

TO: POTENTIAL PROPOSERS

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts
Information Services Division

DATE: April 25, 2008

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: To issue **Addendum Number 1** to RFP #-OGC-2008-01-CT and, as set forth in the attached document: (1) to publish the AOC's Responses to Vendors' Questions, for those questions received by the deadline; and (2) to delete Section 7.1.1.6 from the RFP

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposal ("RFP") as posted at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/rfp/>:
Project Title: **Ten Years Later: Achieving Equal Justice for Women and Men in the California Courts**
RFP Number: **OGC-2008-01-CT**

SOLICITATIONS MAILBOX: solicitations@jud.ca.gov

DUE DATE & TIME FOR SUBMITTAL OF QUESTIONS: Deadline for submittal of questions pertaining to solicitation document was: **2:00 p.m. (Pacific Time) on April 22, 2008.**

PROPOSAL DUE DATE AND TIME: Proposals must be received by **5:00 p.m. (Pacific Time) on May 9, 2008.**

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals should be sent to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. OGC-2008-01-CT
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

(1) AOC Responses to Vendors' Questions

Question 1.

Under Phase I deliverables (section 4.3.1 of the RFP), does the California AOC envision three separate draft reports, or three drafts of the same report?

AOC Response to Question 1:

The AOC anticipates three drafts of the same report.

Question 2.

The RFP seems to envision the selection of research methods, pre-testing, direct research, analysis, and the drafting of a report all within a three-month time period (Phase I), with the latter two phases reserved for presentations, AOC review, and final drafting. Would the AOC consider moving the bulk of the research from Phase I to Phase II (leaving research design and pre-testing in Phase I) to allow a more even schedule for the project?

AOC Response to Question 2:

While the time frames stated in the RFP are normally somewhat negotiable, the Phase I deliverables are, in this instance, driven by the anticipated flow of funding for this study. Therefore, the AOC will not be able to substantially modify the schedule of deliverables, as suggested.

Question 3.

Other than the reports mentioned in section 2.9 of the RFP, has the California AOC undertaken any research projects that are relevant to the present project? If so, would it be possible to identify those?

AOC Response to Question 3:

No. The reports identified are most relevant to this project.

Question 4.

Does the California AOC have a cap or range in mind for the cost of this project that it is able to share?

AOC Response to Question 4:

The AOC estimates the total cost of services to complete the project specified in the RFP to range between \$185,000 to \$240,000.

Question 5.

Is there a statewide database that tracks case information (criminal and family cases)?

AOC Response to Question 5:

The Department of Justice can provide aggregate data or numbers with respect to restraining orders, but specific case information would not be available on a statewide level.

Question 6.

Would research staff on the current project have access to the data that was collected ten years ago, so that analyses could be conducted of how court practices have changed?

AOC Response to Question 6:

The 1996 report, *Achieving Equal Justice for Women and Men in the California Courts*, reflects the findings regarding the status of court practices at the time of the study. The original surveys and reports were not archived, so they are unavailable.

Question 7.

The RFP in Section 7.1.1.6 states that the proposal must "provide a minimum of five current California-based clients with similar Workers' Compensation claim volumes." What does this mean?

AOC Response to Question 7:

Section 7.1.1.6 was included in this RFP in error, and has been removed from the RFP.

(2) THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENT HAS BEEN DELETED AND REMOVED FROM SECTION 7.0, SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL:

~~7.1.1.6 — Provide a minimum of five (5) current California-based clients with similar Workers' Compensation claim volumes.~~

END OF ADDENDUM 1