

Question 1:

Data warehouse integration. Section 4.3.A references communication with "the WJB data warehouse." Could the WJB describe the warehouse's general scope (which courts and source systems feed it), data refresh frequency, and the integration interfaces available to a solution provider (e.g., direct database access, APIs, scheduled extracts)? Does the WJB view the data warehouse as a preferred integration point for an RPA system relative to direct integration with the case management systems?

All district, chancery, and circuit court data are fully integrated into the data warehouse. Supreme Court data is not included, as it is managed through a separate SaaS platform. The data warehouse is refreshed daily on business days (Monday through Friday). Access to the data warehouse is limited to internal users only, with no external access permitted. Any API feeds or reports generated from the data warehouse are governed by established memoranda of understandings (MOUs).

The WJB views the data warehouse as the preferred integration point for an RFP system.

Question 2:

Existing system integration rights. Are there contractual, licensing, or technical constraints associated with FullCourt Enterprise or File & ServeXpress that would limit a third-party RPA solution's ability to integrate with those systems (e.g., API licensing, data access restrictions)? If known, what integration methods are currently licensed or available to the WJB? The WJB can integrate an RPA either directly with the case management systems (CMS) or through the data warehouse. While direct CMS integration can reduce reliance on internal IT development, it would require separate integrations for each CMS and coordination with additional vendors, increasing overall cost and complexity. Direct integration would also not eliminate the continued need for the data warehouse, as it remains essential for internal reporting and downstream data sharing with partner agencies. Given these factors, the data warehouse is currently the most practical and efficient integration point for RPA within the WJB environment.

Question 3:

ADA Title II alignment. Amendment No. 1 cites ADA Title II and WCAG 2.1 Level AA. Does the WJB intend the RPA system to serve as a primary means of conforming its remote public access services to the DOJ Title II rule, and does the WJB anticipate requiring accessibility conformance documentation (e.g., audit reports or an Accessibility Conformance Report/VPAT) in any future procurement? **Yes. Yes.**

Question 4:

Hosting models. Section 4.3.D references cloud-hosted deployment options. Is the WJB also interested in deployment models in which the system operates within WJB- or State-controlled infrastructure (self-hosted or hybrid), or should respondents assume vendor-hosted solutions are preferred? [The WJB prefers vendor-hosted solutions.](#)

Question 5:

Source code and licensing. Would the WJB like respondents to address source-code rights in their submissions—for example, open-source licensing, source code escrow, or perpetual license rights—as part of the data ownership and transition considerations described in Section 4.7?

Yes. The WJB requires assurance that, in the event of contract termination or vendor separation, the WJB will retain continued access to all data and maintain essential system functionality during any transition period. Respondents should describe the mechanisms they offer to provide this assurance.

Please include details on any available source-code rights, licensing models, escrow arrangements, or perpetual use options, along with any associated impacts on data ownership, ongoing system support, and the WJB’s ability to transition to a new solution in the future. These elements will be reviewed in greater depth if an RFP is issued.

Question 6:

Public fee policy. Sections 4.3.B–C describe free, registered, and pay-based access models. Has the WJB established a policy direction on whether baseline public access to court records should be free of charge (as with the Supreme Court's CTEF portal) or fee-based (as with the chancery court’s current system), or should respondents present options and trade-offs for each model? [Respondents can provide a range of options and potential trade-offs for each model to assist with the policy decision.](#)

Question 7:

Audio recordings. For the audio recordings referenced in Sections 1.2 and 4.3.K, could the WJB describe the recording systems currently in use across the district, chancery, and circuit courts, the typical file formats produced, and whether recordings are stored centrally or at individual courts? [The WJB utilizes a combination of locally hosted and cloud-based systems for court audio recording. Circuit courts use Liberty Court Recorder, with audio files stored on local servers at each individual court location, resulting in separate repositories for each court. Several district courts and the Wyoming Supreme Court also use Liberty Court Recorder and maintain their recordings in similar local environments. The chancery court uses the For The Record recording platform, with all recordings stored within the For](#)

The Record cloud environment. As a result, the WJB currently manages a hybrid model of locally stored and cloud-hosted recording repositories, with file formats varying by recording platform and configuration.

Question 8:

Relationship to RFI 2026-WJB-02. Does the WJB envision the RPA system (2026-WJB-01) and the Electronic Evidence Management System (2026-WJB-02) as separate systems, or is there interest in approaches where public access and evidence/exhibit management share a common platform or data integration layer? [The WJB is open to both approaches.](#)