



Request for Information

REGARDING: REMOTE VIDEO
SERVICES PILOT INITIATIVE

RFI # IT-2020-65-RB

RESPONSES DUE: June 18, 2020
3:00 P.M. (PDT)



**JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA**

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

1. Introduction

The Judicial Branch of California (Judicial Council), via its administrative office, seeks to design, build, and launch a pilot project in California courts to enable remote appearances by parties, counsel, and witnesses for noncriminal court proceedings.

California's court system is the largest in the nation, serving a population of over 39 million. Every year, millions of Californians come to a courthouse, whether to serve as a juror, seek a restraining order, resolve a traffic citation, or litigate a case. Technology can provide a less expensive and more effective way for parties and counsel to make court appearances.

In 2014, Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye established The Commission on the Future of California's Court System (Futures Commission) to examine how California court operations could be improved and streamlined. The Commission provided a key recommendation to press forward with remote video appearance for most noncriminal court proceedings.

In 2018, the Judicial Council's Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) was tasked with the above charge and has launched Phase 2 of the Remote Video Services Workstream. The vision is to design, develop and deploy a solution that is intended to serve as the formal pilot of remote video appearances. As conceived, this phase would include the identification of pilot sites, preparation for the pilots, conduct of pilots, evaluation, and development of implementation and training guides for courts that followed the pilots.

2. Current Situation

Court hearings and related appearance by counsel and parties are conducted daily by telephone in courts throughout California. Statutes and rules of court currently permit granting a request for telephonic appearances at non-evidentiary hearings in most civil cases including unlawful detainer and probate matters, unless a court finds good cause to require a personal appearance.

For limited and unlimited civil motions, rule 3.670 of the California Rules of Court is specifically intended to "promote uniformity," allow parties to "appear by telephone," and presumptively allow for telephonic appearances in certain circumstances. The use of video or digital appearances is not clearly encouraged in statute and rule. Although the Legislature has granted the authority for use of video (see Gov. Code, § 70630), it has done so only through a code authorizing fees.

Also, Government Code section 70630 does not provide a limitation on video appearances by case type and instead, on plain read, provides broad authority to the court to make video conferencing available.

Finally, video appearances are already authorized for title IV-D hearings per rule 5.324 of the California Rules of Court. Under that rule, telephone appearance is defined such that it includes appearances by “videoconferencing” (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.324(b)).

The ITAC Workstream reviewed the issue, and although section 367.5 does not include small claims and some civil petitions (as defined) in the blanket authorization for telephonic appearance, it grants the Judicial Council broad authority to expand this authorization. Individual courts would need to evaluate how to balance this generalized authority for video with the existing limitation on small claims cases for telephonic appearances.

3. REMOTE VIDEO SERVICES PILOT INITIATIVE VISION

This Request for Information (RFI) seeks to identify entities and institutions that can partner with the branch and revolutionize the provision of remote video services in California courts. Key outcomes for the initiative will be:

1. Phase 1: 20 courtrooms are deployed in up to 5 courts by early FY 2020-21
2. Phase 2: Another 20 courtrooms are deployed in up to 5 courts by end of FY2020-21

The envisioned solution will encompass the following at a minimum:

1. State of the art video technology for remote video services
2. Remote video equipment provider services, including:
 - a. Equipment (including any software to run the system)
 - b. Installation of equipment
 - c. Implementation services
 - d. Equipment training
 - e. Maintenance (for the full solution)
 - f. Support
3. Requirements for the network infrastructure necessary to implement the solution (for the Pilot Court and Judicial Council), using existing LAN/WAN infrastructure

The California judicial branch envisions a multi-phased project to steadily increase remote video services capabilities incorporated in the solution. We seek an agile deployment strategy that will quickly coalesce the features and functions that are available today, and rapidly deploy a suite of significant enhancements to deliver more complex services and integrations on a predetermined roll-out schedule.

The envisioned solution will comprise the following three main areas:

- A. Equipment Requirements**
- B. Functional Requirements**
- C. Technical Requirements**

Today, some or all of the above requirements may be met in disparate courts, other locations and deployments. The aim of the envisioned portal is not to hard-code a rigid statewide system, but rather to integrate and connect services into an easy-to-use user-centric front-end, where hand-offs to various courts across jurisdictions happens seamlessly.

Finally, as background, the Chief Justice of California recently commissioned a special committee to provide recommendations for modernizing the judicial branch. The final report of the **“Commission on the Future of California’s Court System”** can be found [here](#).

4. Information Requested

The California judicial branch is interested in architects, integrators, and developers who can envision and offer solutions to help us launch an optimal remote video services solution for California courts.

Today, there are several strategic and tactical technology projects underway to help modernize the judicial system-

- A Voice to Text initiative is underway to enhance access in multiple languages conveniently, without court users having to wait for an interpreter, family member, or friend to translate for them, allow court staff to print out the conversation for later reference by the court user and to serve as reference of the information given.
- An Intelligent Chat initiative is underway to provide more interactive assistance for court users, enable search on multiple court webpages to identify information, forms, or services and increase court efficiency in triaging self-help assistance and answering frequently asked questions.
- A Business Intelligence/Data Analytics using Identity Management initiative is underway to deliver standards, strategies, and policies for statewide identity management; automating and streamlining how data is collected and aggregated, and using data analytics to help measure key performance indicators
- A new Forms Modernization initiative is underway to research and strategize how today’s PDF forms can be modernized to better interact with online case management systems throughout the state.

The aim of this current project is to design, architect, and deliver a remote video solution that will leverage and integrate aspects of the above initiatives, as well as propose new and innovative approaches to better address the specific needs of California courts

Respondents may choose to respond to one, some, or all of the following high-level requirements. At this time, we are most interested in learning about what capabilities and approaches exist in the marketplace, and the general costs associated with those capabilities. Note that estimated costs are for Judicial Council planning and information gathering only.

A. Equipment Requirements

Requirement Category	Requirement Description	Mandatory/ Preferred/ Optional	Capability (Y/N) (Please describe if Yes)	Estimated Cost or pricing model
Overview	The vendor's solution shall be no cost to the Judicial Branch.	Mandatory		
	The vendor's solution shall be comprised of the most effective state of the art solution with the best value that meets the requirements	Mandatory		
Courtroom Equipment	<p>Vendor shall provide a solution that meets the acceptance criteria defined in requirements including-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State of the art video technology for remote video services 2. Remote video equipment provider services, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Equipment (including any software to run the system) b. Installation of equipment c. Implementation services d. Equipment training e. Maintenance (for the full solution) f. Support 3. Requirements for the network infrastructure necessary to implement the solution (for the Pilot 	Mandatory		

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION:
 REMOTE VIDEO SERVICES PILOT INITIATIVE
 RFI# IT-2020-65-RB

	Court and Judicial Council), using existing LAN/WAN infrastructure			
	Equipment shall be installed in multiple courtrooms and be readily portable between locations. Courtrooms can either be located within the same court, or within different courts across different jurisdictions.	Mandatory		
	<u>Criteria 1:</u> Equipment originally designed for video remote and audio remote only if video remote not available.	Preferred		
	<u>Criteria 2:</u> Equipment which can be modified or paired with other equipment and work simultaneously	Preferred		
	<u>Criteria 3:</u> High end video conferencing equipment (e.g., CODEC C60 , EX60s/EX90s or better). Simultaneous functionality is preferred.	Preferred		
	<u>Criteria 4:</u> Software end point video conferencing (e.g., like JabberVideo, Skype business) which can run on any computer. Simultaneous functionality is preferred.	Preferred		
	<u>Criteria 5:</u> Fresno-type on premise solution as described in <i>Appendix A</i>	Preferred		

B. Functional Requirements

Requirement Category	Requirement Description	Mandatory/ Preferred/ Optional	Capability (Y/N) <i>(Please describe if Yes)</i>	Estimated Cost or pricing model
Overview	The vendor's Remote Video solution, including equipment, shall be no cost to the Judicial Branch.	Mandatory		
	The vendor shall have the capability to support up to 20 courtrooms during the assessment program, and up to 40 courtrooms for future purchases, upon acceptance after the assessment period.	Mandatory		
	Vendor shall monitor progress for any significant operational failures and need for additional training.	Mandatory		
	Vendor to provide scheduling software.	Optional		
Users	Remote Video solutions shall support the following participants: - Litigants - Attorneys - Judges - Local Courtroom Staff - Court staff	Mandatory		
Training	Vendor shall collaborate as needed with the Remote Video Services Pilot PM and the Court PM(s), to provide training on use of specific equipment to be used in the assessment program and embedded scheduling tools and protocols, evaluation survey completion as appropriate, and troubleshooting protocols. Vendor to specify the frequency and method of training.	Mandatory		
	Vendor shall deliver training after equipment is made operational. At the Judicial Council's discretion,	Mandatory		

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION:
 REMOTE VIDEO SERVICES PILOT INITIATIVE
 RFI# IT-2020-65-RB

	<p>trainees may include but are not limited to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Judicial officers - Equipment operators - Court room staff - Information Technology staff 			
<p>Data Collection</p>	<p>Vendor to collaborate with the Judicial Council in data collection. The following data points shall be collected as required by the IT project manager:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protection of Due process Rights - Participant satisfaction - The effectiveness of a variety of available technologies - A general cost-benefit analysis based on the above data along with cost savings and equipment costs. This should consider scalability and replicability of equipment types and the pilot environment. Consider use of a cost-avoidance model (i.e. avoid travel cost etc.) <p>Include an analysis of the increase in parties and witnesses served by remote video due to the decrease in travel time and elimination of geographical availability issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cross assignments - if applicable - Scheduling - if applicable - Cost efficiencies related to cross assignments - if applicable 	<p>Mandatory</p>		

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION:
 REMOTE VIDEO SERVICES PILOT INITIATIVE
 RFI# IT-2020-65-RB

	Survey tools must be developed prior to the start of the pilot training and as early as possible to allow courts already using Remote Video outside of the pilot to begin collecting data.	Optional		
	Participants to be surveyed include: - Judges - Local Court Staff & Coordinators - Equipment handlers			
Evaluation	Vendor shall collaborate with Remote Video Services Pilot PM and Court PM(s) to conduct interim review to determine if any equipment is failing. Vendor shall then work with to fix equipment and/or resolve any issues.			
Technical Support	Vendor shall provide maintenance and technical support/help desk during the Court's regular business hours.	Mandatory		
Integrations	Vendor's Remote Video Solution shall integrate with Virtual Court environment currently in use at courts (e.g., CourtCall, CMS, other systems etc.)			

C. Technical Requirements

Area	Requirement Description	Mandatory/ Preferred/ Optional	Capability (Y/N) (Please describe if Yes)	Estimated Cost or pricing model
Equipment	The vendor's Remote Video solutions shall build on existing infrastructure	Mandatory		
	The vendor's Remote Video solutions shall allow for point to point intra-court, inter-court, and court to external participant remote video services	Mandatory		
	Equipment must be portable/mobile and may be moved to different courtrooms for the duration of the assessment.	Mandatory		
	Equipment must have the ability to provide a separate and secure audio/video channel for confidential attorney-client communications.	Mandatory		
	Equipment must meet the following technical minimum requirements: Reliability - system to work all of the time and every time Quality - business-quality audio and video to ensure appropriate due process	Mandatory		
	Equipment should meet the following technical minimum requirements: Interoperability - ability to switch among providers or use multiple providers easily: - Use non-proprietary video and audio technical standards	Preferred		

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION:
 REMOTE VIDEO SERVICES PILOT INITIATIVE
 RFI# IT-2020-65-RB

	- Use widely available video and audio technical standards			
	Product offering must provide at least 720p-30FPS grade video, with multi-channel audio or better.	Mandatory		
	Audio signals in the 8 to 20khz range shall be reliably reproduced.	Preferred		
Network Infrastructure	The vendor shall build its Remote Video solution network infrastructure using the existing LAN/WAN infrastructure	Mandatory		
	The vendor to provide network design specifications for its Remote Video product offering that does not alter the security posture of the court's network.	Mandatory		
	Design specification shall include network security specifications.	Mandatory		
	Design specifications shall include bandwidth specifications that scale for users and include options for different CODECS to reduce network impact.	Mandatory		
	Vendor to provide sample QoS settings for optimum video and voice quality.	Mandatory		
Scalability	System shall provide options to scale vertically or horizontally to allow for increased adoption.	Mandatory		
	Remote Video solution shall be scalable to accommodate court size, court users, data volume, and internet users.	Mandatory		

Security	Remote Video solution shall be secure and meet the guidelines set forth the NIST SP800-53 standards for the back end	Mandatory		
	The system must support a secure communication channel to protect communications and document transfers.	Optional		
Monitoring	System shall provide diagnostic and monitoring functionality.	Mandatory		

5. Questions

If you have questions regarding the requirements listed above or the process to respond to this Request for Information, please email your questions to the Judicial Council of California (“JCC”) at Solicitation@jud.ca.gov (“Solicitations Mailbox”) prior to 3:00 p.m. (PDT) on **June 4, 2020**. The RFI number must be included in the subject line of any communication. All questions and answers will be posted on JCC’s website at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/rfps.htm> at or before June 9, 2020 (estimate only). Note that questions become part of the public file and are subject to disclosure; you are accordingly cautioned not to include any proprietary or confidential information in your questions.

6. How to Submit Your Response

A. Submittal Information

All submissions are due by **3:00 p.m. (PDT) on June 18, 2020**. All interested parties should submit an electronic version of the entire response marked “Response to RFI # IT-2020-65-RB”:

Judicial Council of California
 Attn: Bid Desk,
 Procurement/Admin Div
 455 Golden Gate
 Avenue, 6th Floor,
 San Francisco, CA
 94102-3688

Submissions should be transmitted by email to the solicitations mailbox at Solicitation@jud.ca.gov (“Solicitations Mailbox”). The RFI number must be included in the subject line of any communication.

B. Response Format and Content

The response should include the following:

1) Cover Sheet, including:

- o Company Name
- o Company Address
- o Name and Contact Information for Company Representative, including:
- o Telephone Numbers
- o E-mail Address
- o Signature of Representative

2) Brief company description; size of company; years in business; type of entity.

3) Response to Section 4: Respondents may choose to respond to one, some, or all of the high-level requirements in Section 4.

The submission should include:

- The general cost estimate for all services described in Section 4 above
- A general outline of services provided by the company to achieve the considerations as described in Section 4 above, with the number of hours needed to complete the services, the number of personnel involved, and other requirements needed to achieve the work.

8. Information Exchange

After the Judicial Council staff has reviewed the submitted material, your firm may be contacted and asked to participate in an information exchange with Council staff. The objective of this is to gain further understanding of your proposed approach or solution.

Information exchange can take the form of additional phone conversations, in-person meetings, and/or application demonstrations (in-person or via the web).

It is important to note that the Judicial Council of California will not reimburse you for any expenses, travel and/or time etc., regarding information exchange activities.

9. Disposition of Materials and Confidential or Proprietary Information

All materials submitted in response to this RFI will become the property of the Judicial Council of California and will be subject to disclosure pursuant to applicable provisions of the California Public Contract Code and rule 10.500 of the California Rules of Court. Information that is submitted will be disclosed in response to applicable public records requests. Such disclosure will be made regardless of whether the submittal (or portions thereof) is marked “confidential,” “proprietary,” or otherwise, and regardless of any statement in the submittal (a) purporting to limit the Judicial Council’s right to disclose information in the proposal, or (b) requiring the Judicial Council to inform or obtain the consent of the vendor prior to the disclosure of the submittal (or portions thereof). Any submittal that is password protected, or contains portions that are password protected, cannot be accepted or considered. Companies are accordingly cautioned not to include confidential, proprietary, or privileged information in the submittal.

10. Disclaimer

This RFI is issued for judicial branch information and planning purposes only and does not constitute a solicitation. Responses to the RFI will not be returned. A response to this notice will not be considered an offer and cannot be accepted by the Judicial Council of California to form a binding contract. Responders are solely responsible for all expenses associated with responding to this RFI.

APPENDIX A

For reference only - Minimum Technology Guidelines for Remote Video implementation of a similar system at Superior Court of County of Fresno

1. Video Endpoint (at Remote location)
 - a. CAMERA: A standalone or integrated camera that supports a minimum resolution of 720p.
 - b. DISPLAY: Tablet (8" and above), or 15" minimum for external laptop display or monitor display. Mobile devices should be motionless during remote video session
 - c. COMPUTER/LAPTOP: Should be less than 4 years old.

2. Video Endpoint (in Courtroom)
 - a. LOCATIONS: A camera shall be in place, aimed directly at the defendant, from either a computer or tablet device. In addition, an external component can be connected to the bench computer allowing participant to see the judge. Cameras (or Tablets) covering the Public Defender, District Attorney and courtroom can be used to give a better remote video experience.
 - b. CAMERA: A standalone or integrated camera that supports a minimum resolution of 720p if using a desktop computer or laptop. If a tablet is being used (e.g. iPad, Android or Windows based tablet such as a surface), an integrated camera that supports a minimum resolution of 720p.
 - c. DISPLAY FOR DEFENDENT: A display monitor connected to a computer, laptop display or tablet can be used for viewing, depending on technology available at the court.
 - d. DISPLAY FOR COURTROOM: The display shall be a display monitor of an appropriate size, as determined by the judge in the courtroom. It should be setup as a duplicated display from either the desktop computer, laptop or tablet. Wired or wireless video transmissions can be arranged from the endpoint to the large LCD using technologies such as (wireless VGA transmission, Apple TV, Miracast, etc.)
 - e. COMPUTER/LAPTOP: Should be less than 4 years old.
 - f. TABLET: Should be either an Apple iPad, Android OS or Windows based tablet, Chromebook, PixelSlate or an equivalent device that is less than 4 years old.

3. Endpoint Bandwidth

Each connecting device shall be provisioned or have access to a minimum amount of bandwidth to the Internet to support 720p video and allow for multiple video participants to be aggregated and shown on each endpoint in a “Hollywood squares” arrangement.

4. Network Connectivity

It is recommended that QoS be implemented/enabled on each court’s network to prioritize video traffic, helping to prevent video jitter and pixilation. Similarly, if VoIP is being used rather than older PBX, CENTREX or PSTN direct lines, audio traffic shall be prioritized as the most critical network packets due to the importance of audio clarity. The size of a court’s network connection should provide enough sustainable bandwidth to facilitate an active remote video session, in addition to general day-to-day Internet traffic consumed by the court.

5. Security

All participants within a Remote Video session shall use SSL encryption for initial video connectivity to the head-end conferencing system. This is accomplished and enforced by the head-end system using the HTTPS protocol and a 2048-bit SSL certificate provided via a valid certificate authority (CA). Additionally, audio connections must be authenticated through a meeting code, ensuring that “barge-ins” do not occur and that each remote video session has a unique access code.

6. Audio

- a. Wired or wireless phones can be used by courtroom participants
- b. Phones should at a minimum be provided with PSTN or PBX dial-tone. VoIP is preferred and adds reliability and preservation of clear audio.
- c. Standard G.711 and G.729 CODECS are acceptable. G.722 wideband CODEC is not required and is converted automatically to narrowband (e.g. G.711 and G.729) by VoIP systems for “off-net” calls traversing the PSTN. This standard has been a common practice for decades and works well for numerous calls made around the globe each day.
- d. Wired and wireless phones must have the ability to allow for the use of a good quality headset with an adjustable mic for optimum voice clarity

Fresno Superior Court’s Cart Solution

Fresno Superior Court’s cart solution was primarily based on using equipment that the court currently possessed. The LCD TV/DVR was repurposed from upgrading the Jury area with larger TV’s. The mobile cart is a fully contained system that requires a single power outlet.

Qty	Equipment	Description
6	Cisco Wireless phone (7921 or newer)	Judge, DA, PD, Def, CSR, Public
5	Plantronics headsets	excluding public
5	Plantronics to 2.5mm adapter	
1	LCD TV/DVD combo (26")	For courtroom to view active speaker
1	Cart w/powerstrip	Holds all equipment - portable
1	Tablet (Surface Pro 3)	Courtroom Camera / Displays active speaker
3	iPad Tablets	Def, DA and PD
3	iPad Keyboard Case	Def, DA and PD
1	HD camera	Camera for Judges PC
1	HDMI cable	Surface-Pro 3 to TV
1	Mini Display to HDMI	Surface-Pro 3 to TV
2	Power strips	

Assumptions:

- Court has a wireless infrastructure solution in place
- Court is using a Cisco VoIP phone system
- Using a conferencing solution that supports webcams and tablets
- Remote user has sufficient internet bandwidth at their location for Audio and video conferencing

Pictures of Fresno Superior Court's Remote Video solution

Cart with all components



View of Judges PC



View of Judges Bench



View of the Defendants Bench with tablet



ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Center for Legal and Court Technology, Report to the Administrative Conference of the United States: Best Practices for Using Video Teleconferencing for Hearings and Related Proceedings, http://www.acus.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Final_Best%2520Practices%2520Video%2520Hearings_11-03-14.pdf (as of May 21, 2019).

Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., Video Remote Technology in California Courts: Survey and Findings (Dec. 2014), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/02-ctac-20141205-materials-VRTsurveyandreport.pdf>

National Association for Presiding Judges and Court Executive Officers, Study of State Trial Courts Use of Remote Technology (Apr. 2016), <http://napco4courtleaders.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Emerging-Court-Technologies-9-27-Bridenback.pdf>

State Justice Institute, Use of Telephonic and Video Conferencing Technology in Remote Court Appearances: A Supplemental Report to a State Justice Institute (SJI) Funded Project (June 20, 2016), <https://www.ncsc.org/~media/Microsites/Files/Civil%20Justice/UseTelephonicVideoTechnology.ashx>

Self-Represented Litigation Network, Remote Appearances of Parties, Attorneys and Witnesses: A Review of Current Court Rules and Practices (Mar. 2017), <https://www.srln.org/system/files%20/attachments/SRLN%20Remote%20Appearances%20Court%20Rules%20and%20Practices%20Report%204-2-17.pdf>

END OF FORM