

VENDOR QUESTION AND RESPONSE LOG

STAKEHOLDER DATA SYNTHESIS PROJECT

RFP No. EOP-1205

No.	DATE	REFERENCE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
1	Wed 1/18/2006 9:10 PM	p.4, 3.1	The contract performance dates are stated to be between January 2006 and July 2006, yet the estimated contract start date (p.3, 1.3.1) is March 1, 2006. Will the scope of work be changed and/or the timeline for task completion be revised given the shortened period of performance?	The timeline for this project remains very tight; deliverables (3.2.7 through 3.2.7.4) must be available for the Judicial Council's June 28-29, 2006, annual planning meeting. The AOC is willing to negotiate adjustments to the timeline for completion of <i>individual project tasks</i> (3.2.1-3.2.6) and may be willing to accept an interim – as opposed to “final” – report (3.2.7.3) in June.
2	Wed 1/18/2006 9:10 PM	p.5, 3.2.1	The contract start date is given as around March 1, 2006 and the first set of analyses are supposed to be completed by March 1, 2006. What revised completion date does the AOC have for completing the analysis of short term response plans mentioned in this task?	As indicated above, the AOC is willing to negotiate due dates for <i>all</i> project tasks listed at 3.2.1 through 3.2.6. However, deliverable dates listed at 3.2.7 through 3.2.7.4 cannot be changed. The referenced AOC short-term response plan report has been completed and can be made available to the selected researcher(s) immediately upon execution of a contract.
3	Wed 1/18/2006 9:10 PM	p.5, 3.2.1 and p.6, 3.2.5	How many advisory committees will have short term response plans (3.2.1) and recommendations for long term strategic planning priorities (3.2.5.) that need to be reviewed as part of the work on these two tasks?	13 advisory committees submitted response plans. Their responses have been consolidated into a single report that can be made available to researchers immediately upon execution of a contract. The report is 47 pages in length and lists approximately 166 individual responses/recommendations.
4	Wed 1/18/2006 9:10 PM	p.5., 3.2.1 and p.6, 3.2.5:	What are the names of all the advisory committees that will have short term response plans (3.2.1) and recommendations for long term strategic planning priorities (3.2.5.) that need to be reviewed as part of the work on these two tasks?	1. Access and Fairness AC; 2. AC On Civil Jury Instructions; 3. Civil & Small Claims AC; 4. Collaborative Justice Courts AC; 5. Court Executives AC; 6. Court Interpreters Adv. Panel; 7. Court Technology AC; 8. Criminal Law AC; 9. Family & Juvenile Law AC; 10. Governing Committee of the

No.	DATE	REFERENCE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
				Center for Judicial Education and Research; 11. Probate and Mental Health AC; 12. Traffic AC; 13. Trial Court Presiding Judges AC.
5	Wed 1/18/2006 9:10 PM	p.5-6, 3.2.1-3.2.6.	<p>What is the timeline for providing information to the contractor on the following six tasks that need analysis:</p> <p>3.2.1: Short term response plans from the Advisory Committees?</p> <p>3.2.2: Operational plans from the 58 trial courts?</p> <p>3.2.3: Other stakeholder data that need to be analyzed?</p> <p>3.2.4: High priority projects?</p> <p>3.2.5: Recommendations for long term strategic planning priorities?</p> <p>3.2.6: Phase 2 data from the Trust and Confidence in the California courts study?</p>	<p>3.2.1: The Short term response plan report is immediately available upon execution of a contract (see question 3 response).</p> <p>3.2.2: Trial Court Operational Plans: A Consolidated report will be available from the AOC's central database by March 10, 2006.</p> <p>3.2.3: "Other stakeholder data" includes a review and analysis of state & national trends likely to affect the administration of justice in CA. The selected researcher(s) must obtain this information independently; for example, the National Center for State Courts and others provide such information.</p> <p>3.2.4 AOC High priority projects report will be available by March 10, 2006.</p> <p>3.2.6 Phase-2 data will be made available beginning in April 2006 and continuing through early June.</p> <p>3.2.5 Recommendations are to be formulated – <i>by the selected researcher(s)</i> – via a comparison of the above-referenced data to the existing Strategic Plan for California's Judicial Branch (a gap analysis). It is probable that the concurrent Phase-2 project (being undertaken by separate researchers) will also yield recommendations.</p>

No.	DATE	REFERENCE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
6	Thu 1/19/2006 9:13 AM	Section 3.0 Scope of Services	Where are the AOC staff indicated in each of the Process steps located?	All AOC staff referenced in the RFP are housed in the AOC's San Francisco offices. Phase-2 researchers referenced at 3.2.6 are located in NY and NJ and will be available by telephone and will make occasional onsite visits to the AOC's SF offices.
7	Thu 1/19/2006 9:13 AM	Paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2	Given that the contract for these services will not be signed until March 1, 2006, please provide adjusted delivery dates for section 3.2	The AOC is willing to negotiate adjustments to the timeline for completion of <i>individual project tasks</i> (3.2.1-3.2.6) and may be willing to accept an interim – as opposed to “final” -- report (3.2.7.3) in June. However, deliverable <i>dates</i> listed at 3.2.7 through 3.2.7.4 cannot be changed.
8	Thu 1/19/2006 9:13 AM	Paragraph 3.2.6 (Process)	Who are the "Phase 2 Consultants"?	Public Agenda (NY) and Doble Research Associates, Inc. (NJ)
9	Thu 1/19/2006 9:13 AM	Paragraph 3.2.7.4	Who participates in the Judicial Council annual planning meeting?	Judicial Council Members (27); Judicial Council Advisory Committee Chairs and Co-Chairs (approx. 20); leadership of State Bar of California; AOC Executive staff (approx 20); other invited stakeholder guests (reps from Chamber of Commerce; legislators, etc.).
10	Thu 1/19/2006 9:13 AM	Paragraph 5.7.2	What additional data, beyond what has previously been collected, is required for this analysis and synthesis? If this is to be determined by the consultant, what criteria and/or constraints need to be considered?	State & National trends likely to affect the administration of justice in CA must be included in the analysis. The National Center for State Courts and others provide a number of reports that provide this information. The selected researcher(s) must obtain this information independently.

No.	DATE	REFERENCE	QUESTION	RESPONSE
11	Thu 1/19/2006 11:26 AM	Paragraph 3.2	<p>This paragraph of the subject RFP asks for a "consultant analysis" of a variety of documents. We have experience with strategic planning efforts within the California Court system. Our approach has been to involve a considerable number of your stakeholders in the evaluation of these documents through interviews and email surveys. We do not conduct analyses without this kind of input.</p> <p>Is this stakeholder approach an acceptable methodology?</p>	<p>With the exception of data referenced at 3.2.3 , all stakeholder data to be analyzed for inclusion in this project's final product has already been—or will be—collected by the AOC (or its contractors). While the AOC is willing to entertain the possibility of <i>very limited</i> follow-up (telephone) stakeholder interviews, it does not favor additional surveys of any kind for this project.</p>