

Vendor: SimpliGov

Page 9:

**b) Explain how your solution supports complex case structures such as Shell Case and Sub-Case, including data segregation.**

**Vendor Questions**

1. Can OFRA describe how Shell Case and Sub-Case structures are managed in the current environment today, including how data segregation and access boundaries are maintained across attorneys, parties, and case participants?

**A: Currently, OFRA’s case management activities are primarily managed through manual and semi-structured processes utilizing Office 365 tools, shared documentation repositories, and internal coordination practices. While a formal “Shell Case” and “Sub-Case” system does not exist today within a centralized application, operational workflows function similarly through administrative tracking and document organization practices.**

**A single legal matter may involve multiple parties, attorneys, children, and interdisciplinary participants. As a result, OFRA must manage varying levels of privileged and role-specific information across related case activities. Data segregation today is maintained primarily through manual controls, staff procedures, restricted document access, and role-based handling of sensitive information.**

**The future-state vision seeks to formalize this operational structure through a configurable case hierarchy model that supports parent/Shell Case relationships, related Sub-Cases or party-specific records, segregated privileged information, role-based access controls, configurable visibility rules, shared and restricted document management, and independent lifecycle tracking for related case entities.**

2. Which aspects of the current case structure and workflow model are working well today and should be preserved in a future solution?

**A: Although the current environment relies heavily on manual coordination, several operational concepts are considered valuable and should be preserved in a future solution, including flexibility in managing complex legal case relationships, the ability for multiple attorneys and stakeholders to collaborate across related matters, separation of sensitive or privileged information when appropriate, adaptability of workflows based on case type and legal circumstances, and human-centered coordination between legal, administrative, and interdisciplinary staff.**

**OFRA values operational flexibility and does not want future workflows to become overly rigid or restrictive. While automation and workflow efficiencies are important, OFRA also recognizes that certain operational and legal processes require human review, judgment, and decision-making. This includes situations where staff may need to request missing information, review and validate conflict checks, evaluate case-specific circumstances, and finalize attorney or case assignments based on professional judgment and operational context.**

**The future solution should support a balance between automation and human-centered decision points, allowing staff to intervene, review, approve, and manage exceptions where appropriate. The**

**solution should also support configurable workflows while improving consistency, visibility, automation, centralized tracking, and collaboration across related case activities.**

3. What operational challenges or limitations exist in the current approach to managing Shell Cases, Sub-Cases, and segregated case data?

**A: Current challenges primarily stem from the absence of a centralized, purpose-built case management platform. Operational limitations include heavy reliance on manual tracking processes, limited centralized visibility into related case activities, difficulty maintaining consistent privilege separation across documents and communications, inconsistent tracking of case status, assignments, and lifecycle events, manual coordination across attorneys and interdisciplinary participants, increased risk of duplicate data entry or fragmented information storage, limited reporting and analytics capabilities, and difficulty managing communication history and auditability across related matters.**

**OFRA's modernization initiative seeks to address these challenges through workflow automation, configurable permissions, centralized document management, improved reporting capabilities, and enhanced case relationship tracking.**

4. Are there additional capabilities OFRA would like to introduce related to case hierarchy management, privilege separation, lifecycle tracking, or cross-case visibility?

**A: Yes. Through stakeholder discovery sessions and current-state analysis, OFRA identified several operational themes and opportunities for improvement related to case hierarchy management, privilege separation, lifecycle tracking, workflow automation, and cross-case visibility.**

**OFRA is interested in exploring configurable capabilities that may include hierarchical case relationship management, parent/child or related-case linking, granular role-based and permission-based access controls, segregation of privileged or confidential information, workflow-driven lifecycle tracking, automated notifications and task management, cross-case visibility where operationally appropriate, audit history and activity tracking, centralized calendaring and deadline management, reporting and dashboard capabilities across related case records, and configurable security zones or restricted access areas.**

**OFRA also recognizes the importance of maintaining appropriate human review and decision-making within operational workflows, particularly in areas involving conflict review, assignment approvals, exception handling, and privileged case management.**

**OFRA recognizes that vendors may offer differing approaches to achieving these capabilities and welcomes recommendations based on industry best practices.**

#### **f) Explain integration capabilities including APIs and third-party systems.**

##### **Vendor Questions**

1. What third-party systems, platforms, or external applications does OFRA anticipate needing to integrate with as part of the modernization initiative (e.g., court systems, document repositories, calendaring tools, identity providers, communication platforms, or reporting systems)?

**A: At this time, OFRA has not finalized specific integration requirements. However, potential future integrations may include court-related systems such as Odyssey and/or external agency systems such as CYFD's FACTS/Impact system, depending on operational and technical feasibility.**

**Additional future integration considerations may include identity and access management providers, calendaring and scheduling tools, document management repositories, reporting platforms, and communication tools. OFRA is seeking a flexible and scalable solution architecture capable of supporting future integration needs as business and technical requirements evolve.**

2. Are there existing APIs, integration standards, or interoperability requirements that vendors should be aware of when proposing integration approaches?

**A: At this time, OFRA has not established formal API, interoperability, or integration standards specific to this initiative. However, OFRA anticipates that future integration requirements may emerge as the project matures. Accordingly, OFRA is interested in solutions that support modern API frameworks, configurable integration capabilities, industry-standard interoperability approaches, secure data exchange methods, and scalable architecture supporting future system connectivity.**

3. Which integrations are considered critical for initial go-live versus future-phase enhancements?

**A: At this time, OFRA has not identified any integrations that are considered mandatory for an initial implementation phase. Integration requirements will likely be refined during future planning, design, and implementation activities. OFRA anticipates that certain integrations may be evaluated as future-phase enhancements depending on operational priorities, funding, technical feasibility, and vendor capabilities.**

4. Are there known pain points or manual handoffs in the current environment that OFRA is specifically seeking to eliminate through system integrations?

**A: Yes. OFRA currently relies heavily on manual processes for document management, communication coordination, case tracking, and information sharing. Existing pain points include manual storage and retrieval of case documentation, fragmented information across repositories and communication channels, duplicate data entry and administrative effort, limited centralized visibility into case activities and status, and manual coordination of deadlines, assignments, and communications. OFRA's modernization goals include improving centralized access to case information, reducing manual administrative processes, improving workflow automation, and enhancing overall operational efficiency.**

#### **g) Describe your data migration approach from legacy systems.**

##### **Vendor Questions**

1. What legacy systems, repositories, shared drives, databases, or other data sources currently contain case-related information that OFRA anticipates migrating into the future platform?

**A: Currently, case-related information is primarily maintained within Office 365 environments, including SharePoint and other document repositories containing Word, Excel, PDF, and related business documents.**

**Depending on the capabilities of the selected solution, OFRA may require migration of relevant documentation and records from existing repositories into the future platform to support centralized case management and document access.**

2. Can OFRA provide an estimated volume of data expected to be migrated, including approximate record counts, document volumes, or storage size if available?

**A: At this time, OFRA has not completed a formal data inventory or sizing assessment and therefore cannot provide estimated record counts or storage volumes. Additional analysis and discovery activities would likely be required during future implementation planning.**

3. What data formats currently exist across legacy systems (e.g., structured databases, spreadsheets, PDFs, shared drive documents, email archives)?

**A: Current data and documentation primarily exist within standard Office 365 and Adobe Acrobat formats, including:**

- Microsoft Word documents (.doc/.docx)
- Excel spreadsheets (.xls/.xlsx)
- CSV files (.csv)
- PDF documents (.pdf)
- SharePoint-hosted files
- Email-based communications and attachments

**The current environment is largely document-driven and manually managed rather than supported by a structured legacy case management database.**

4. Has OFRA identified any known data quality, normalization, duplication, or retention challenges that vendors should consider as part of migration planning?

**A: Because the current environment relies heavily on manual document management and decentralized processes, OFRA anticipates that data normalization, duplicate records, inconsistent naming conventions, and document organization considerations may require evaluation during migration planning.**

**At this time, no formal data cleansing assessment has been completed. Vendors should assume that discovery, validation, and migration planning activities would likely be necessary as part of implementation.**

5. Does OFRA anticipate a one-time migration approach, phased migration strategy, or parallel-system transition period?

**A: A final migration strategy has not yet been determined and will likely depend on the selected solution, implementation approach, operational readiness, and vendor recommendations. However, OFRA anticipates that some level of phased onboarding and/or parallel operational period may be necessary during transition to ensure continuity of operations, user adoption, validation, and data accuracy throughout implementation.**