

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS**

**RFP-IT-OPD-18-46-RB  
POC-Website-Hosting**

**May 1, 2018**

1. After the 10-month term, all development and content are the property of the Judicial Council and should be transferred to therefore to the Judicial Council. All rights to all content, approaches and designs will be owned by Judicial Council.

Our open source software platform, including default themes/templates, is licensed. At any time, the Judicial Council can access/download all of the data/content/code at the Judicial Council's instance; however, in accordance with the open source license and to foster exponential government innovation, as well as limit any potential for proprietary 'lock-in', ownership of the base intellectual property is not relegated to any one party. Does this meet the Judicial Council's ownership conditions?

Answer: Yes.

2. Did the Judicial Council already chosen a CMS Platform for the POC website? If yes, would you please tell us which one?

Answer: No, the Judicial Council has not yet selected a CMS platform.

3. Is the Judicial Council expected to deploy the POC Website infrastructure on premises or in the Cloud?

Answer: This has not yet been determined, but Cloud hosted solutions are acceptable to the Judicial Council.

4. Does the Judicial Council has a preference of technology stack: LAMP, Java or .Net?

Answer: Currently, out of the three, the Judicial Council only supports Java.

5. If the Judicial Council wants to deploy the POC Website infrastructure in cloud, does the project cost include the following costs - compute, database, networking and bandwidth)?

Answer: Yes.

6. Is the Software Licensing costs (CMS, Database) isolated from the project budget?

Answer: In relation to this specific POC project, software licensing, data base, etc., should be included in cost proposal.

7. Is the Judicial Council open to a shared public cloud for hosting the POC website?

Answer: See answer #3.

8. Is the Judicial Council planning to use the POC Website as a base for further development of the production website?

Answer: It is possible that the POC website will be the base for further development, but this has not yet been determined.

9. Page 2, Section 2.1 – Training for the hosted WCMS solution is not listed as a deliverable. Is that something the Judicial Council would like to propose as an option?

Answer: The Judicial Council seeks a POC platform that includes operational instruction.

10. Page 2, Section 2.1 – Includes one iteration of Front End Visual Design Refinement, with an option for more services at an hourly rate. Ideally, what is the scope of this design refinement iteration? For instance, is the goal to provide design refinement along the lines of usability best practices, including/organizing content elements within the hosted WCMS' content work area? If so, can you provide an estimate of the number of such form/content layouts that should be included in this design refinement iteration?

Answer: To the extent a proposer can help us change a design or modify a template, should that be necessary based on user testing, the Judicial Council would welcome the support. We are not looking for the proposer to deliver the initial visual design.

11. Page 3, Section 2.1 – Mentions a 10-month term (minimum) wherein the proof of concept platform is active and supported. We assume “Active” is relevant to the POC's availability for the Judicial Council's staff to access it in the hosted environment. We assume “Supported” refers to technical support, such as monitoring the health of the application, installing security patches and updates, etc. and functional support for “how do I” types of questions. Please confirm if this will meet the Judicial Council's requirements.

Answer: Yes, this meets the Judicial Council's requirements.

12. Page 4, Attachments – Our intent is to bid along with a CMS software provider – they provide the CMS tools and software and we provide the support services. Should both firms complete Attachments that are to be submitted with our proposal?

Answer: Yes.

13. Page 5, Section 5 – Please confirm that travel expenses are or are not included in the \$50,000 not to exceed amount.

Answer: Yes. Travel expenses are to be included in the \$50,000 budget.

14. Page 7, Section 9.0 – Is a single award the goal? Or is the Judicial Council considering the evaluation of multiple software solutions during the 10-month term?

Answer: For this POC platform solicitation, a single award is preferred.

15. How many users will the CA Courts team likely have that will be entering content and evaluating the proposed platform?

Answer: This has not yet been determined, but we anticipate 6-8 end users actively updating the platform.

16. How many full time staff members does the State recommend that the proposer staff on this project?

Answer: Proposers will need to staff the project appropriately to complete the deliverables in a timely manner.

17. What is the composition of the Judicial Council’s team that will be working on the project? Can the Judicial Council 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.

18. The RFP has the contract timeline from May 21, 2018 to June 30 2019. 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.

19. The RFP mentions that the Judicial Council needs the proof-of-concept website to be active for at least 10 months. What is driving that timeline?

Answer: The Judicial Council intends to showcase new digital design iterations in that timeframe.

20. Does the Judicial Council expect the proposer to support with the strategy, design and content of the proof of concept website, or would the proposer simply be responsible for hosting?

Answer: The proposer is responsible for the deliverables outlined in section 2.0 of the RFP. Visual design, per se, is not part of the requirements.

21. Is the Judicial Council looking for a SaaS/ COTS proposer for this opportunity, or are you open to custom build solutions?

Answer: The Judicial Council is open to any proposal.

22. Does the total cost of \$50,000 include travel expenses?

Answer: See question #14.

23. 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: Overall scoring for the RFP will result in an assessment of value; however, the cost score itself will be weighted toward the lowest proposed cost.

24. 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 work plan that is outlined in section 2.0.

25. Will the proposer who complete 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.

26. On the Content Audit and Process analysis RFP, you state, under 1.6, that there will be a subsequent WCMS selection project. The entire point of the hosted platform for proof-of-concept website is to provide content management infrastructure as per the requirements under 2.1. It thus seems that what you seek in this RFP is a TEMPORARY solution. In any case, please clarify as we are confused.

Content management is not something that simply works “out of the box” and building it, then throw things away seems like waste (not to mention that the budget provided would only suffice to provide minimal platform hosting and software but no services to develop).

Answer: The intent of this RFP is to procure a temporary POC platform to deploy a subset of conceptual digital services.

27. Could you clarify section 2.1.9? It seems to imply that we would be providing some development services but the rest of the requirements 2.1.1-2.1.8 are all simply features in the system provided which are available; but the services to make them work for a specific website are not included.

Answer: To the extent a proposer can help us change a design or modify a template, the Judicial Council would score that ability favorably. We are not looking for the proposer to deliver the initial visual design.

28. Back End Development: Form Builder - how complex could a custom form become? We would need to consider a number of variables to ensure the system is scalable.

- a. Types of responses? E.g. selection, yes/no, long answer
- b. Length of form?
- c. Number of questions?
- d. Number of possible subsections per question?

Answer: The complexity has not yet been determined since the types of responses, length of the form, number of questions, and possible subsections is variable and depends on the forms selected.

29. What is the purpose for these forms?

- a. How will the data collected from the form be used?
- b. Will the data be fed into another system?
- c. Will the data be output in another format? (Word Document, PDF)
- d. Will different forms have different workflows for its data? Examples -
  - i. Form A prints out the inputs in a printable format.
  - ii. Form B analyzes the inputs to produce a formatted document.

Answer: The primary purpose for the form builder is to gather user input and improve the user experience around filling out and submitting forms.

30. What would the approximate scale of users/traffic during this POC period? During the POC period will it only be stakeholders and future users on the site, this will help to clarify the hosting requirements, for now we are assuming light traffic to focused users during the POC?

Answer: The Judicial Council anticipates only light traffic on this POC platform. We do not anticipate that will be fully deployed to the public.

31. One Iteration of Front-end Visual Design (Ultimate goal for the following questions is to gage how much focus is in design for the prototype) for the prototype design is there any inspiration or websites that come to mind?

Answer: To the extent a proposer can help us change a design or modify a template, the Judicial Council would score that ability favorably. We are not looking for the proposer to deliver the initial visual design.

32. There is another Design / UX phase in another RFP, in the future will this design replace the prototype design or are they separate entities?

- a. Why is Judicial Council of California looking for a visual design specific for this prototype?
  - i. To demonstrate our design skills?
  - ii. Show how the chosen technology can be templated?
  - iii. Demonstrate limitations of the front end?
- b. What are the goals/purpose of this design?

Answer: The POC platform is subject to change, based on other research and analysis. For “a” the Judicial Council is more concerned with ii and iii.

33. General Execution

- 1. Does the Judicial Council plan to continue with a hosted platform for the POC beyond the 10 months?
- 2. During the POC will a Judicial Project Manager and/or Product/Owner be applied to governance of the POC and be engaged with the Supplier’s project team?

Answer: Part 1: This has not yet been determined.  
Part 2: Yes.