JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

IT-2018-06-LB
California Courts Digital Services Conceptual Design

April 27, 2018

1. The RFP does not indicate the proposal should include bios or descriptions of the vendor team. Will the vendor need to provide these details in the proposal?

   ANSWER: Yes. Since the scoring matrix includes a category for staff credentials, proposals should include staff credentials.

2. $200,000 is indicated as the total cost for this project. Are expenses included or not included in this cost (i.e., research recruiting incentives, travel expenses, etc.)?

   ANSWER: Travel expenses will be reimbursed; however, the total project cost is not to exceed $200,000.

3. Section 2.2.1 indicates the vendors will "lead recruiting of research participants." Will JCC provide any insight and research access (i.e., initial introductions) to the best site visits of representative court Self-Help Centers (Section 2.2.2)?

   ANSWER: Yes. The JCC will provide introductions between vendors and court or self help center representatives.

4. In Section 2.2.1 the RFP indicates that a representation of demographics should be recruited. Does the JCC have existing demographic data on self-represented litigants across the state of California? Does the JCC have statistics on the total population of self-represented litigants?

   ANSWER: The Judicial Council will be able to provide some degree of statistical information once the project kicks off.

5. Section 2.2.1 indicates a number of methods. Does the vendor have flexibility to suggest other methods in the proposal that may be more cost effective?

   ANSWER: Yes. The Judicial Council is open to hearing suggestions from the vendors that align with project goals.

6. In Section 2.2.1 of the RFP, what does "non-response" mean in this context?

ANSWER: This item refers to the need to document incomplete or nonresponsive surveys.

7. In Section 2.2.2 of the RFP, what does the JCC consider as components for a "service blueprint?" Various criteria exist defining this type of deliverable.

   ANSWER: Service blueprints include but are not limited to use-cases, journeys, and/or workflows of existing services.

8. In Section 2.2.3, the RFP asks for "secondary research including published articles in academic journals on legal aid, access to justice and trust and confidence in the courts as they relate to digital interactions." Is the JCC seeking an analysis of best practices, lessons learned, and a summary of conclusions about digital interactions, OR is the JCC seeking a list of resources that self-represented litigants use to understand digital interactions with the courts? Or both?

   ANSWER: The Judicial Council would like an analysis and report on available secondary research related to access to justice and digital interactions.

9. The current "Self-Help" pages of the website have Spanish as an option. Is the JCC interested in conducting Usability Testing and/or User Interviews (Section 2.2.1) with Spanish-speaking participants?

   ANSWER: Yes.

10. In Section 2.3.1, the RFP indicates "following the hand-off from digital to physical interaction and processing requests." Can this statement please be clarified?

    ANSWER: This refers to analyzing the gap between services that can be conducted online but may be need to be completed with in-person visits to the court.

11. In Section 2.4.2, according to the JCC, what is the difference between a "service blueprint" and "user flow diagram?" Various criteria exist defining these deliverables.

    ANSWER: Generally speaking, they refer to the same thing.

12. How many full time staff members does the state recommend that the vendor staff on this project?

    ANSWER: Vendor will need to staff the project appropriately to complete the deliverables in a timely manner.

13. What is the composition of JCC's team that will be working on the project? Can JCC describe the roles of the staff members involved, and the percentage of time they will be spending on this project?

ANSWER: The project team consists of a product manager, and up to five user experience and digital services professionals.

14. The RFP has the contract timeline to by May 21, 2018 to December 30, 2018. Are there any internal or external constraints that are driving this timeline?

ANSWER: As an initiative by the Chief Justice of California, for the Futures Commission, a deliverable is to be completed by December 2018.

15. Does a vendor need to have a CMAS in place to work on this project? If yes, then are vendors able to submit proposals given that they have a CMAS in place by the time of project kickoff if they were to be awarded the project?

ANSWER: No.

16. What are the major pain points that internal and external users are currently facing with the JCC's existing web properties?

ANSWER: This project is focused on external users. Our aim is to transform our websites from informational to transactional services and develop a series of digital services. Pain points include: no end to end transactions, content is hard to understand in its current format.

17. Can you elaborate on the envisioned Statewide SRL e-Service portal? What is the purpose of the portal, and when does the state expect to be able to launch this?

ANSWER: This conceptual design project will serve as a blueprint for the SRL e-Service portal. A prototype needs to be completed by December 2018. The SRL e-services portal project is envisioned to be a statewide aggregation of end-to-end digital services for self-represented litigants and is set to launch in 2020.

18. To what level of fidelity does JCC expect prototypes (section 2.5.3)?

ANSWER: To the extent that is technically feasible, the prototype should be fully functional.

19. The two sister RFPs timelines extend through June 2019 whereas this RFP goes through Dec 2018. What is the reason for the difference?

ANSWER: Please see answer #14.

20. Does the total cost of $200,000 include travel expenses?

ANSWER: Please see answer #2.

21. The evaluation criteria lists Cost as 50% of the total score. Does Cost score include an assessment of value, or will the lowest cost proposal receive the highest score?

ANSWER: Scoring for the RFP overall results in an assessment of value; however, the cost score itself will be weighted toward the lowest cost.

22. The evaluation criteria lists Experience, Credentials, and Ability to meet timing as factors for scoring. Should each of these be addressed in the "Proposed method to complete the work" section of the Proposal? If not, how should the proposer address these criteria?

ANSWER: These criteria should be addressed in a well thought out workplan that is outlined in section 2.0.

23. Will the vendor who completes this work be precluded from award on any subsequent projects?

ANSWER: There are certain procurement rules that prevent 'follow-on contracting.' The need to invoke this rule would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis. Unfortunately we are not able to provide a more definitive answer at this time.

24. Given the short turnaround time between the date by which the questions are responded to (May 1) and the proposal deadline (May 7), would the JCC be open to extending the proposal due to date by 2 weeks to May 21? This will give vendors the opportunity to take the information from the responses into account and create higher quality proposals.

ANSWER: Due to fiscal year-end contracting deadlines, we are unable to extend the deadline for this solicitation.

25. **Self-represented Litigants:**

Describe self-represented litigant segments:
- What are sample demographics for the state of California's over all population? Or a source that you trust the most to be most representative?
- Does the set of self-represented litigants match that same population breakdown or is there a difference in demographic data?
- What percentage of self-represented litigants are English speakers? Spanish speakers? Speak a different language as their primary language?
- Which types of self-litigation are most utilized.

ANSWER:

Bullet 1: Please refer to https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/CA
Bullet 2: This data is not available. We have data for persons who come to attorney staffed self-help centers in the trial courts in California. Selected vendors can receive this information

Bullet 3: We do not have these figures for the full population. Of those who fill out intake forms at self-help centers in the courts:

 77% report speaking English
 15% report speaking Spanish
 .2% report speaking Mandarin
 .2% report speaking Cantonese
 .1% report speaking Vietnamese
 .1% report speaking Armenian
 .1% report speaking Russian
 1% report speaking other languages

Bullet 4: Self-represented litigants most commonly complete their own forms and legal pleadings. They also present their case in court at hearings and trials.

What customer data exists today. Can you share?
- Engagement by demographics or behaviour
- Analytics on usage of the Getting Started page
- Analytics on usage of the different types of self-represented litigation on the site.
- Any existing service design blueprints or just descriptions of how the process works today?

 ANSWER: Selected vendors will receive available analytics related to this project.

What customer research has been conducted to date? Can you share?
- Known pain points
- KPIs and performance against them
- Survey data
- NPS scores
- Customer feedback
- Key posts in social media, criticisms and successes
- Existing user flows, inclusive of online, offline and processing request
- Data from existing website polling ('Was this info helpful' surveys)

 ANSWER: Selected vendors will receive available information related to this project.

26. **Staff:**

Describe the roles, titles and headcount of key staff that are engaged in self-litigation.
- By court staff?
- By Court Self-Help Centers?

 ANSWER: We do not have that information.

Who are the key stakeholders for this project?

ANSWER: Judicial Council staff, Judicial Council advisory committees, and trial courts.

What staff documentation exists? Can you share?
- Known pain points
- KPIs and performance against them
- Survey data
- Staff feedback
- Existing user flows, inclusive of online, offline and processing request
- Analytics on which types of self-litigation take up the majority of the time for staff

ANSWER: Selected vendors will receive available information, as appropriate.

27. **Existing initiatives:**

Regarding JCC website usability and focus group research projects - what stage are these engagements in currently? Are you able to share any in progress conclusions or final outcomes?

ANSWER: Selected vendors will receive relevant results and outcomes from past studies. The Judicial Council will also be engaged in a new usability study, results from which can be shared to the selected vendor(s), as appropriate, for this project.

28. **Existing Experience:**

This is for just one subsection of the larger http://www.courts.ca.gov site. How should this be considered in context of that larger experience:
- Integration of style guides as well as tone and voice?
- Over all look and feel, interaction patterns, site architecture and navigation

ANSWER: We are looking for a holistic evaluation of the user experience, which may dictate the style guides, tone, and voice.

Please provide any existing documentation on the current site experience.
- Style guides
- Tone and voice guidelines
- Mission statement and collateral

ANSWER: Documentation will be provided with the selected vendor.

29. **Inspiration:**

What is the vision for how a world would look if you increased access to justice for Californians?

ANSWER: We envision greater convenience for users.

What do you think are the best experiences that exist in the local, state or federal agencies that you admire? Any international ones?

ANSWER: Gov.uk is an excellent example of user-experience design done well.

What experience do you admire that exist outside of any local, state or federal agencies?

ANSWER: We do not have any specific examples to share.

30. **Working together:**

Describe the ideal partnership. Have you engaged in successful partnership w/ UX & service designers in the past?

ANSWER: JCC sees partnerships with results-driven, well-qualified vendors.

Are there any tools or firewall constraints to be aware of in terms of sharing research findings?

ANSWER: No.

Regarding the to not exceed budget of $200,000 - are those total costs inclusive of travel expenses?

ANSWER: See question #2.