

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

RFP-IT-OPD-18-47-RB Web Content Management

May 1, 2018

1. Section 1.2 - It is mentioned that the Judicial Council maintains several web properties. While a comprehensive list of properties will be appreciated, at a minimum, please confirm the specific web property URL's that are included in the scope of this RFP.

Answer: All public-facing section and/or sites contained in or linked to from www.ca.courts.ca.gov are generally the list of sites we maintain.

2. Section 1.4 – A separate RFP for UX Design Research and Content Strategy is mentioned. Has that RFP been issued yet? Regardless, can we request a link to that RFP now – or when available in the future?

Answer: See <http://www.courts.ca.gov/38374.htm>.

3. Section 2.1 – Regarding interviews and facilitated workshops, how many Business Units and representative trial courts are to be included in the scope of this RFP? And how many total persons will be participating from these business units and trial courts? Is there any logical grouping of these workshop and interviewees that will inform us regarding the number of likely workshops and interviews needed?

Answer: As of yet, no formal project teams have been created. It is assumed we'll have representation from large, medium, and small courts across the state.

4. Section 2.2 – refers to a Conceptual Design Vendor. Is this to be included in a separate RFP? If so, please indicate an approximate day for its release. If not, can you provide us a link to that RFP?

Answer: See <http://www.courts.ca.gov/38374.htm>.

5. Section 2.4 – Mentions end-to-end digital services currently in development. Please describe these development efforts in sufficient detail to inform us regarding their nature and scope.

Answer: See <http://www.courts.ca.gov/38374.htm> (Digital Services Conceptual Design)

6. Section 9.0 – Contains set aside for DVBE. The RFP also mentions a preference for small businesses, but there is no mention of it, or related points in this Evaluation area. Please confirm this is correct.

Answer: Please read Attachment 5 and please see <http://www.courts.ca.gov/18759.htm> for your perusal.

7. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

Answer: A number of in-person meetings would be desirable.

8. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (Like, from India or Canada)

Answer: Please refer to <http://www.sos.ca.gov/business-programs/business-entities/faqs/>

9. Can we submit the proposals via email?

Answer: No. Please refer to Section 6 of the RFP

10. How many full time staff members does the Judicial Council recommend that the proposer staff on this project?

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

11. 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.

12. Does a proposer need to have a CMAS in place to work on this project? If yes, are proposers 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: Respondents need not have a CMAS.

13. What are the major pain points that internal and external users are currently facing with the current content production system?

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.

14. The RFP mentions the desire to test the viability of federated content production models. Can the Judicial Council elaborate on all the various content production models that are currently in use?

Answer: Today, a majority of Judicial Council-maintained sites are centrally managed through a Judicial Council Web Services team.

15. What hypotheses does the Judicial Council have about the federated content production model it anticipates utilizing in the future?

Answer: A federated model would provide administrative access for various content and site owners to manage their respective sites, while sharing components, design, and code.

16. The RFP mentions creating an ‘approach of supporting federated on online communication and publishing needs.’ Can the Judicial Council list all the various internal stakeholders who currently have communication and publishing needs?

Answer: This is part of the work and undertaking associated with the deliverables in the *Content Audit and Process Analysis, Enterprise Web Content Management & Federated Content Strategy*, RFP.

17. Can the Judicial Council share which ‘end-to-end digital services’ are currently in development?

Answer: None at this time.

18. In the proposal contents sections, the RFP states “Please be sure to reference RFP to the Judicial Council website at www.courts.ca.gov.” Can the Judicial Council further elaborate on what that requirement means?

Answer: That means that when you are writing on the proposed method to complete the work and work plan, make sure that your proposal addresses each of the Deliverables referred to in the RFP located at the Judicial Council website at www.courts.ca.gov. Any updates if any will also be posted there.

19. The RFP has the contract timeline of 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.

20. 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.

21. The evaluation criteria lists Experience, Credentials, and Ability to meet 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.

22. Will the proposer 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.

23. Given the short turnaround time between the date by which the questions are responded to (May 1) and the proposal deadline (May 7), as well as the requirement that the proposals be submitted in hard copies, would the Judicial Council be open to extending the proposal due to date by 2 weeks to May 21? This will give proposers 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.

24. The contract end date is 13 months away from the start date. It seems to us that 13 months would not be in line with the budget of \$100,000. Could you please clarify? This could work if the process occurs in a much shorter timeframe but our guess is that you are noting 13 months to accommodate for subsequent phases? Could you provide the timeframe over which the services envisioned under 2.0-2.4 be provided?

Answer: Deliverables can be completed and delivered ahead of the published contract end date.

25. Please summarize your current publishing workflow and the roles and checkpoints involved.

Answer: This will be provided once the contract is awarded.

26. How many staff are currently involved in managing web content?

Answer: This will be provided once the contract is awarded.

27. Can you supply a comprehensive list of the web properties that should be included in the content inventory?

Answer: The precise number of sites in scope will be determined in partnership with the winning bidder. For reference, there are 58 county websites and a single statewide site (www.courts.ca.gov).

28. Are you currently using an external document management application to manage digital assets?

Answer: We currently manage digital assets within our existing Web Content Management System.

29. Can you summarize the user research that has been completed in the past 2 years, as well as any that is currently underway?

Answer: There has been little user research done on the majority of the pages on the current Judicial Branch public site. A separate usability study will take place within this calendar year.

30. To what extent were end users involved in the development of the current web properties, or the content published on them?

Answer: User surveys and interviews were done prior to the launch of the Judicial Branch public site over seven years ago. A very small percentage of the site has been redone with end-user testing; however, not enough to inform us of a holistic approach for a redesign. A separate usability study is set to begin within this calendar year.

31. Does the Judicial Council maintain a Web Editorial Style Guide? Are content standards defined anywhere? Are readability metrics currently part of content evaluation?

Answer: Yes, the Judicial Council has a web style guide. Documentation will be provided with the selected proposer. Readability metrics are included in that documentation.

32. Is the Judicial Council more a distributed or a centralized organization?

Answer: The Judicial Council of California is one central agency; however, our work is distributed between various offices and divisions. Additionally, our work with trial courts is varied and is therefore distributed work over which the Council does not control. The POC project may potentially include work with trial courts.

33. Has the organization previously investigated the concept of content reuse?

Answer: We currently use a content management system that offers the ability to reuse content on multiple pages of the same site; however, CAAs is not something we have fully explored as of yet.