to 1 hour. Attachment A (Tab 3) states the reverse (RPO under 4 hours; RTO of 15 minutes to 1 hour). Which values apply?

NNJB Response: Attachment B controls. The required Recovery Time Objective is less than four hours following a system failure, and the required Recovery Point Objective is between 15 minutes and one hour. Proposers shall explain how the objectives apply across the proposed solution and describe backup, failover, redundancy, testing, and restoration procedures**.**

26. The “F” (Future) response deadline is July 1, 2028 in Attachment B and January 1, 2027 in Attachment A, Tab 14. Which date applies?

    NNJB Response: See response to question 20 above.

27. Attachment C states that subscription Year 1 begins at contract signing, while Attachment A states a module’s subscription is not payable until its project phase begins. Please confirm which applies, and whether subscriptions may ramp with the number of active users during the pilot and rollout.

    NNJB Response: For cost-comparison purposes, Proposers shall complete all years requested in Attachment C beginning with contract execution and clearly show any waived, deferred, or ramped amounts. For payment purposes, module subscription charges are not expected to become payable until the applicable project phase begins, as stated in Attachment A, Tab 11. Proposers may propose user or module ramping, but must fully describe the schedule, assumptions, and five- and ten-year effects. Prices shall remain firm for the initial contract term, subject to the RFP’s contract-change provisions.

28. Interfaces 4–7 in Attachment B describe exchanges with separate Prosecution, Public Defender, Probation and Peacemaking systems. If one integrated solution is proposed for all five groups, please confirm these are satisfied natively and need not be priced as interfaces.

    NNJB Response: The Interfaces tab identifies prospective exchanges for proposal planning. Where the proposed solution provides Court, Prosecution, Public Defender, Probation, or Peacemaking functionality natively within an integrated platform, Proposers may identify the applicable exchange as satisfied through native integration rather than price a separate external interface. For external systems, Proposers should describe the recommended interface method, frequency, dependencies, third-party coordination, assumptions, and one-time and recurring costs. Final specifications, sequencing, and responsibilities will be validated during implementation.

29. For a solution delivered on a commercial cloud platform, will functionality delivered through configuration of the proposed release (no code changes) be accepted as “S” (Standard)?

    NNJB Response: Configuration using generally available, vendor-supported tools may be identified as “S” when the capability exists in the current proposed release and will be implemented by the applicable phase go-live without custom code. Changes to workflows, business rules, forms, labels, reports, roles, and supported configuration are permitted. Source-code changes, unsupported extensions, or modifications that create a separate code branch shall be identified as customization.

30. Must all 594,665 historical documents and attachments (approximately 1.22 TB) be migrated into the new system, or may older records be archived and remain accessible?

    NNJB Response: Refer to the response to question 15 above.

31. GT.13 requires Development, Staging, Testing, Training and Production environments. Must Staging and Training contain a full copy of production data, or is a partial or masked data set acceptable?

NNJB Response: Full copies of production data are not required in the Staging or Training environments. Representative subsets of production data are acceptable, provided they support the intended testing and training activities and preserve necessary data relationships. The Staging environment shall reflect the applicable Production configuration sufficiently to validate releases and integrations, and Training shall reflect Production configuration to support realistic practice scenarios.

32. Attachment A, Tab 5, Section 2, and Attachment C, Row 9, reference an “Attachment B – Data Conversion” tab; however, that tab does not appear to be included in the provided solicitation documents. Please provide the missing tab, including the complete list of source systems and associated data conversion requirements. If the tab is unavailable, please clarify which document governs the data conversion scope and whether a revised attachment or addendum will be issued.

    NNJB Response: Refer to the RFP Specifications document Section 3. C for all data conversion information.

33. Please clarify the full-text search requirements for documents migrated from the legacy system. Must OCR be performed on existing image-based documents during migration to make their contents searchable, or is full-text search required only for documents containing searchable text and for documents created or imported after go-live? Please identify any applicable requirements for OCR accuracy, language support, document types, and processing of historical documents.

    NNJB Response: For base-proposal and pricing purposes, bulk OCR of image-based documents migrated from the legacy system is not required. Existing searchable text in migrated documents shall be preserved and indexed for full-text search. OCR shall be provided for supported image-based documents scanned, uploaded, or otherwise added through normal operations following the applicable go-live. Proposers shall describe supported document types and languages, OCR accuracy limitations, and any separately priced options for bulk or on-demand OCR of historical documents.

34. The Interfaces tab introduction indicates that certain interface requirements may not apply when the proposed solution provides the required functionality directly. If the proposed solution provides integrated Prosecution, Public Defender, Probation, and Peacemaking functionality without separate system interfaces, how should proposers complete the response columns for Req. #4–7 and PR.1, PD.1, PB.1, and PM.1? Please clarify whether integrated functionality may be identified as satisfying these requirements and specify the appropriate response designation and supporting explanation.

    NNJB Response: See response to question 28 above.

35. May proposers include multiple deployment options, such as SaaS and proposer-hosted deployment, within a single proposal submission? If permitted, should each option include a separate technical compliance matrix, implementation plan, security response, and pricing schedule? Please clarify whether the options will be evaluated independently and whether any deployment model is preferred or subject to additional requirements.

    NNJB Response: Yes, proposers may include multiple deployment options within a single proposal submission (SaaS or proposer-hosted), provided that each option is clearly identified and fully documented. In developing proposals, Proposers shall clearly define the proposed deployment model including the licensing model as well as any perceived benefits of the proposed model. In the event two or more products are proposed under the same proposal (e.g., through a partnership or

offered by the same company) the Proposer shall clearly indicate in both the Technical Proposal (Attachment A, Tab 2) and Cost Proposal (Attachment C) the deployment model for each proposed software product. Refer to the RFP Specifications document Section 5.D for evaluation criteria.

36. Attachment B, Requirements GT.13–GT.19, require separate Development, Staging, Test, Training, and Production environments, while Attachment C provides a separate pricing item for additional environments. Please clarify which environments must be included in the base proposal price and which, if any, should be priced as additional environments. Please also clarify whether each environment must be independently hosted and licensed, whether environments may share underlying infrastructure while remaining logically segregated, and whether separate environments must be maintained throughout the contract term.

    NNJB Response: Development, Staging, Testing, Training, and Production environments shall be included in the base proposal price. Environments may share underlying infrastructure if they remain logically segregated with appropriate access controls and change-management protections. Non-production environments need not contain full production copies; representative data sets are acceptable unless a specific test requires otherwise. Proposers shall identify licensing, refresh, retention, and additional-environment costs.

    The required Development, Staging, Testing, Training, and Production environments shall be maintained and available throughout the contract term unless otherwise approved by NNJB. Proposers shall identify any environment-specific licensing, hosting, storage, refresh, retention, maintenance, and support assumptions. Attachment C's additional-environment pricing should be used only for environments beyond those required by GT.13 through GT.19.

37. Attachment B, Requirement GT.95, states that the solution “must adhere to the following standards for issue resolution,” but no standards appear after that statement, and Requirements GT.96–GT.98 appear to be missing. Please provide the complete requirements and clarify the required incident severity classifications, response times, resolution or workaround targets, support availability, escalation procedures, and any applicable service-level agreement or service credits. Please also confirm whether the requirements apply to all reported issues or vary by severity and operational impact.

    NNJB Response: See response to question 12 above.

38. Attachment B, Requirement DM.14, indicates that there is no file size limit, while Requirements POR.62 and POR.64 specify different per-document limits of 25 MB and 100 MB. Please clarify the governing file size requirements and whether different limits apply to document uploads, e-filing submissions, individual attachments, or other document-handling functions. Please also clarify whether limits apply to individual files or the total size of a submission and whether any exceptions or alternative submission methods are permitted for files exceeding the applicable limits.

    NNJB Response: The specific file-size limits identified in the Portal Requirements (POR.62, POR.64, and related requirements) govern e-filing submissions and portal-based document uploads. The requirement in DM.14 is intended to indicate that the document management capabilities of the system should be able to accommodate large documents and electronic records and should not be subject to an artificially restrictive system-wide maximum file size.

    NNJB assumes that different file-size limits may apply to different functions, including e-filing and internal document management. Where file-size limits exist, the system shall ideally allow those limits to be configured by authorized administrators.

Unless otherwise specified, file-size limits in the Portal Requirements apply to individual uploaded files rather than the aggregate size of all documents associated with a filing or submission. Proposers shall identify any limitations regarding individual file size, total submission size, supported file types, storage architecture, performance considerations, and recommended practices for large document uploads. Proposers shall describe recommended methods for handling files that exceed configured upload limits.

39. Attachment A, Tab 11 requires module-level pricing, while portions of Attachment C do not appear to provide corresponding module-level pricing fields. Please clarify which attachment and pricing format will govern the proposal submission. If module-level pricing is required, please identify where proposers should enter the costs for each module, including any applicable implementation, licensing, maintenance, hosting, and recurring support charges. May proposers include a supplemental pricing schedule if the provided templates do not accommodate the required breakdown?

    NNJB Response: Refer to the updated Attachment C with this addendum.

40. For proposals involving phased implementation and module-specific go-live dates, please clarify when the required five-year or ten-year pricing period begins. Does the period begin at contract execution, the initial production go live, or the production go-live of each individual module? Please also confirm whether annual price escalation is prohibited during the applicable pricing period or whether proposers may identify an alternative escalation assumption. If escalation is permitted, please specify any applicable limits, approval requirements, or required pricing assumptions.

    NNJB Response: For proposal evaluation purposes, proposers shall complete the five-year and ten-year pricing schedules in Attachment C beginning on the effective date of contract execution. This approach is intended to provide a consistent basis for comparing proposals that may include different implementation schedules, deployment approaches, and module-specific go-live dates.

    For implementation and invoicing purposes, proposers shall identify when subscription, hosting, maintenance, licensing, and other recurring costs commence for each module or functional area. If recurring costs begin upon a module-specific production go-live rather than contract execution, the proposer shall clearly identify those assumptions and reflect them in the pricing narrative. Refer to Attachment A, Tab 11, Payment and Retainage Terms Section a.i.

    Prices submitted in response to this RFP shall remain firm throughout the applicable pricing period proposed in Attachment C unless otherwise specifically identified and approved by NNJB. Any proposed escalation assumptions, renewal pricing adjustments, or future price increases shall be clearly disclosed in the proposal, including the timing, methodology, and basis for the adjustment.

    Refer to Attachment A, Tab 11 Section I.c and d for instructions on price increases. NNJB reserves the right to negotiate pricing, escalation provisions, renewal terms, and any future adjustments during contract negotiations.

41. Please clarify whether the prime vendor must submit one consolidated Attachment B compliance matrix covering the complete proposed solution, including all partner and third-party products, or whether separate compliance matrices are required from each partner. Where a requirement is satisfied by functionality provided through an integrated partner solution, please specify the appropriate response indicator and the documentation required to demonstrate compliance. Please also clarify how proposers should distinguish standard functionality provided by the prime vendor from standard functionality provided by a third-party solution.

NNJB Response: The prime Proposer shall submit one consolidated Attachment B workbook covering the complete proposed solution, including partner and third-party products included in the prime Proposer's proposal submission. For requirements satisfied by a partner or third-party product, use the applicable response indicator (e.g., "S" for standard functionality, "F" for future functionality, "C" for custom functionality, and "N" for not provided) and clearly identify the provider or product in the Comments column. The "T" third-party indicator should be used when the third-party system or integration is not included with the prime Proposer's proposal submission.

42. Attachment A, Table 14-1 and Attachment B appear to provide conflicting instructions regarding response indicators and the treatment of functionality planned for future releases. Please identify which instructions govern completion of Attachment B and confirm the applicable response indicators and definitions. Please also clarify how proposers should identify functionality that is not available at proposal submission but is planned for delivery before implementation completion or a specified acceptance milestone, including how the required availability date should be documented.

    NNJB Response: See response to question 20. Functionality that is not available in the proposed software version at the time of proposal submission, but will be available no later than July 1, 2028, shall use the "Future" or "F" response indicator. Proposers can document the planned availability date in the Comments field of Attachment B.

43. Attachment A, Tab 3 and Attachment B, Requirements GT.88 and GT.89 appear to provide conflicting or reversed Recovery Point Objective (RPO) and Recovery Time Objective (RTO) requirements. Please confirm the governing requirement and the required RPO and RTO values. Please also clarify whether these objectives apply to the entire solution or individual modules and identify any applicable disaster recovery, backup, failover, redundancy, testing, and service-restoration requirements.

    NNJB Response: See response to question 25. These apply to the production solution as a whole, including all implemented modules and associated components to support business operations.

44. Please confirm whether offshore resources may be utilized for solution configuration, customization, development, and implementation activities, provided they do not access production systems or production data.

    NNJB Response: Offshore personnel may perform work that does not involve access to NNJB data, systems, credentials, or environments, subject to disclosure and NNJB approval. Consistent with Addendum No. 2, NNJB data may not be hosted, stored, processed, transmitted, viewed, or otherwise accessed from outside the United States.

45. Please confirm whether offshore resources may provide ongoing application maintenance, troubleshooting, and technical support using non-production environments and sanitized data, without access to production systems or production data.

    NNJB Response: Offshore resources may be utilized for application maintenance, troubleshooting, software development, testing, quality assurance, documentation, and other support activities involving non-production environments and appropriately sanitized, masked, or de-identified data, provided such activities comply with all applicable security, confidentiality, and contractual requirements.

Offshore resources shall not have access to NNJB production data, production environments, credentials, or systems unless expressly authorized in writing by NNJB and Navajo Nation DIT. Consistent with other RFP requirements, proposers shall identify all locations from which services will be provided and describe the security controls and laws governing access to non-production environments and data.

Proposers shall clearly identify any support, maintenance, monitoring, incident response, service desk, or operational functions that will be performed by offshore personnel. Proposers shall also describe how support coverage will be provided during NNJB's normal business hours, including escalation procedures, communication protocols, staffing locations, and expected response times.

46. 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.

    NNJB Response: For proposal-pricing purposes, Proposers should assume conversion of the full existing JustWare data and electronic document repository identified in the RFP, including associated case-document relationships. Proposers may separately identify a clearly described alternative for retaining designated historical records in a secure, searchable, read-only archive, with the associated cost adjustment. Exact fields, mappings, retention rules, data quality, audit history, document associations, and final conversion scope will be validated during discovery and implementation planning. Proposers shall clearly state assumptions, exclusions, dependencies, and pricing effects.

47. Please provide the record counts and approximate data volumes by module, entity, and table, including active and closed cases, parties, case events, docket entries, financial transactions, notes, attachments, and audit history. Please also clarify which historical data elements must be migrated into the new system.

    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.

48. Please clarify which of the prospective interfaces listed in Attachment B are required as part of the initial implementation and which may be implemented in subsequent phases. For interfaces involving third-party systems, please also confirm whether any associated vendor licensing, API access, or integration fees will be covered by NNJB.

    NNJB Response: NNJB is open to reviewing proposing vendors' best practices for integration timelines. NNJB reserves the right to discuss at time of contract negotiations.

49. Please confirm whether NNJB has an existing payment gateway or payment processing provider that the proposed case management system must integrate with. If so, please identify the provider and confirm whether integration documentation and API access will be made available.

    NNJB Response: NNJB does not require integration with an existing payment gateway or payment processing provider as part of this procurement. Proposers shall provide and identify the payment processing solution, payment gateway, merchant services approach, and related integrations included in their proposed solution.

50. Please confirm whether NNJB has an existing electronic signature solution that may be integrated with the proposed system, or whether the selected vendor is expected to provide the complete electronic judicial signing capability, including signature workflows and applicable legal validation requirements.

    NNJB Response: NNJB does not have an existing electronic signature solution that proposers are required to integrate with as part of this procurement. The selected Proposer shall provide the electronic judicial signing capabilities necessary to satisfy the requirements of the RFP, either through native functionality or an integrated third-party solution included as part of the proposed system.

51. Does NNJB require a single cutover from JustWare to the new system across all judicial districts and justice partners, or would a phased cutover by district or module be acceptable, with both systems operating during the transition?

    NNJB Response: NNJB's preferred approach is a phased implementation and rollout that allows the selected solution to be deployed incrementally, validated in production, and refined before broader deployment. Refer to Section 3.I of the RFP.

52. Please confirm whether NNJB requires separate application instances or databases for the Court, Prosecution, Public Defender, Probation, and Peacemaking modules, or whether a shared platform with logical data segregation, role-based access controls, and appropriate confidentiality safeguards would be acceptable.

    NNJB Response: NNJB does not require separate instances or databases for each functional area. A shared platform is acceptable if it provides effective logical segregation, granular role-based access, confidentiality protections, and auditability for Court, Prosecution, Public Defender, Probation, and Peacemaking information.

53. Given the specialized nature of judicial case management and the unique operational requirements across NNJB courts and justice partners, please clarify NNJB's expectation regarding use of the software "as is." Specifically, please distinguish permitted configuration of workflows, business rules, forms, and judicial processes from customization requiring NNJB review and approval.

    NNJB Response: Refer to Attachment B. Configuration using generally available, vendor-supported tools may be identified as “S” when the capability exists in the current proposed release and will be implemented by the applicable phase go-live without custom code. Changes to workflows, business rules, forms, labels, reports, roles, and supported configuration are permitted. Source-code changes, unsupported extensions, or modifications that create a separate code branch shall be identified as customization and require NNJB review and approval.

54. Section 3.F states that proposals offering a subset of functionality will not be accepted, while Sections 5.F and 5.G contemplate point solutions, partial awards, and multiple awards. Must each proposal cover all five named applications and all ten functional areas through one prime contractor or partnership, or may NNJB evaluate and award subsets?

    NNJB Response: See the response to question 6 in Addendum No. 2. It reads, in part: Proposals must address all functional areas identified in Section 3.A and 3.E of the RFP. NNJB will not accept a proposal limited to a subset of the requested functionality. Proposers may satisfy the full scope through partnerships or subcontractors, provided that a single prime proposer submits a complete proposal and clearly identifies the responsibilities of each participating entity. This clarification is

consistent with Section 3.F, which states that NNJB will not accept proposals offering only a subset of functionality."

55. Will a bidder satisfy the production-version demonstration requirement by using its current generally available SaaS release in a configured demonstration tenant with representative data, where customer-specific workflows and interfaces will be finalized during implementation, provided that no beta or unreleased software is presented?

    NNJB Response: Yes. A configured demonstration tenant using the current generally available production release will satisfy the demonstration requirement. Beta, unreleased, prototype, or roadmap-only functionality may not be presented as available functionality.

56. For Req. PB.53, please expand on this requirement. Is the Navajo Nation expecting the User Interface to display different field labels for adult vs juvenile cases or is this requirement asking the system to provide different lists of values for different case types (e.g. Adult vs Juvenile)?

    NNJB Response: See response to question 11 above.

57. Regarding Req. JT.76, is the Navajo Nation Judicial Branch interested in a separate solution for automated court recording and transcription that is integrated with the Court CMS, or do they prefer that information to be solely recorded within the CMS solution offered?

    NNJB Response: JT.76 pertains to courtroom case-management functionality and is not intended to require a court-recording or transcription solution. The requirement is intended to support real-time courtroom operations and case-status updates, such as calling cases, recording appearances, updating readiness status, recording continuances, documenting hearing outcomes, and automatically updating case records and calendaring information based on courtroom events.

58. The Cost Worksheet states that Data Conversion Costs details are "to be contained in Attachment B – Data Conversion tab" but there is no Data Conversion tab currently present in Attachment B. Can the Navajo Nation Judicial Branch provide this tab, or indicate a separate area for detailing the Data Conversion costs?

    NNJB Response: Please refer to the RFP Specifications document Section 3. C for all data conversion information.

59. Should we include the 6% Navajo Nation Sales Tax in our Attachment C prices, or list it separately? Does the tax apply to work our staff do outside the Navajo Nation? Does it apply to software subscription fees?

    NNJB Response: See response to question 18 above.

60. Which courts will be the pilot courts? Section 3.I says the pilot will include one small, one medium and one large court.

    NNJB Response: See response to question 13 above.

61. Will the Prosecution, Public Defender, Probation and Peacemaking modules go live for the whole Nation at pilot, or only for the staff who serve the pilot courts?

    NNJB Response: NNJB currently anticipates that the pilot implementation will focus primarily on the courts and justice-partner personnel directly supporting the pilot locations rather than deploying the Prosecution, Public Defender, Probation, and Peacemaking modules to all users across the

Navajo Nation at the outset. However, NNJB has not finalized the pilot scope, participating locations, or deployment approach. Proposers shall describe their experience in phased rollouts in Attachment A, Tab 4.

62. Should costs for Financials, Document Management, Judicial Tools and Reporting go in the Court column of the cost sheets? Section 3.E lists 10 functional areas, but the cost sheets have 6 module columns.

    NNJB Response: Correct, these should be included in the Court column.

63. Which date applies to "Future" features: July 1, 2028 or January 1, 2027? Attachment B gives the first date, and Tab 14 in Attachment A gives the second.

    NNJB Response: See response to question 20 above.

64. Must all 594,665 documents (about 1.22 TB) move to the new system? About how many are scanned images without searchable text?

    NNJB Response: Refer to the response to question 15 above.

65. Will the 15 Peacemaking users include the non-judicial Peacemakers, or only program staff?

    NNJB Response: Only Peacemaking Program staff.

66. Question GT.95 in the General Technical tab of Attachment B states that “The vendor, at a minimum must adhere to the following standards for issue resolution:” and provides no further information. Can the Navajo Nation please specify the minimum standards for issue resolution that are referenced in this question?

    NNJB Response: See response to question 12 above.

67. Would the NNJB considering granting an extension for us to gather needed information and prepare an RFP response?

    NNJB Response: The proposal deadline has been extended to December 11, 2026.

68. Even though we did not make the pre-proposal conference and submit formal Q&A questions, will be able to receive the answers to submitted questions once they are provided back to interested vendors?

    NNJB Response: All interested Proposers can access addenda that contain questions and answers via the Navajo Nation Purchasing website.

69. Please share the "Data Conversion tab" for Attachment B. Tab 5 and the cost sheets refer to it, but Attachment B does not have it. Besides JustWare, which Excel or Access files must we convert, and about how many are there? Do any justice partners keep case data in other systems?

    NNJB Response: Please refer to the RFP Specifications document Section 3. C for all data conversion information.

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

Bid 26-08-4284SB

Addendum No. 2 – October 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:
November 18, 2026, at 4:00 pm local Window Rock, AZ time (MST)

Please find below questions received prior to, during, and after the September 29, 2026, Pre-Proposal Teleconference, and responses from the Navajo Nation Judicial Branch (NNJB).

NNJB is reviewing vendor questions on a rolling basis and will continue to issue addenda as questions are received, reviewed, and finalized. This addendum does not contain all questions submitted to date. Additional questions, responses, clarifications, and any resulting RFP modifications will be issued through subsequent addenda. Prospective proposers are responsible for monitoring the procurement website and reviewing all addenda prior to submitting a proposal.

1. The system we will be proposing prices data migration based on the number of fields [first name, last name, zip code are three example field names] you'd like to migrate from the current database. Only counting the same field name once, please estimate the total number of fields with “meaningful data” that needs to be migrated to live on in the new system. Drop down pick lists and case notes are treated as one field.

   NNJB Response: NNJB does not currently have a validated count of the unique database fields containing meaningful data that will be converted. NNJB does not currently have formal documentation concerning the prior conversion into JustWare or a documented inventory of conversion issues encountered during that effort.

   The current JustWare database contains 433 tables. Of those tables, 239 currently contain one or more rows and 194 contain no rows. The table row counts collectively total approximately 295.9 million rows. Table 1 at the end of this addendum contains the names and row counts of the 239 populated database tables. Proposers may use this information as a planning artifact when developing data-conversion assumptions, estimating effort, and preparing pricing; however, the table should not be interpreted as a definitive inventory of records, fields, or data elements that will be converted.

   Additional information concerning the current database platform, table count, case volumes, person records, and document volumes is provided in Section 3.C of the RFP. Exact source

fields, populated fields, data structures, field mappings, historical-data retention, and final conversion scope will be validated during project discovery and implementation planning.

For proposal purposes, proposers shall clearly state their assumptions regarding:

- The anticipated number and types of fields to be converted
- Treatment of historical and inactive data
- Coded values, notes, and user-defined or custom fields
- Data cleansing, transformation, deduplication, and validation
- The relationship between database records and electronic documents
- Any limitations, exclusions, or dependencies affecting the proposed conversion

Proposers shall also explain the basis of their conversion pricing and identify how pricing would be addressed if discovery identifies a materially different field count, record volume, or level of conversion complexity.

2. Do you plan on migrating files (documents, video, etc.) to the new system? If yes, where do these files reside today? If yes, is there some sort of identifier linking the documents/files to current cases?

   NNJB Response: Yes. NNJB anticipates that electronic documents and attachments associated with case records will be included in the data conversion scope. As described in Section 3.C, NNJB maintains an external electronic document repository that is logically linked to records within the current application. Current inventory information indicates that the repository consists primarily of PDF and Microsoft Word documents, along with a limited number of other file types.

   For proposal purposes, proposers should assume that the primary conversion scope consists of documents and file attachments commonly associated with case records. NNJB does not currently anticipate requiring conversion of all file types that may exist within the repository. The final scope of document conversion, including treatment of less-common file types, historical records, and any audio or video content, will be validated during discovery and implementation planning.

   Proposers shall clearly identify any assumptions regarding supported file types, excluded file types, document metadata, and pricing implications associated with the conversion of specialized file formats.

3. Prior to the release of this RFP, which case management software vendors did you meet with or research?

   NNJB Response: Before release of the RFP, NNJB conducted general market research regarding available court and justice-partner case management solutions. The following vendors or products were included in that research:

   - Arctic IT
   - Catalis
   - Neumo
   - Quicket Solutions

- Equivant
- I3 Verticals
- Handel IT
- Journal Technologies
- SolidCircle
- Thomson Reuters
- Tybera
- Tyler Technologies

Such research was informational only and does not affect the evaluation of proposals under this RFP.

4. Are you wanting the chosen vendor to provide all Administrative services to the live site, or is NNJB willing to have 2-3 people trained on supporting the application from an Administrative perspective?

   NNJB Response: NNJB has not established a final post-go-live application-administration and support model. NNJB is open to training designated personnel to perform appropriate application-administration and support functions, but the number of personnel and division of responsibilities will depend on the proposed solution and the vendor's recommended operating model.

   As required in Attachment A, Tab 4, proposers shall describe the proposed post-go-live support model, including:

   - The role of NNJB in providing ongoing support and maintenance
   - The number and type of NNJB resources recommended, including anticipated FTE requirements
   - The application-administration and support tasks to be performed by NNJB personnel
   - The tasks to be retained by the proposer, software provider, or subcontractor
   - The level of pre- and post-go-live support included in the proposed fee structure
   - Available standard and enhanced support tiers
   - Support hours, escalation processes, emergency support, and support channels

   NNJB resource requirements associated with releases, upgrades, interfaces, integrations, and data exchanges.

   Proposers shall clearly identify all assumptions, dependencies, optional services, and associated costs in their proposal and in Attachment C. NNJB will determine the final support model based on the selected solution, the proposer's recommended approach, and implementation planning.

5. Will you reconsider accepting proposals via email? The reasons this would be helpful include:

   - Financial & Efficiency Savings
   - Direct Cost Reductions: Printing and mailing copies of a multi-page proposal is expensive for small businesses.

- Resource Optimization: Preparing physical copies requires administrative hours for printing, collating, binding, and organizing—time that could be spent focusing on the response content.
- Risk of the package not arriving on time or not at all, potentially causes the need to reprint and resend everything.
- Spreadsheets can be challenging to print, with some content difficult to read.
- Environmental Impact (Carbon Reduction)
- Waste Prevention: Proposals are often read once and thrown away; digital delivery eliminates immediate landfill waste.
- Carbon Savings: Cut down on the emissions associated with manufacturing paper, producing printer toner, and transporting physical documents.

NNJB Response: No, NNJB will not accept proposals submitted by email. Proposers must comply with the physical and electronic-media submission requirements stated in Sections 2 and 5 of the RFP. Proposers are responsible for ensuring that their complete proposal is physically received by the stated deadline.

6. I see that Section 3.F (page 10) says subset proposals won't be accepted. However, Section 5.G (page 23) allows awards for "subsets of functionality," and the cost criteria mention "point solutions." Would NNJB accept a proposal covering only the court, probation, and e-filing/portal areas, or must every proposal cover all functional areas?

   NNJB Response: Proposals must address all functional areas identified in Section 3.A and 3.E of the RFP. NNJB will not accept a proposal limited to a subset of the requested functionality. Proposers may satisfy the full scope through partnerships or subcontractors, provided that a single prime proposer submits a complete proposal and clearly identifies the responsibilities of each participating entity. This clarification is consistent with Section 3.F, which states that NNJB will not accept proposals offering only a subset of functionality.

   To remove conflicting language, the RFP is amended as follows:

   a. **Section 5.D.5, Evaluation Procedures.** Strike item viii in its entirety. The language is replaced with "*award the project to the proposer determined to provide the best overall value and fit for NNJB, regardless of whether that proposer receives the highest numerical score.*"

   b. **Section 5.F, Cost Point Criteria.** Strike the following sentence in its entirety: "Proposers of point solutions will be compared against other proposals for the respective functional area group."

   c. **Section 5.G.** The heading is revised to "*No Obligation and Right of Rejection."* Strike the following sentence in its entirety: "In addition, NNJB reserves the right to make one or more awards to competing Proposers for subsets of functionality as a result of this RFP."

      Strike the following sentence: "NNJB reserves the right to create a Project of lesser or greater expense than described in this RFP or the Proposer's reply, based on the component prices or scope submitted." The language now reads: "*NNJB reserves the right, before contract award and subject to applicable procurement requirements, to*

clarify or negotiate the final project scope and cost with the selected proposer. This reservation does not authorize the submission or separate award of proposals covering only a subset of the applications, modules, or functional areas required by the RFP."

All other provisions concerning NNJB's right to reject proposals, waive informalities, seek clarifications, cancel the solicitation, or amend its scope remain unchanged.

7. Is a software development company based in India eligible to submit a proposal as the prime contractor, assuming we can satisfy the RFP's technical, contractual, security, insurance and support requirements?

   NNJB Response: Yes. A company incorporated or principally located outside the United States may submit a proposal as the prime proposer, provided that it satisfies all requirements of the RFP and is eligible to contract with the Navajo Nation. The prime proposer must comply with all applicable Navajo Nation contracting requirements, insurance requirements, security and privacy requirements, support obligations, and other solicitation and contractual requirements. The prime proposer will also remain responsible for ensuring that all subcontractors and other participating entities comply with these requirements.

   Regardless of the prime proposer's country of incorporation or principal place of business, NNJB data must be hosted, stored, processed, transmitted, viewed, or otherwise accessed only from within the United States. NNJB data may not be accessed from outside the United States by the prime proposer, its employees, affiliates, subcontractors, software providers, support personnel, or any other third party. The proposal must identify the locations and time zones from which implementation, development, maintenance, security, hosting, and support services will be performed.

8. If an international company cannot serve as the prime contractor, may it participate as a software development/implementation subcontractor to an eligible U.S. prime contractor?

   NNJB Response: An international company may be proposed as a subcontractor, subject to all applicable RFP and contract requirements. The prime proposer will remain fully responsible for the subcontractor's performance, security, data handling, confidentiality, insurance, and compliance. The proposal must clearly identify the subcontractor, the services it will perform, the locations from which those services will be provided, and whether its personnel would have access to NNJB systems or data.

   All hosting, storage, processing, and access arrangements must comply with the RFP's data-location and security requirements. NNJB reserves the right to review and approve or reject proposed subcontractors during evaluation and contract negotiations.

9. Is the Judicial Branch primarily seeking an existing commercial case-management product that can be configured and implemented, or would a custom-developed solution meeting the RFP requirements also be considered?

   NNJB Response: NNJB will consider any proposal that satisfies the requirements of the RFP. However, NNJB has a strong preference for a commercially available software solution with demonstrated production use in court, justice, or comparable governmental environments.

   Regardless of whether a proposer offers a commercial off-the-shelf solution, a configurable platform, or a solution involving custom-developed components, proposals will be evaluated using the criteria identified in Section 5 of the RFP, including functionality, technical capabilities,

implementation approach, proposer experience, demonstrated system capabilities, reference feedback, and overall cost and value.

Proposers offering custom-developed functionality or significant customizations should clearly describe the following in Attachment A and in their technical response:

- The maturity and current production status of the proposed solution
- The extent of custom development required
- Comparable production implementations
- Long-term support, maintenance, and upgrade approach
- Product roadmap and ongoing development strategy
- Risks, assumptions, and dependencies associated with the proposed approach

NNJB reserves the right to determine which proposal represents the best overall value and fit for the Judicial Branch in accordance with the evaluation process described in the RFP.

Table 1: Populated JustWare Database Tables and Associated Row Counts

In response to Question 1. Provided for planning purposes only; not a definition of final conversion scope.

Table Name	Number of Rows
tblOperationDetail	171,905,313
ltblCaseActual	20,149,323
tblOperation	17,676,853
ltblFileTransferRequest	9,425,956
ltblEventActual	8,016,452
tblCaseNotes2Actual	7,207,312
tblEventActual	6,850,790
ltblWorkflow	5,661,821
ltblCaseInvPers	4,054,777
tblCaseInvPers	4,043,307
ltblEventInvPers	3,855,528
ltblCaseNotes2Actual	3,835,290
tblEventInvPers	2,929,279
tblNumber	2,757,843
ltblNameActual	2,554,680
tblCaseAgency	2,199,003
ltblCountInvPersActual	2,131,893
ltblNumber	1,742,736

Table Name	Number of Rows
tblFile	1,509,567
tblCountInvPersActual	1,220,881
ltblCaseAgency	1,192,015
tblCountActual	1,095,465
tblCaseActual	1,088,304
tblCaseSummary	1,088,304
ltblAccount	881,280
tblAddressActual	837,422
ltblAppPerson	779,506
ltblCaseAttributes	746,404
ltblAddressActual	718,957
ltblNameNumber	630,674
tblNameActual	565,741
tblNameSummary	565,736
tblNameNumber	558,840
ltblCountActual	509,170
ltblReminder	363,650
ltblMergedNames	363,590
tblCaseAttributes	357,103
ltblObligation	341,484
tblNotificationLog	337,654
ltblNameAttributes	285,799
ltblTransfer	226,799
ltblObligationCountInvPers	195,557
tblTransfer	188,280
ltblCaseToCase	185,496
tblNameAttributes	178,361
ltblPayment	172,438
tblObligationCountInvPers	161,338
tblObligation	161,338
tblCaseToCase	147,199
tblPayment	143,515
ltblAccountOwner	129,388
tblAccountOwner	112,671

Table Name	Number of Rows
tblAccount	112,671
ltblIntoxicant	92,429
tblCountHistory	88,493
tblIntoxicant	76,580
ctblCodePartitionInclusion	70,544
ltblPhoneActual	56,916
tblPhoneActual	48,697
ltblBond	30,416
tblSessionPermission	28,226
tblNonCasePaymentItem	26,914
ltblCountAttributes	22,894
admHolidayCalendar	22,281
tblCountAttributes	19,353
ltblBondAmend	14,732
ltblFolder	14,605
tblBond	14,029
tblBondAmend	13,478
tblReminder	10,360
tblFolder	9,022
ltblEmailActual	5,816
jweb_ltblRequestQueue	5,305
lApplicationParameters	5,248
tblEmailActual	5,153
tblVoucher	5,029
tblSnapInField	4,574
ltblNameToName	4,152
tblMachine	3,290
ltblPaymentSchedule	3,080
tblNameToName	3,074
jweb_tblRequest	2,137
ctblAgencyPartition	2,016
tblSessionTable	1,769
tblAppPerson	1,534
admCaseTypeRestriction	1,496

Table Name	Number of Rows
tblJDATemplateQGLink	1,476
ltblNameNotes2	1,338
tblNameNotes2	1,213
ctblStatute	1,022
tblStatuteSummary	1,022
ctblEventSuperType	1,012
admVersion	864
jweb_tblProfile	840
admEventInvDefault	754
ctblAmtDueType	702
ctblStatuteText	637
admUserSettings	623
admDaylightSavingsTimeRule	592
tblUserGroupSecuritySchema	555
tblGroupMembersToTblUserGroupSecuritySchema	555
tblGroupMembers	546
admSealingPermissions	546
ltblMergedCases	491
ltblSecuritySchema	370
ctblCaseAttributeCodeList	351
tblSessionDefinition	321
tblJDATemplate	313
ctblBondType	255
ctblNonCasePaymentItemType	235
admTrackingNumToCaseType	234
ctblCodePartitionRule	219
tblJDADialogTemplateQGLink	214
ctblStatuteAttributes	195
admTableViewLink	193
ltblBondCondition	186
tblPaymentSchedule	180
tblWorkflowActivityToCtblAgency	178
tblBondCondition	159
tblAgencyDefaultSettings	156

Table Name	Number of Rows
tblAuthorizationTicket	153
ctblCaseAttributes	148
tblJDADataSource	147
ctblCountDispoPlea	134
admAutoInc	132
ctblNameAttributeCodeList	123
ctblInvolveType	121
ctblEventStatus	116
ctblAgency	106
admTrackingNum	101
tblJDADialog	100
admCodeTableRegister	88
ctblEventLocation	83
admZipCodeAutoFill	83
jweb_tblJusticeWebServerToCaseStatus	74
ApplicationParameters	69
jb_admCodeTableRegister	68
ctblState	62
ctblQuickSearchOptions	53
ctblJDAGroup	52
jweb_tblRequestQueue	50
ctblCaseType	47
tblWorkflowCriteria	45
ltblPaymentScheduleException	44
jweb_tblField	35
ctblNumberType	34
ctblStatuteClass	33
jweb_tblFieldType	32
tblWorkFlowActivity	31
tblWorkflowDefinition	31
tblSecuritySchemaAttributes	29
ctblEventCategory	28
ctblBondConditionType	23
NonParseList	22

Table Name	Number of Rows
tblPaymentScheduleException	21
ctblNameAttributes	20
jweb_tblJusticeWebServerToObligationType	20
ctblCaseInvTypeDefaults	19
admAgencyReceiptNumber	19
ctblRelationship	19
jweb_tblReportToInvolveType	18
ctblEyeColor	17
ctblHairColor	17
tblWizardHTML	16
tblSecuritySchema	16
ctblCaseNotes2Type	16
ctblNameType	16
ctblPaymentType	14
jb_admAuditEventType	14
ctblDistrict	14
ctblJurisdiction	13
ctblCaseTypePartition	12
ctblStatuteCat	12
ctblPhoneType	12
ctblStyleSheet	11
tblNotificationTemplate	11
ctblIntoxicant	10
tblDepositToAgency	10
jweb_tblRequestTypeToInvolveType	9
ctblAddressType	8
ctblCountAttributeCodeList	8
ctblExhibitType	8
ctblCounty	8
ctblCountAttributes	8
ctblAccountType	8
ltblLocation	8
jb_ctblStatusCode	7
jweb_tblReport	7

Table Name	Number of Rows
ctblDLClass	7
jweb_tblPage	7
ctblInvokeType	6
jweb_ctblRequestStatus	5
ctblAgencyLevel	5
ctblFileState	5
jweb_tblRequestPage	5
ctblCountHistoryType	5
ctblBondStatus	5
ctblStatuteSeverity	5
ctblTimeTrackingType	5
admDataPartitionOption	5
ctblRace	4
ctblTransferType	4
ctblEmailType	4
admCaseTitlePartType	4
jweb_ctblRequestType	4
ctblEventInvPersStatus	4
ctblDocumentExtension	3
jweb_tblRequestNotificationTemplate	3
ctblDepositStatus	3
ctblPaymentStatus	3
ctblTimeTrackingStatus	3
ctblSex	3
tblNotificationTemplateDataSource	3
ctblExhibitStatus	3
ctblAccountStatus	2
tblCalendarDocket	2
admRecord_IDs	2
ctblStatuteTextType	2
ctblStatuteSource	2
tblFileTransferRequest	2
jweb_tblJusticeWebServerToInvolveType	2
tblLocation	2

Table Name	Number of Rows
tblAgencyToCalendarDocket	2
ctblAutoNameNumberInc	2
jweb_tblJusticeWebServerToCaseType	2
tblDomainMap	1
tblCalendarDocketInvPers	1
tblCountAgency	1
admAdminUser	1
ctblPhysicalLocation	1
jweb_tblJusticeWebServer	1
ctblStatuteAttributeType	1
tblDeposit	1
ltblDeposit	1
rb_folder	1
tblEmailReminderTemplate	1
tblWorkflowSchedule	1
ltblCountAgency	1
ctblCalendarTemplate	1

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

Bid 26-08-4284SB

Addendum No. 1 – October 9, 2026

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

Due Date and Time: November 18, 2026 at 4:00 pm AZ

A Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference was held on September 29 at 9:00 a.m. (AZ). The Pre-Proposal Teleconference was facilitated by the NNJB and the NNJB's consulting partner, BerryDunn. Attendance at the Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference was **not** mandatory. The following vendors identified themselves as being in attendance via phone:

Company	Representative
Aditi LLC	Aaron Sanju Eappen
Aditi LLC	Vennila
Catalis	Maddie Flowers
Catalis	Ryan Crowley
Catalis	Naomi Skopec
Jano	Vasco Bridges III (Nosa)
Journal	Gary Dunn
Pine Technologies	Kade Hendricks
QuickSolutions	Christiaan Burner
Tybera Development Group	Ross Woolf
Tyler Technologies	Spencer Ingram
Tyler Technologies	Matt Romeo

This Addendum No. 1 is being issued to provide guidance to prospective Proposers regarding access to attachments associated with the RFP and to address questions received to date. The Navajo Nation Judicial Branch (NNJB) is publishing this information promptly to ensure all interested vendors have access to the materials necessary to prepare a responsive proposal.


Pursuant to the RFP, the deadline for submission of formal written questions is **October 15, 2026**. NNJB will continue to review questions as they are received and intends to issue additional addenda containing responses and clarifications as appropriate. Prospective Proposers are responsible for monitoring the procurement website and reviewing all addenda issued by NNJB prior to submitting a proposal.

---

1. The Attachments pane in Adobe Acrobat Reader is not showing. Please send Attachment B.
   The Attachments pane in Adobe Acrobat Reader is not showing. Please send Attachment C.

   NNJB Response: The RFP attachments are embedded within the PDF document and can be accessed through the Attachments pane in Adobe Acrobat Reader. Proposers should select the Attachments icon (paperclip) within Adobe Acrobat Reader to view and open all RFP attachments, including Attachments B and C. See the example below.

   If a Proposer is unable to access the attachments after following these steps, they should contact Kate Offerdahl-Joyce at kate.offerdahl-joyce@berrydunn.com and CC reba.francisco@navajo-nsn.gov.



SIGNATURE

COMPANY

DATE

JUDICIAL BRANCH OF THE NAVAJO NATION
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE

P.O. Box 1779 ◆ Window Rock, Arizona 86515
Telephone 928-871-7669 ◆ Fax 928-871-7016

ELEANOR SHIRLEY
INTERIM Chief Justice of the Navajo Nation

William J.J. Platero
ACTING Associate Justice

Navajo Nation Judicial Branch BID
#26-08-4284SB

for Court and Justice Partners Case Management
Software Systems Environment

The Navajo Nation Purchasing Services Department is soliciting for sealed proposals from Proposers capable of satisfying the needs for software and consulting services to implement a new software systems environment to address the NNJB's needs related to Court Case Management System (CCMS).

The Request for Proposals (RFP) is available at the following link:
https://www.nnooc.org/request-for-proposals-2026/

This RFP package is provided as a single PDF document. Certain attachments are available through the hyperlinks below and must be submitted in their native file formats. Please refer to Section 5 for further instructions regarding submission requirements.

Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms:	See the Attachments pane in Adobe Acrobat Reader to open Attachment A.
Attachment B – Functional and Technical Requirements:	See the Attachments pane in Adobe Acrobat Reader to open Attachment B.
Attachment C – Cost Proposal:	See the Attachments pane in Adobe Acrobat Reader to open Attachment C.
Online Advertisement Run Date:	September 3, 2026
Newspaper Advertisement Run Date:	September 3, 2026
Closing Date:	November 18, 2026

NAVAJO NATION JUDICIAL BRANCH

Scope of Work and Specifications for a Court and Justice Partners Case Management Software Systems Environment

BID# 26-02-4284SB

SECTION 1 - OVERVIEW

A. General Information:

The Navajo Nation Judicial Branch (NNJB) provides court services, peacemaking, and probation and parole services, to adjudicate cases, resolve disputes, rehabilitate individuals and families, restore harmony, educate the public, agencies, and other governments in Diné bi beenahaz' áanii, and protect persons and property pursuant to Navajo Nation laws, customs, traditions, and applicable federal laws. Pursuant to Diné bi beenahaz' áanii, the NNJB has established a justice system that fully embodies the traditional values and processes of the Navajo People. The Judicial Branch provides these services in the Administrative Office of the Courts, Navajo Supreme Court and eleven Judicial Districts.

The NNJB invites qualified and well-established Contractors capable of providing software to support court, probation, prosecution, defense, and peacemaking services to propose on this bid.

B. Dates for delivery of products: Contractor must complete deliverables within five years of the execution of the contract.

C. Contact Information: Kate Offerdahl-Joyce, BerryDunn
kate.offerdahl-joyce@berrydunn.com

D. Addendum to the RFP: In the event it becomes necessary to revise any part of the RFP, NNJB shall issue a written addendum on the specifics of the change and inform all respondents who received the original RFP.

E. Inquiries Regarding this RFP: Questions regarding this RFP should be submitted in writing via email to Kate Offerdahl Joyce at kate.offerdahl-joyce@berrydunn.com. Only written responses to written questions shall be official. Verbal inquiries and responses shall be considered unofficial.

F. Non-Mandatory Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference: A non-mandatory Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference will be held on September 29, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. Mountain Daylight Time (MDT). Interested participants shall contact BerryDunn in writing to kate.offerdahl-joyce@berrydunn.com to request the teleconference information.

G. Rejection of Proposals: The Navajo Nation reserves the right to waive any informalities or irregularities in the RFP, or reject any or all proposals whenever such rejection is deemed in the best interest of the Navajo Nation.

SECTION 2 – PROPOSAL & BID SUBMITTAL DEADLINEAND RELEVANT INFORMATION

A. Deadline: All proposals & bids must be physically submitted to:

Delivery via UPS or Federal Express:	Delivery via US Mail:
Navajo Nation Purchasing Department Administration Building 1 Window Rock Boulevard Window Rock, AZ 86515 ATTN: Sharon Belone, Buyer	Navajo Nation Purchasing Department P. O. Box 3150 Window Rock, AZ 86515 ATTN: Sharon Belone, Buyer

Proposals due November 18, 2026 by 4:00 PM local Window Rock, AZ time (MST).

Late, facsimiled, or emailed proposals will not be accepted. Late, facsimiled, or emailed proposals will be returned unopened to the firm unrated and firms responding in such fashion shall be considered non-responsive. Use of mail and/or delivery service is at the respondent's own risk. A post mark by the due date on the package will not substitute for the actual, physical receipt of proposal and bid by the deadline.

RFP Schedule of Events	
Event	**Estimated Date**
RFP Published	September 3, 2026
Pre-Proposal Vendor Teleconference	September 29, 2026
Deadline for Questions from Vendors	October 15, 2026
Proposals Due	November 18, 2026
Shortlist Vendors Notified	Week of January 11, 2027
Vendor Demonstrations	Week of February 8, 2027

B. Proposal Submittal Specifications: All proposals & bids shall be submitted in a sealed envelope clearly marked: "DO NOT OPEN - BID #26-02-4284SB - PROPOSAL FOR A COURT AND JUSTICE PARTNERS CASE MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENT".

1. Name and address of the firm submitting the proposal shall be written legibly on the outside of the sealed envelope.
2. All Bid Sheets shall be submitted within the sealed proposal, separately.
3. Note whether firm is a Navajo Nation Priority 1 or Priority 2 vendor. Priority 1 vendors are Navajo Nation certified businesses that are 100% Navajo-owned and controlled that have a principal place of business on or off the Navajo Nation. Priority 2 vendors are Navajo Nation certified businesses that are 51%-99% Navajo or 51% to 100% other Indian owned and controlled businesses or 100% Navajo

Nation owned and controlled economic enterprises having its principal place of business on or off the Navajo Nation.

SECTION 3 - SPECIFICATIONS FOR A COURT CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CCMS) AND JUSTICE PARTNERS SOFTWARE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENT

A. Purpose and Deliverables

Navajo Nation Judicial Branch is soliciting Proposals from Proposers capable of satisfying the needs for software, implementation, and maintenance services to implement a new software systems environment to address the NNJB's need to replace its justice technology ecosystem, to include the following applications and modules:

- Court Case Management System (CCMS)
- Prosecution Case Management System
- Public Defender Case Management System
- Probation Case Management System
- Peacemaking Case Management System

Collectively, these applications and modules will be referred to by "CCMS." The selected solution should facilitate information sharing, collaboration, and case processing across these stakeholder groups while respecting the unique operational requirements, confidentiality considerations, and cultural practices of each program.

In addition to soliciting written responses, this document provides information to assist Proposers in preparing their responses and facilitates the subsequent evaluation and comparison process. In that regard, this RFP:

- Provides information essential to soliciting meaningful recommendations and realistic commitments from the Proposers
- Specifies the desired format and content of Proposals in response to this RFP
- Outlines the NNJB's evaluation and selection procedures
- Establishes a schedule for the preparation and submission of Proposals in response to this RFP

This RFP and the selected Proposal in response to this RFP will be incorporated into the contract resulting from this solicitation.

B. Introduction to the Navajo Nation Judicial Branch and its Justice Partners

The mission of the Judicial Branch is to provide exceptional services to the Navajo People by providing an accessible justice system while ensuring judicial independence. This is accomplished by providing court, probation and parole, and peacemaking services throughout the Navajo Nation reservation spanning three states: Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. Currently, Navajo courts, Probation, Peacemaking, Public Defenders, and Prosecutors use different modules within the same application to support their work. Public Safety departments have read-only access to the application to view necessary data.

Courts

The Navajo Nation Judicial Branch is responsible for adjudicating civil, criminal, family, probate, juvenile, and other matters arising under Navajo Nation law. There are eleven Judicial Districts throughout the reservation in addition to the Navajo Nation Supreme Court. There are approximately 200 Judicial Branch staff and ten judges. See the table below for annual case filing information.

	District Court New Filings	Family Court New Filings
2023	16,297	3,834
2024	8,533 plus a backlog of 5,086 cases	3,814 plus a backlog of 1,247 cases

Currently, Navajo courts accept filings in person, via mail, or by fax. E-mail submissions are accepted in certain case types and time-sensitive circumstances, though the original document must still be submitted to the court. Some Navajo Bar members practice on reservation, while others are off reservation in the surrounding areas. Navajo courts see a particularly high number of pro-se filers.

Probation and Parole Services

Probation and Parole Services supports the rehabilitation and supervision of individuals involved in the justice system. Probation officers conduct investigations, prepare pre-sentence and pre-disposition reports, monitor compliance with court-ordered conditions, document offender activities, conduct field contacts, and provide progress updates to the courts. The program works closely with judges, prosecutors, defenders, law enforcement, families, and community service providers. The future solution should support case supervision, assessments, compliance tracking, reporting, referrals, document management, alerts, and the exchange of information with courts and justice partners.

Peacemaking Program

The Navajo Nation Peacemaking Program is a unique component of the Navajo Nation justice system and is grounded in Diné traditional teachings and restorative justice principles. The program provides non-adversarial dispute resolution services intended to restore harmony, strengthen relationships, and resolve conflicts through consensus-building and community participation. Cases may be referred to the Peacemaking Program by courts, prosecutors, schools, agencies, or community members and often involve family, community, juvenile, and civil matters. Peacemaking staff manage referrals, schedule

peacemaking sessions with designated non-judicial Peacemakers, document outcomes, and coordinate with courts depending on peacemaking outcomes. Because peacemaking workflows differ significantly from traditional court processes, vendors should demonstrate how their solution can support or be configured to accommodate peacemaking-specific business processes, referrals, participant management, confidentiality requirements, and culturally appropriate workflows.

Office of the Prosecutor

Housed within the Department of Justice, the Office of the Prosecutor is responsible for initiating and prosecuting criminal and related proceedings on behalf of the Navajo Nation. Prosecutorial staff manage investigations, charging decisions, case filing, document preparation, witness management, discovery activities, court appearances, and coordination with law enforcement agencies. Prosecutors currently play an important role in the initiation of criminal cases and interact with courts, probation personnel, defense counsel, and law enforcement agencies throughout the case lifecycle. The future solution should support prosecutorial case management, charging workflows, document and evidence management, calendaring, reporting, and secure information sharing with authorized justice stakeholders. Prosecutors are among the primary users anticipated to exchange information electronically with the courts.

Public Defender

The Public Defender's Office provides legal representation and advocacy for individuals involved in judicial proceedings who are entitled to defense services under Navajo Nation law. Defense staff manage caseloads, case preparation, legal research, client communications, investigations, court appearances, motions practice, discovery review, and document preparation. Public defenders require secure access to case information, document management, calendaring, workflow tools, conflict management capabilities, reporting, and electronic exchange of information with courts and other justice partners while maintaining attorney-client confidentiality and appropriate access controls. The Public Defender's Office is a key stakeholder that regularly interacts with the courts and participates in case proceedings.

C. Current Applications Environment

The NNJB rolled out JustWare as its electronic case management application in 2012. The system is currently used by the Navajo Nation courts, Office of Probation and Parole, Peacemaking Services, Prosecutors, and to a lesser extent, Public Defenders. While the NNJB originally purchased JustWare from Journal Technologies, the vendor phased out its on-premises applications in favor of a new cloud-hosted application and discontinued JustWare support. The Judicial Branch now contracts with a third-party software company for application support.

JustWare is hosted on premises by the Navajo Nation Department of Information Technology (DIT). As of June 2026, the system’s primary relational database backup size is approximately 48 GB. In addition to structured database records, the organization maintains an external electronic document repository (“filing cabinet”) totaling approximately 1.22 TB, consisting primarily of scanned documents and file

attachments associated with case records. The database and document repository are logically linked through the existing application, though stored separately.

Additional information regarding the current environment is provided below for data conversion planning and estimation purposes:

Database Platform:	Microsoft SQL Server 2019 running on Microsoft Windows Server 2022 Datacenter
Number of Database Tables:	433
Open Cases:	66,406
Closed Cases:	702,800
Person Records:	565,741
Total Electronic Documents and Attachments:	594,665
PDF Documents:	487,564
Word Documents:	104,701

The figures provided is intended for planning purposes only. Exact record counts, data structures, field mappings, document relationships, and conversion scope will be validated during project discovery and implementation planning. Proposers should identify any assumptions made regarding data conversion scope, historical data retention, document migration, and data cleansing activities as part of their proposal responses (See Attachment A – Tab 5).

D. Project Objectives

The Judicial Branch seeks a solution that supports collaboration across courts, probation services, peacemaking services, prosecutors, and public defenders while preserving appropriate role-based security and confidentiality controls. The Judicial Branch plans to replace its current CCMS software with a new system, and in doing so, take advantage of the newest technology and gain efficiencies. The Judicial Branch places particular importance on solutions that can accommodate the unique operational and cultural requirements of the Navajo Nation, including support for peacemaking and other processes influenced by Diné values and traditions.

The Judicial Branch seeks to address several challenges in the current environment and gain future efficiencies, including, but not limited to:

- **Key Objectives and Outcomes:**
    - Enhance operational effectiveness by making more timely, accurate, and complete case information available to Judicial Branch personnel, case parties, and relevant justice partners

- Implement robust reporting tools, including but not limited to ad hoc reporting, statistical reporting, and configurable scheduled reports
- Improve internal and external communications using electronic data exchanges with justice partners
- Reduce reliance on manual and paper-based processes
- Introduce modern features and functionality to support increased automation and operational efficiencies

- **Primary Challenges in the Current Environment:**
  - Unreliable infrastructure and connectivity: Frequent internet and power outages, particularly in remote areas, require courts to intermittently revert to paper-based processing and limit reliable access to current technology.
  - Heavy reliance on manual data entry and processing: Court clerks manually enter most case data and manage filings, increasing administrative burden, risk of errors, and reducing the reliability of data for reporting and analysis.
  - Manual and inconsistent communications with parties and partners: Filings, service, and notifications rely on mail, e-mail, and in-person delivery, occasionally resulting in lost documents or delayed notices. With no real-time status updates, court staff receive increased inquiries about case information.
  - Lack of automation for deadline tracking and alerts: Clerks track statutory and procedural deadlines using disparate methods (limited ticklers, spreadsheets, notes), with no automated alerts, increasing the risk of missed deadlines and compliance issues.
  - Inconsistent filing practices and limited system support across courts: Variations in accepted filing methods, training approaches, and clerical capacity across Judicial Districts can create confusion for filers, reduce access to justice, and impede standardization due to limited IT and application-level support.

E. Functional Areas

The following table contains the list of functional areas of the desired future systems environment.

Functional Areas			
No.	**Functional Area**	**No.**	**Functional Area**
1	Case Management	**6**	Financials
2	Document Management	**7**	Probation

Functional Areas			
No.	**Functional Area**	**No.**	**Functional Area**
3	Judicial Tools	**8**	Peacemaking
4	e-File & Web Portal	**9**	Prosecution
5	Reporting	**10**	Public Defender

The List of Functional and Technical Requirements/Capabilities contained in **Attachment B – Functional and Technical Requirements/Capabilities** contains the detailed functionality NNJB requires within each functional area in a future systems environment, as well as general and technical system requirements, and data conversion and interface scope.

F. Alternate Proposals, Partnerships and Proposers of Subsets of Functionality

Alternate Proposals:

- Proposers may submit multiple Proposals for evaluation. For example, if a Proposer offers one or more "branded" products that may meet the needs of NNJB they are encouraged to separately propose each software package for consideration.
- Software companies that deliver their solution through one or more consulting firms (system integrators) are also allowed to submit more than one Proposal for consideration through differing consulting firms.
- A separate Proposal package submitted in accordance with Section 4 is required in order for NNJB to accurately evaluate each Proposal independent of the other.

Partnerships:

Proposers are encouraged to establish partnership relationships to fully provide all requirements defined by the RFP.

- Proposers engaged in a partnership relationship shall submit a single proposal in response to this RFP.
- Partnership relationships shall be clearly defined by proposal responses. Such definition shall identify the entity in the partnership relationship deemed to be the Prime Vendor.
- Each Vendor engaged in the partnership shall respond to any and all applicable portions of this RFP that relate to the work that will be performed, or the capabilities provided. For example, each Vendor shall provide references, and each Vendor shall respond to the Company Background and History questions.

Proposers of Subsets of Functionality:

NNJB will not be accepting proposals from Proposers offering a subset of functionality (best of breed).

G. NNJB and Project Staffing

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.

Staffing considerations are a consideration for NNJB in terms of both the implementation process as well as supporting the software once operational. Vendors are encouraged to submit questions to NNJB during the RFP questions period to solicit such additional information as is necessary to adequately estimate the resource commitments that would be expected of NNJB during implementation, and post go-live for ongoing support of the system(s). Additional resource planning will be performed based upon the selected Proposer(s).

Proposers shall clearly indicate in the proposal responses the estimated level of NNJB resource involvement in the implementation process to allow NNJB to perform adequate planning. NNJB will utilize the response to Proposers' Resource Hour Estimates in Tab 4 – Project Approach and Implementation Methodology, of Proposals as an input into the staffing plan NNJB develops, and requests that Proposers clearly articulate estimated staffing considerations in their responses.

H. Deployment Model

NNJB is not considering an on-premise deployment model and has structured the RFP to allow for the deployment model as one factor in the evaluation process. NNJB wishes to evaluate the greatest range of marketplace offerings feasible through this process.

NNJB recognizes there are many factors contributing to a comparison of Cost Proposals for these various deployment methods including needed infrastructure and/or hardware costs, the potential for reduced hardware and support costs in hosted/SaaS models, a particular Proposer's approach to managing upgrades, and technical staffing needs. As such, NNJB is open to considering two deployment models considering the breadth of functionality and available solutions in the marketplace to address those functional areas. NNJB will consider, in no particular order, the following deployment models:

a. Software as a Service (SaaS or subscription-based models)

b. Proposer hosted (hosted and managed by the Proposer, perpetual licenses)

Cost sheets have been provided under **Attachment C – Cost Worksheets** for pricing each of the deployment models.

This solicitation is not a bid process nor will it follow a lowest-priced responsive Proposal process, but will be based on most advantageous Proposal(s) utilizing the Evaluation Criteria listed in the RFP, including the review of life cycle costs (i.e., recurring costs, hardware, third-party licenses, etc.).

In developing proposals, Proposer's shall clearly define the proposed deployment model including the licensing model as well as any perceived benefits of the proposed model. In the event two or more products are proposed under the same proposal (e.g., through a partnership or offered by the same company) the Proposer shall clearly indicate in both the Technical Proposal (Attachment A, Tab 2) and Cost Proposal (Attachment C) the deployment model for each proposed software product.

NNJB does not have a preference as to a specific hosting location but does require hosting to be within the contiguous United States. Vendors shall specify the hosting location in proposal responses, specifically as part of Tab 3 to proposal responses (please see Attachment A for further instruction).

Number of Users

The following user counts by module contained in the table below are estimates and are provided for planning purposes only. The number of users represents the **anticipated future number of users of a new system.**

Participating Department	Estimated Number of Users
Supreme Court	4
Administrative Office of the Courts	8
Office of the Chief Justice	6
Self Help Center	9
District and Family Court	104
Prosecutor's Office	76
Public Defender's Office	4
Probation and Parole	18
Peacemaking Services	15
Floating / Additional Licenses	6
Total User Count Across Departments	**250**

In addition to internal NNJB stakeholders and users, it is anticipated that the system will be indirectly or directly used by the public (such as attorneys, parties to cases, and members of the public) by means of a public-facing portal. Any such public users cannot be quantified and are not included in the user counts above.

I. Potential Phasing and Target Live Dates

The Judicial Branch requests that offerors provide potential phase start and target go-live dates in proposal responses per **Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms**, Tab 8. These dates should be estimates based on anticipated resource requirements and dependencies between functional areas. These dates are subject to negotiation. The Judicial Branch anticipates that implementation activities would begin in spring of 2027, with a potential go-live target date of late 2028 for all modules in the pilot agencies. The pilot agencies are expected to be one small, medium, and large court along with the Prosecutors, Probation, Peacemaking, and Public Defender modules, ideally beginning with criminal cases to test the new technology environment and the information exchanged between justice partners. Proposers are asked to describe their experience with pilot and phased rollouts in Attachment A, Tab 4.

J. Project Management Documentation

The following information establishes the expectation of the minimum level of project management documentation to be provided by Proposers as a part of, but not exclusively, the resulting implementation services offered. As part of the implementation scope, following signing of a contract, the selected Contractor(s) shall develop and provide NNJB with the following items:

- Project Management Plan: a detailed Implementation Project Plan that, at a minimum, includes the following:
  - Objectives
  - Deliverables and Milestones
  - Project Schedule
  - Resource Management Processes
  - Scope Management Processes
  - Schedule Management Processes
  - Risk Management Processes
  - Quality Management Approach
  - Communication Management Approach
  - Organizational Change Management Approach
  - Status Reporting
- Data Conversion Plan
- Training Plan
- System Interface Plan
- Testing and Quality Assurance Plan
- Pre- and Post-Implementation Support Plan
- System Documentation

- Risk Register

Additional documentation about each Plan may be found in **Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms,** attached to this RFP.

K. Budget

NNJB is committed to fully funding the one-time and recurring annual costs for the acquisition of the software (whether a licensed model or a subscription model is selected as a result of this process). NNJB intends to use the proposals received through this process to inform the budget development process. NNJB has performed initial, high-level estimations, for the acquisition of either a proposer-hosted or cloud-based software solution including professional services and recurring maintenance/subscription costs. Recognizing the cost and payment differences between deployment models, a final budget will be programmed based on the results of this RFP and final contract negotiations.

NNJB is sensitive to the total costs and has listed cost as one of the several evaluation criteria in the RFP; however, this is not an opportunity to identify the lowest priced solution. This RFP opportunity is being presented as a best value solicitation, and not a lowest priced bid, opportunity.

L. Personnel

All of Contractor's personnel providing goods and services under the contract shall possess the necessary skills, experience, and knowledge, to perform their assigned duties. In the event assigned personnel are providing non-conforming or unsuitable services, NNJB shall notify Contractor and provide the opportunity to rectify the deficiency. If unable to cure the nonconforming services, Contractor shall remove from the project and replace the Contractor's personnel that NNJB deems unsuitable for the project with a resource possessing the necessary skills, experience, and knowledge, to perform their assigned duties in a satisfactory manner.

M. Software Upgrades

NNJB shall be entitled to any and all upgraded versions of the software covered in the contract that becomes available from the Contractor. Such upgrades shall be provided at no cost to NNJB so long as a valid maintenance and support agreement, or if applicable software as a service licensing agreement, is in place.

N. Performance Review

The Contractor may be required to meet with NNJB's Project Manager not less than once per quarter to conduct a performance review of the Contractor. These meetings will be either in person at NNJB offices, or via teleconference or web-conference. This performance review will include a review of the pricing, delivery performance, customer service, and improving operational efficiencies.

SECTION 4 - GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

A. Standard Contract: The Navajo Nation reserves the right to incorporate contract provisions which are based on applicable requirements, such as, Navajo Nation Laws, Federal, State, and local requirements, etc. into the contract documents; including provisions of the Navajo Nation Business and Procurement Act, at 12 N. N. C. § 301-371 et seq., the Navajo Preference in Employment Act, at 15 N. N. C. § 601 et seq., and the Navajo Business Opportunity Act, at 5 N. N. C. § 201 et seq.

B. Availability of Funds: Any contract with the Navajo Nation is contingent upon the availability of funds appropriated by the U. S. Congress and/or the Navajo Nation Council, pursuant to 2 N. N. C. § 223 (A).

C. Indemnification: Contractor shall agree to hold harmless and to indemnify the Navajo Nation against any and all losses, costs, damages, claims, expenses or other liability whatsoever arising out of or in connection with Contractor's services under proposed contract including, but not limited to, any accident to person or property.

D. Sovereign Immunity: Nothing herein shall be considered a waiver, express or implied, of the sovereign immunity of the Navajo Nation except to the extent provided for in the Navajo Nation Sovereign Immunity Act, 1 N. N. C. §551 et. seq.

E. Taxes: If applicable, all work performed and services provided within the territorial jurisdiction of the Navajo Nation is subject to the six percent (6%) Navajo Sales Tax, 24 N. N. C. § 601 et seq.

F. Proprietary Information: Any restriction on the use of data contained within any proposal must be clearly stated in the proposal. Each and every page that contains proprietary information must be clearly marked "Proprietary".

G. Ownership of Proposals: All materials submitted with the RFP accepted for review and evaluation shall become the property of NNJB and not returned to the firm. NNJB has the right to use any or all information presented in the RFP subject to limitations outlined in Paragraph F above under SECTION 4. Disqualification or non-selection of a Contractor or proposal does not eliminate this right.

H. Contractual Obligation: The contents of the proposal may become part of contractual obligations of the contract award. Failure of the firm to accept these obligations may result in cancellation of the award.

I. Cost Incurred: The Navajo Nation is not liable for any cost incurred by the firm prior to issuance of a signed contract award for services. Cost incurred as a result of participating in this RFP process shall be at the sole risk and responsibility of the respondent.

J. Legal Review: Best efforts shall be used to resolve any disputes through informal means. In the

unlikely event that formal action must be taken, all agreements will be interpreted by the law of the Navajo Nation. The Navajo Nation reserves the right to pursue appropriate legal action in the set of circumstances in Navajo Nation Courts.

K. Sufficient Appropriation: A contract awarded as a result of this RFP is contingent upon the availability of funds. A contract may be terminated or reduced in scope if sufficient funds do not exist. Sending written notice to the Contractor shall affect such termination or reduction in scope. The NNJB Chief Justice's decision to terminate or reduce the scope due to insufficient appropriations shall be accepted as final by the Contractor.

L. Ownership of Data and Transition: Any and all NNJB data stored on the Contractor's servers or within the Contractors custody is the sole property of the NNJB. The Contractor, subcontractor(s), officers, agents, and assigns shall not make use of, disclose, sell, copy or reproduce NNJB's data in any manner, or provide to any entity or person outside of NNJB without the express written authorization of the NNJB.

In the event resulting Agreement is terminated for any reason, or upon expiration, and in addition to all other rights to property set forth, the Selected Proposer shall:

a. Incur no further financial obligations for materials, Services, or facilities under the Agreement without prior written approval of the NNJB;

b. Terminate all purchase orders or procurements and any subcontractors and cease all work, except as NNJB may direct, for orderly completion and transition; and

c. Make available to NNJB, at no cost, all NNJB data stored within the system, stored on the Contractor's servers, or within the Contractor's custody, within fifteen (15) days of termination or NNJB request. Such data shall be provided in a machine-readable format as agreed-upon by the parties.

In the event resulting Agreement is terminated for any reason, or upon expiration, and in addition to all other rights to property set forth, NNJB shall:

d. Retain ownership of all data, work products, and documentation, created pursuant to the resulting Agreement

M. Data Privacy and Security: Contractor shall comply with all relevant federal, state, and local laws and regulations on security and privacy. Contractor shall have and follow a disaster recovery plan. Contractor shall only store and process NNJB data within the continental United States. If applicable to the Contract, the Contractor shall back up all NNJB data daily to an offsite hardened facility.

SECTION 5 - PROPOSAL CONTENT AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

A. General Instructions

The following instructions must be followed by Proposers submitting Proposals. Offers that do not comply with all instructions contained herein may be disqualified:

1. **Deadline:** The deadline for Proposal submissions is established on page one. It will be the sole responsibility of the Proposer to submit its Proposal to NNJB before the closing deadline.
2. **Hard Copy Proposals:** Hard copy proposals are required; Proposers shall submit one (1) hard copy original of the Technical Proposal and Price Proposal and seven (7) copies in separate three-ring binders with tab separators or otherwise under separate cover, clearly marked "Original" or "Copy". An electronic media file must also be submitted. Proposer must follow the naming and file formats identified in the table below. Technical Proposals shall not include extraneous marketing materials.
3. **Email Proposals:** No emails will be accepted for proposal submission.
4. **Electronic Media Proposal File Formats and Naming:** Proposers shall submit one (1) electronic version of the Technical Proposal and one (1) electronic version of the Price Proposal on a removable device (e.g., USB or thumb drive). The following table provides the required file formats and naming conventions for the electronic media files.

Proposal Naming and File Formats

Proposal Section	Recommended File Naming Convention	Required File Format
Technical Proposal • Inclusive of Attachments A, B, Cost Narrative • Inclusive of Proposer's Standard Travel and Expense Policy, and any Appendices • Inclusive of any Exhibits or Attachments	"(*Proposer Name*)" Technical Proposal	All files combined into one (1) searchable Adobe PDF
Attachment B – Functional and Technical Requirements	"(*Proposer Name*)" Proposal Response to Attachment B	To be submitted in Microsoft Excel format, in addition to above PDF format
Price Proposal Attachment C – Cost Worksheets	"(*Proposer Name*)" Price Proposal	To be submitted in Microsoft Excel format

5. **Amendment of Proposals:** Proposers may amend Proposals prior to the deadline set for receipt of Proposals. In the event an Addenda is issued and a Proposer has previously submitted a Proposal in

response to this RFP, the Proposer shall notify NNJB via email of the need to submit an amendment and clearly outline the reasons in writing. No amendments will be accepted after the deadline unless they are in response to a request of NNJB.

6. **Confidential Information:** Proposers shall clearly mark any information or graphics that are considered to be confidential as such within Proposal submissions. Any such designation as confidential shall be specific as to the portions of the proposal deemed confidential by the vendor, and not the entire Proposal response.

7. **Technical Proposal Organization Guidelines:** Proposers are instructed to insert the completed Tab forms (Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms) in the corresponding Tab sections as a part of their response to the Technical Proposal. **NNJB expects that Proposers will include additional proposal content beyond simply completing the forms and worksheets provided through this RFP.** The following table contains the organization guidelines for Proposal responses.

Technical Proposal Organization Guidelines

Proposal Tab No.	Proposal Section
Tab 1	Company Introduction and Relevant Experience
Tab 2	Software Solution
Tab 3	Application Architecture and Security
Tab 4	Project Approach and Implementation Methodology
Tab 5	Data Conversion
Tab 6	Testing and Quality Assurance
Tab 7	Training Plan
Tab 8	Project Schedule
Tab 9	Proposed Personnel and Team Organization
Tab 10	References
Tab 11	Cost Narrative
Tab 12	Sample Contracts, Service Level Agreements, and Warranty
Tab 13	Exceptions to Project Scope and Contract Terms
Tab 14	Please insert the response to Attachment B, Functional and Technical Requirements, following Attachment A in the electronic submittals as a consolidated PDF Technical Proposal.
Supplements	Any Proposer-submitted materials or documentation not specifically requested through this RFP may be included as Supplements to the Proposal in a separately marked “Supplements” tab of the proposal.

B. Content for Tabs 1 – 13

1. Tabs 1 – 13

Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms is a Word document that provides detailed instructions and requirements for the Proposer as it relates to the documents to be submitted as their RFP response and services required for the Project. Proposers are instructed to organize Proposals in a tabbed format and to insert the completed Tab forms (Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms) in the corresponding Tabs as a part of their response to the Proposal. In addition to the information captured through the questions and tables in Attachment A, Proposers are requested to provide complementary narrative information, diagrams, and images to help substantiate and support their proposal response to each Tab section. Proposers are directed to Attachment A, which includes forms, tables, and questions, including the cost narrative that are to be completed by the Proposer and inserted into each applicable tab of the RFP response.

2. Attachment B: Tab 14

Attachment B – Functional and Technical Requirements/Capabilities is an Excel document that provides detailed requirements and capabilities related to software features and functions, as well as potential interfaces and data conversion requirements. This tab is to include Proposer's response as detailed in Attachment B – Functional and Technical Requirements/Capabilities, which is an Excel document to be filled out by the Proposer. **Proposers are to provide Attachment B in both Excel format, and also in PDF format appended to the responses to Attachment A – Proposal Response Forms.**

3. Proposal Supplements

Any Proposer-submitted materials or documentation not specifically requested through this RFP may be included as Supplements to the Proposal.

C. Price Proposal

The Price Proposal is contained in Attachment C – Cost Worksheets. Proposers shall not modify the worksheets in any way.

D. Evaluation Procedures

1. Only those proposals and bids submitted within the established deadline (SECTION 2. A.) shall be opened and reviewed for responsiveness. Proposals shall be open in accordance with the Navajo Nation Business Opportunity Act, 5 N. N. C. § 201 et seq.

2. Representatives from the Navajo Nation Business Regulatory Department, the Navajo Nation Purchasing Department (Office of the Controller) and NNJB will be present for the opening of sealed proposals and bids.

3. After each sealed proposal is opened, the content of the sealed envelope will be examined and reviewed for responsiveness to Bid #26-02-4284SB.

4. Proposals determined to be responsive to Bid# 26-02-4284SB will be evaluated on the criteria outlined under Section 5.D.5.

5. The following subsection outlines the intended proposal evaluation process NNJB has identified. NNJB reserves the right to deviate from this process at its own discretion, and to (i) negotiate any and all elements of the RFP, (ii) amend, modify, or withdraw the RFP, (iii) revise any requirements under the RFP, (iv) require supplemental statements of information from any Proposer, (v) extend the deadline for submission of Proposals, (vi) cancel, in whole or part, this RFP if NNJB deems it is in its best interest to do so, (vii) request additional information or clarification of information provided in any Proposal without changing the terms of the RFP, (viii) award this project in whole or in part to a vendor other than the highest scoring vendor based on the determination of the best overall value and/or fit for NNJB, and/or (ix) waive any portion of the selection process in order to accelerate the selection and negotiation with the top-ranked Proposer. NNJB may exercise the foregoing rights at any time without notice and without liability to any Proposer, or any other party, for expenses incurred in the preparation of responses hereto or otherwise.

   a. **Vendor Shortlist:** NNJB Evaluation Committee will initially review and evaluate each Proposal received to determine the Proposer's ability to meet the requirements of NNJB. The evaluation criteria described herein will be the basis for evaluation. The Evaluation Committee will determine the Proposers best suited to meet the needs of NNJB based on the scoring of the evaluation criteria. These Vendors will form the Vendor Shortlist.

   b. **Vendor Demonstrations**: NNJB, at its sole discretion, reserves the right to have system demonstrations with those Proposers on the Vendor Shortlist, or any other Proposer. Demonstrations may be conducted at County and Schools offices or via web conference. Demonstrations will involve a scripted demonstration. The schedule, scripts, and demonstration requirements will be provided with the invitation to participate in demonstrations. A Pre-Demonstration Vendor Teleconference will take place for those Vendors that have been shortlisted, and Proposers will have an opportunity to review the format of the demonstrations and ask questions related to procedure and specific demonstration scenarios. Vendors that are invited to participate in demonstrations are advised that the provided scripts must be strictly adhered to while presenting. Optional modules or functionality shall not be presented if they fall outside the scope of requested functionality or that functionality which has been proposed by the Proposers. The proposed version of the software must be shown, and must not include any software that is under development or in beta testing. Evaluation Committee members will view the demonstrations, and additional County and Schools staff may also be in attendance to observe and provide informal feedback.

   c. **Reference Checks:** NNJB may employ a process of contacting references provided through Proposers' proposals. This process may include teleconference meetings, web conferences, and in-person meetings with references. NNJB reserves the right to conduct reference checks at any point in the evaluation process, and to contact other known users of the proposed system(s) beyond just those references provided.

d. **Best and Final Offer and Request for Clarification:** A Best-and-Final-Offer process may be initiated if it is determined to be in the best interest of NNJB. Such process may be initiated following the identification of the Vendor Shortlist or at any other evaluation process step. Additional processes of scope and cost clarification may be employed as part of the evaluation process if it is deemed to be in NNJB's best interest.

E. Clarification and Discussion of Proposals

NNJB may request clarifications and conduct discussions with any Proposer that submits a Proposal, including requesting additional information. NNJB reserves the right to select the Proposal or Proposals that it believes is the most responsive as determined by NNJB Evaluation Committee, which will best serve NNJB business and operational requirements, considering the evaluation criteria set forth below. Proposers shall be available for a system demonstration to NNJB's staff on dates specified on page one or as otherwise requested by NNJB if selected for system demonstrations. Failure of a Proposer to respond to such a request for additional information, clarification, or system demonstrations may result in rejection of the Proposal. The initial evaluation may be adjusted because of a clarification under this section. NNJB reserves the right to waive irregularities in the Proposal content or to request supplemental information from Proposers.

F. Evaluation Criteria

As described in the preceding Evaluation process sub-section, NNJB intends to follow a cumulative approach to scoring based on key evaluation activities (e.g., scoring is conducted in a progressive manner, following various steps in the process). NNJB hereby reserves the right to evaluate, at its sole discretion, the extent to which each Proposal received compares to the stated criteria. Vendor proposals shall be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria, subject to variation at the sole discretion of NNJB:

Short-List Identification: NNJB intends to utilize the criteria presented in the table below, following the Evaluation Team's review of Proposals.

Short-List Identification Criteria

Criteria	Description	Points
Functionality	This criterion considers but is not limited to the following: • The Proposer's written responses to the Functional and Technical Requirements for proposed functional areas and overall software solution. • The ability for the proposed software to integrate with NNJB systems environment.	35
Technical	This criterion considers but is not limited to the following: • Alignment of the proposed software to NNJB's preferred technical specifications.	15

Criteria	Description	Points
	• The Proposer's written response to each Potential Interface. • The level of integration among proposed functional areas.	
Approach	This criterion considers but is not limited to the following: • The described approach to implement an enterprise system to achieve NNJB's goals and objectives. • The alignment of the proposed implementation timeline to NNJB's desired timeline. • The distribution of implementation tasks among NNJB and Proposer teams. • The proposed resources hours among NNJB and Proposer teams. • The Proposer's approach to key implementation tasks including but not limited to data conversion, testing, and training. • The Proposer's planned ongoing support and maintenance services.	25
Proposer Experience	This criterion considers but is not limited to the following: • The Proposer's experience delivering the services requested in the RFP. • The Proposer's experience with similar implementations for comparable organizations. • The Proposer's experience deploying comparable interfaces to NNJB's related applications.	20
Proposed Staff Experience	This criterion considers but is not limited to the following: • The experience of named staff delivering services requested in the RFP. • The experience of named staff with similar implementations for comparable organizations. • The qualifications of named staff to deliver the services requested in the RFP with a focus on business process optimization.	5

Finalists Identification: NNJB intends to utilize the criteria presented in the table below, following the demonstrations by Short-List Proposers.

Finalist Identification Criteria

Criteria	Description	Points
Functionality Demonstrated	This criterion considers new information learned through Proposer demonstrations including but not limited to the demonstrated user interface and user experience and the alignment of demonstrated functionality with preferred business processes.	15
Technical Capabilities	This criterion considers new information learned through the Technical Discussion as part of Proposer demonstrations as well as other sessions.	5
Approach Discussion	This criterion considers new information learned through the Implementation Approach Discussion as part of Proposer demonstrations as well as other sessions.	5
Experience Discussion	This criterion considers new information learned through the Company Overview Discussion as part of Proposer demonstrations as well as other sessions.	5
Reference Feedback	This criterion considers the feedback received from references related to the Proposer's performance in the implementation including meeting project objectives and timelines, as well as the knowledge, skills, and experience of implementation staff; capabilities of the software; and ongoing Proposer performance with support and maintenance.	20
Comparable References	This criterion considers the relevance of references related to organization size and location, structure of the organization, entity type (e.g. County and Schools/town/village), comparable scope, similar software version, and deployment model.	10

Cost Point Allocation: NNJB will evaluate cost proposals based upon this criteria. Cost points will be applied at the timing in the evaluation process as may determined by the Evaluation Team. NNJB reserves the right to review cost proposals at any stage in the process to ensure pricing is within internal budget planning ranges. Cost points may be refined or replaced in the event of a subsequent Request for Clarification or Request for Best and Final Offer (BAFO). Proposers should be aware of the applicable 6% Navajo Nation Sales Tax for services performed on the Navajo Nation.

Cost Point Criteria

Criteria	Description	Points
Cost	This criterion considers, as applicable, the price of the software licensing, services, and terms of any offered ongoing maintenance and support (including applicable service level agreements, disaster recovery, etc.)	40

Criteria	Description	Points
	proposed in response to the information solicited by this RFP. Proposers will be evaluated on their pricing scheme, as well as on their price in comparison to the other proposers. In evaluating cost, NNJB may evaluate on a fully loaded five-year or a fully loaded ten-year cost of ownership. Fully loaded is defined to include (but is not limited to): software purchase and implementation costs; ongoing support and service costs; hardware costs; and associated hardware support costs. NNJB reserves the right to add their own estimates of the costs (including any anticipated savings) associated with the required level of internal staffing (business users and IT staff) for implementation and for ongoing support, hardware and overhead costs and savings, and may rely on the Proposer's resource estimates as a basis for their calculations. Proposers of point solutions will be compared against other proposals for the respective functional area group.	

G. No Obligation, Right of Rejection, and Multiple Award

The inquiry made through this RFP implies no obligation on the part of NNJB. This RFP does not constitute an offer or a contract with any Proposer or other party. NNJB reserves the right to reject any or all Proposals, in whole or in part, and to waive any informality in proposals received, deemed to be in the best interest of NNJB or to accept or reject all or any part of any Proposal. Proposals deemed to be received from debarred or suspended Vendors will be rejected. NNJB may reject any Proposal that is not responsive to all of the material and substantial terms, conditions, and performance requirements of this RFP. NNJB further reserves the right to award all, part, or none of the components/functional areas included in this RFP. In addition, NNJB reserves the right to make one or more awards to competing Proposers for subsets of functionality as a result of this RFP. NNJB also reserves the right to refrain from making an award if it determines it to be in its best interest. NNJB reserves the right to abandon the Project and/or to re-advertise and solicit other Proposals. NNJB reserves the right to create a Project of lesser or greater expense than described in this RFP or the Proposer's reply, based on the component prices or scope submitted. NNJB reserves the right to cancel this solicitation or to change its scope if it is considered to be in the best interest of NNJB.

H. Offer Held Firm

Unless otherwise specified, all bids/proposals submitted shall be valid for a minimum period of 180 calendar days following the date established for receiving bids/proposals. At the end of the 180 calendar days the bid/proposal may be withdrawn at the written request of the bidder/proposer. If the bid/proposal is not withdrawn at that time, it remains in effect until an award is made or the solicitation is cancelled.

I. Contract Negotiation

After final evaluation, NNJB may negotiate with the Proposer(s) of the highest-ranked Proposal. If any Proposer fails to negotiate in good faith, NNJB may terminate negotiations and negotiate with the Proposer of the next highest-ranked Proposal or terminate negotiations with any or all Proposers. If contract negotiations are commenced, they may be held via teleconference. If contract negotiations are held, the Proposer will be responsible for all of Proposer's costs including, without limitation, its travel and per diem expenses and its legal fees and costs.

J. Failure to Negotiate

If the selected Proposer:

1. Fails to provide the information required to begin negotiations in a timely manner
2. Fails to negotiate in good faith
3. Indicates it cannot perform the contract within the designated timeframes or within budgeted funds available for the Project
4. If the Proposer and NNJB, after a good-faith effort, cannot come to terms; then

NNJB may terminate negotiations with the Proposer initially selected and commence negotiations with the next highest-ranked Proposer. At any point in the negotiation process, NNJB may, at its sole discretion, terminate negotiations with any or all Proposers.

K. Contract Type

The contract resulting from this RFP shall be in form and content satisfactory to NNJB and shall include, without limitation, the terms and conditions provided for in this RFP and any sample agreement provided by NNJB, and such other terms and conditions as NNJB deems necessary and appropriate. The resulting contract from this RFP shall be a not-to-exceed based contract, subject to the Payment Terms identified in Attachment A - Cost Narrative for the various cost types.

The standard of performance for the contract resulting from this RFP shall be in accordance with the highest applicable standards in the financial information software industry. The initial contract price will be based on prices submitted by the Selected Proposer, subject to contract negotiations with NNJB, and shall remain firm for the initial term of the contract. Price adjustments may be negotiated at the request of either party in the extension periods with mutual agreement of the parties. A party proposing a price change in an extension period must notify the other party at least one-hundred eighty (180) days prior to the commencement of any extension period.

L. Contract Changes

Written requests for price changes, during the implementation process or thereafter, resulting from a change of scope, as initiated or requested by NNJB, must be submitted in writing to NNJB via Change Order. Any increase will be based on the Contractor's actual cost increase only, as shown in written documentation. All Change Order requests must be in writing, must not constitute increases in profit,

and must contain data establishing or supporting the increase in cost. At the option of NNJB, (1) the request may be granted; (2) the Change Order may be modified to include a greater, or lesser, scope; or (3) NNJB and Proposer may continue with the Contract without change. NNJB will accept or reject all such written requests within ninety (90) days of the date of receipt of Contractor's request for price increase or receipt of proper written documentation, whichever is later.

If a price increase is approved, NNJB will issue an amendment or change order to the contract specifying the date the increase will be effective. All Services and related accessories are to be billed at prices in effect at the time the service was rendered or order was placed. If a price increase is rejected, the Contractor will be notified and, at the option of NNJB, the Contract may be (1) cancelled and the solicitation may be re-advertised; or (2) continued without change.

All other Contract changes will be effective only on written agreement signed by both parties.

M. Contract Approval

NNJB's obligation will commence only following NNJB Commission's approval of a Contract and the parties' execution of the Contract. Upon written notice to the Contractor, NNJB may set a different starting date for the Contract. NNJB will not be responsible for any work done or expense incurred by the Contractor or any subcontractor, even such work was done or such expense was incurred in good faith, if it occurs prior to the Contract start date set by NNJB.

End of Scope of Work & Specifications for Bid# 26-02-4284SB

NAVAJO NATION CERTIFICATION
Regarding Non-Collusion

Consultant/Project Name	Work Location

In accordance with Navajo Nation Procurement Act, 12 N.N.C. §§ 301-80, Applicant, in either its present form or in any other identifiable capacity, certifies and acknowledges the following:

1. Applicant is submitting an offer that is genuine and not collusive or a sham to the Navajo Nation for the above-named Project;
2. Applicant is fully informed regarding the preparation and required content of its offer, including all pertinent circumstances governing submission of its offer to the Navajo Nation;
3. Applicant has in no way colluded, conspired; connived; or agreed, directly or indirectly, with any other entity, offeror, or person regarding the proposed contract for the Project, to:
   a. submit a sham offer to the Navajo Nation, or
   b. refrain from submitting an offer to the Navajo Nation;
4. Applicant has not in any manner, directly or indirectly, sought by agreement or collusion, or communication or conference, with any other entity, offeror, or person, to:
   a. fix any price or fee relating to its offer or of any other entity, offeror, or person, or
   b. fix any price, overhead, profit, reimbursement, or cost element of its offer, or that of any entity, offeror, or person;
5. Applicant has not, through any collusion, conspiracy, connivance, or unlawful written or oral agreement, secured any advantage against the Navajo Nation or against any other entity, offeror, or person interested in the proposed contract for the Project;
6. that the individual named below is authorized to represent Applicant for purposes of the declarations in this certification, and that all such declarations are made on behalf of Applicant and all of its owners, partners, officers, members, employees, officials, agents, or parties-in-interest;
7. all statements set forth herein, and in its offer submitted to the Navajo Nation, are true; and
8. that, if the Navajo Nation determines this executed Certification is untrue or not wholly accurate, the Navajo Nation shall have grounds terminate the contract award or contract and pursue other legal remedies, at the Navajo Nation's discretion.

Applicant Name	Printed name individual signing on Applicant's behalf
Applicant Address	Title of individual signing on Applicant's behalf
Applicant Address	Signature of individual signing on Applicant's behalf
Applicant Address	Date

NAVAJO NATION CERTIFICATION

Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Contracting Eligibility

Consultant/Project Name	Project/Work Location

1. Applicant acknowledges, in accordance with the Navajo Nation Procurement Act, 12 N.N.C. §§ 301 *et seq.*, as amended from time to time, to the best of its knowledge, that Applicant, in either its present form or in any other identifiable capacity, has not:
   a. been convicted in any jurisdiction of the commission of a criminal offense incident to obtaining, or attempting to obtain, a public or private contract or subcontract, or in the performance of such contract or subcontract;
   b. been convicted in any jurisdiction of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, receiving stolen property, or any other offense indicating a lack of business integrity or business honesty, which currently, seriously, and directly affects responsibility as a Navajo Nation contractor;
   c. been convicted in any jurisdiction under any antitrust statute arising out of the submission of offers;
   d. violated contract provisions, such as having:
      i. deliberately failed, without good cause, to perform in accordance with the contract specifications, purchase descriptions, or within the time limit provided in the contract; or
      ii. a recent record of failure to perform, or of unsatisfactory performance, with the terms of any contract;
   e. engaged in any other cause so serious and compelling as to affect Applicant's responsibility as a Navajo Nation Contractor, including debarment or suspension by the Navajo Nation or another government.
2. Applicant certifies that the individual named below is authorized to represent Applicant for purposes of the declarations in this certification, and that all such declarations are made on behalf of Applicant and all of its owners, partners, officers, members, employees, officials, agents, or parties-in-interest;
3. Applicant acknowledges that, if the Navajo Nation determines that this executed Certification is untrue or not wholly accurate, the Navajo Nation shall have grounds to terminate the procurement award or executed contract and pursue other legal remedies, at the Navajo Nation's discretion.
4. Applicant certifies that, to the best of its knowledge, it is eligible to do business with the Navajo Nation in its present form or in any other identifiable capacity pursuant to 12 N.N.C. §§ 1501-16 and 5 N.N.C. §§ 201-380.
5. Applicant acknowledges that per 12 N.N.C. § 1505, it will not be eligible to contract with the Navajo Nation if deemed ineligible by the appropriate department or entity of the Navajo Nation which receives the Applicant's request for consideration for a business opportunity.

Applicant Name	Printed name individual signing on Applicant's behalf
Applicant Address	Title of individual signing on Applicant's behalf
Applicant Address	Signature of individual signing on Applicant's behalf
Applicant Address	Date

Certificate of Liability Insurance

See the Attachments pane in Adobe Acrobat Reader to open Attachment w9 2024.