

**MASTER AGREEMENTS FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
CONSULTING MANAGED SERVICES
RFP NO: RFP-IT-2025-203-RB**

References & Placement History

1. In Exhibit A1, the Reference Tables are different. Please confirm that the following information is expected for all job clarifications we are bidding on:

- 1) JCC Classification
- 2) Duration of Assignment (list dates)
- 3) Name of Individual Placed
- 4) Not included but assume this is needed:
 - a. Agency / Company
 - b. Name
 - c. Title
 - d. Email
 - e. Phone

In other words, are you expecting a reference table for each Job Classification, or 40+ references tables?

Answer: Please provide a total of 5 references. See Exhibit A-1, Section A-2, Part II for the required information for each reference.

2. As mentioned in the RFP, we can pick and choose categories. If we choose to bid on 10 categories, can we utilize subcontractors' references for the remaining categories? In such a case, would their placement data be acceptable to use?

Answer: Please provide 5 references total. Direct customers would be preferred but subcontractor customer references would be acceptable.

3. Would 3-year or 4-year placement data be compliant, or is it mandatory to provide only 2-year placement data?

Answer: See Exhibit A-1, Section A2, Part 1. "Indicate the number of placements your company has made in the past 24 months".

4. There are 64 unique classifications for job titles in this RFP. We serve clients across the United States, and our placements are equally diverse; what is the upper cap on placement references?

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

5. Exhibit A1 - Evaluation Criteria - Page 5, Part - II References How many client references are required to be submitted as part of the proposal?

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

6. Exhibit A1 - Evaluation Criteria - Page 5, Part - II References Are references required to be government or public-sector only, or are commercial references acceptable?

Answer: Commercial references are acceptable if they demonstrate similar scope/complexity.

7. Exhibit A-1 §A-2 Placement History Pages 2–6. Will placements performed as a subcontractor to another prime be scored equally to placements performed as the prime vendor?

Answer: Prime is preferred. Subcontractors of the prime are acceptable.

8. Exhibit A-1 §A-2 Placement History Pages 2–6. If a proposer has experience in classifications substantially similar but not identical to JCC classifications, how will equivalency be evaluated for scoring purposes?

Answer: If equivalent, it will be scored as if it is the same classification.

9. Exhibit A-1 §A-2 Placement History Pages 2–6. Is there a minimum number of placements required per classification to receive full or partial points?

Answer: No, there is not a minimum number of placements required.

10. Exhibit A-1 §A-2 Placement History Pages 2–6. Are placements outside California eligible for scoring consideration if they demonstrate comparable complexity and scale?

Answer: Yes.

11. Exhibit A-1 §A-2 Placement History Pages 2–6. Will the Judicial Council consider anonymized references if client confidentiality restrictions apply?

Answer: Yes, however, the information must be verifiable to be considered as a reference.

12. For Part II – References, does the Judicial Council require a separate reference for each JCC classification, or can one reference cover multiple classifications?

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

13. If multiple resources were placed under the same classification (for example, 25 Technical Lead placements), is a reference required for each placement, or will one or a few references be sufficient?

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

14. Would the Judicial Council accept a limited number of total references (for example, five overall) that represent the placements listed in Part I?

Answer: See Answer to Questions 1.

Is there a minimum or maximum number of references the Judicial Council expects proposers to submit?

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

15. There are 64 unique classifications for job titles in this RFP. We serve clients across the United States, and our placements are equally diverse; what is the upper cap on placement references?

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

Can our minimum 3 references overlap with the references provided for each placement?

Answer: Yes. Five references are required.

16. Given the large number of job classifications included in this solicitation, may proposers consolidate references by grouping similar or related classifications under a single client reference, provided the scope and responsibilities are clearly mapped to the relevant JCC classifications?

Answer: Provide 5 references total.

17. Will the Judicial Council accept program-level or master agreement references that demonstrate multiple placements across several classifications and regions, instead of requiring a separate reference for each individual classification?

Answer: Provide 5 references total.

18. Is there a minimum or maximum number of references the Judicial Council prefers per proposer for evaluation purposes?

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

19. For the Placement History / References section, the reference template requests the Name of Individual Placed for each assignment. Given the volume of classifications and, in some cases, client confidentiality or privacy constraints, may proposers omit individual consultant names and instead:

- Provide aggregate or program-level references covering multiple placements; and
- Describe roles, classifications, duration ranges, and scope of work without identifying individual names, provided that the proposer clearly maps the referenced engagement to the applicable JCC classifications?

Answer: Names can be omitted, if necessary, as long as the proposer clearly maps the referenced engagement to the applicable JCC classifications and that the referenced engagements can be verified upon the JCC's request.

Additionally, can the Judicial Council confirm that the approach described above will be considered fully responsive and will not negatively impact evaluation scoring, so long as the relevance, scale, and performance quality of the placements are adequately demonstrated?

Answer: Confirmed.

20. Does the Judicial Council evaluate references based on coverage of all individual classifications, or on the overall relevance, scale, and performance quality demonstrated through the references submitted?

Answer: Overall relevance, scale, and performance quality.

Regarding Exhibit A-1, Part II, are references required for every placement made in the last 24 months, or is the request for 5 references (as per the 5 reference boxes in the template)?

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

21. Exhibit / Attachment Clarification - In Exhibit A1, Reference A4, should vendors include exceptions in the provided box, or in an attachment?

Answer: Using the provided box is preferred. If proposer chooses to provide an attachment, make sure to reference the attachment in the box provided.

22. Under Part II – References of Exhibit A-1, Evaluation Criteria & Proposal Submission Forms, do vendors need to provide reference information for all placements identified in Part I – Number of placements per JCC job classifications in the last 24 months, or only a subset of those placements?

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

23. For Placement History, should placements be evaluated strictly by Classification count, or does geographic distribution (Region) materially affect scoring?

Answer: Scoring for placement history will not be evaluated by region.

24. Are placements performed by subcontractors counted equally toward Placement History scoring as prime contractor placements?

Answer: See Answer to Question 7.

25. Under Placement History, please confirm whether vendors must provide references for each placement of the positions mentioned. Is it mandatory to have placements for each of the positions listed?

Answer: Provide 5 references total. Placements for each position listed are preferred, but not mandatory.

Please confirm if vendors can provide commercial clients in the Placement History exhibit.

Answer: Confirmed.

Are vendors allowed to fill the Placement History and References section through the use of a subcontractor?

Answer: See Answer to Question 7.

26. How many references can be provided at a maximum under 'Placement History'?

Answer: See Answer to Question 1.

27. May vendors use the same past performance reference for multiple job classifications.

Answer: You may re-use references if they credibly map to multiple classifications.

Subcontractors

28. How many subcontractors are we allowed to utilize?

Answer: There is no cap.

29. Main RFP Document - Page 7, Point 1.5 states: If a Proposer plans to utilize subcontractors. Are vendors required to disclose all subcontractors at proposal stage, or only when responding to a WORF?

Answer: Vendors are required to disclose all known subcontractors at the proposal stage. Subcontractors may be added at a later point with prior approval from the Judicial Council.

30. Exhibit A-1 §A-1 Methodologies. Page 1. Will subcontractors proposed for sourcing be required to execute agreements prior to proposal submission, or may commitments be conditional upon award?

Answer: The Judicial Council will not execute agreements with subcontractors. The RFP requires disclosure of subs in proposal.

31. 1.5 Subcontractors - Are subcontractors viewed favorably, neutrally, or discouraged?

Answer: Neutrally.

Is there a limit to how much of the work can be subcontracted?

Answer: No Limit.

Do subcontractors need to be identified/pre-approved at Master Agreement award, or only before assignment/per WORF?

Answer: See Answer to Question 29.

Do subcontractors need to meet the same background check, security, and insurance requirements as prime resources, and when/how are those requirements validated (at Master Agreement award vs per WORF)?

Answer: When each WORF is awarded. The vendor will need to provide a recent background check to execute the Work Order.

32. If subcontractors are used to satisfy specific tools, certifications, or experience requirements, must this be explicitly identified at the Classification level in Exhibit A2?

Answer: This does not need to be explicitly identified.

33. Subcontracting / DVBE - Can DVBE or niche subcontractors be added post-award, subject to Judicial Council approval, to address specialized skill needs?

Answer: See Answer to Question 29.

34. If a prime vendor does not propose the use of any subcontractors, could this result in disqualification?

Answer: No.

35. If vendors do not use a subcontractor under this proposal, will they be disqualified?

Answer: Subcontractors are not required.

36. Can subcontractors be added at the time of the WORF?

Answer: See Answer to Question 29.

DVBE & Local Preference

37. Is DVBE participation mandatory, considering that 3 evaluation points are allocated to this category?

Answer: No. DVBE is incentivized, but not mandatory.

38. Is there any local preference applicable? We don't have business in California.

Answer: There is no local preference, but you must be registered to do business in California.

39. Please confirm whether the Judicial Council of California maintains or can provide an approved or recommended DVBE Vendor Directory for this RFP.

Answer: The Judicial Council does not have a directory, but DGS does.

If so, kindly advise where the directory can be accessed. If not, please confirm whether bidders are expected to identify DVBE firms independently using the State of California's DVBE Vendor Directory.

Answer: State-Certified DVBE's can be found on the DGS website.

Scope & Services

40. Main RFP Document - Page 7, Section 2.0 - Description of Services. Can a vendor offer services only for selecting IT domains (e.g., data, cloud) rather than full-spectrum IT services?

Answer: Vendors may bid on one or more regions but are expected to cover all classifications within a region.

41. Main RFP Document - Page 7, Section 2.0 - Description of Services. Does vendor required to submit resumes for all proposed roles? Will the submission of sample resumes for the proposed roles be acceptable?

Answer: At the proposal stage, Key Staff resumes are required (See Exhibit A-1, Section A-3 Part II). Candidate resumes for classifications are only required during the WORF process and not required with the proposal.

42. Will vendors be allowed to support multiple regions?

Answer: Yes.

43. The RFP indicates that the Judicial Council is seeking staffing augmentation via the classifications listed under Description of Services (RFP Section 2.0, item 2.1). Could the Judicial Council please clarify if the RFP is seeking staffing augmentation or consulting services?

Answer: This RFP enables both managed services support and consultant placements via WORFs across the classification list.

44. Description of Services; 2.1 Scope - Prior to RFP submission, will the Judicial Council provide job descriptions for the roles listed under "2.1 Scope" and Exhibit A1?

Answer: See Exhibit A2, Classification Descriptions.

45. 2.2 Business and Technical Requirements; Remote / onsite / geographic expectations - Do most JBEs prefer remote resources by default, or are any known to require in-person presence?

Answer: If a vendor submits a bid for a specific role/region they should be able to provide staff to work either on-site or remote. Each WORF will have different needs/requirements.

Are any job classifications historically or operationally more likely to require onsite staffing (e.g., Desktop Support, A/V Tech, Network roles)?

Answer: Yes.

Will JBEs provide advance notice if a role's requirement changes from remote to onsite?

Answer: Yes. If a master agreement is awarded for a specific role/region, staff should be available to work onsite.

Do any regions have a stronger preference for local resources even when remote work is permitted?

Answer: This is dependent on the needs of each individual JBE.

Will JBEs consider out-of-state consultants, or must all consultants reside within California?

Answer: Out-of-state consultants will be considered, but if awarded a master agreement for a specific region, then they must be able to provide on-site and remote services.

If out-of-region remote resources are permitted, are there any restrictions based on role type, system access, or data sensitivity?

Answer: See Attachment 2, Judicial Council Master Agreement Terms and Conditions. Further details will be provided when a Work Order is executed.

What data types/classifications should vendors assume they may encounter (PII, confidential court information, etc.), and are there data residency or handling restrictions?

Answer: Any data that resources have access should be treated as confidential. Data residency depends on the project and its individual requirements.

Proposal Submission & Evaluation

46. Main RFP Document - Page 17, Section 9.0 - Evaluation of Proposals. Is there any minimum score threshold required to be awarded a Master Agreement?

Answer: No. Proposals are scored on a 100-point scale. Up to 10 agreements will be awarded per region to the highest scored proposers.

47. RFP (Transparency) Will proposers receive debriefings or scoring summaries following award decisions?

Answer: The Cost portion is publicly opened. Notice of Intent to Award will be posted to the court's website. Arrangements for debriefing may be made upon request.

48. Exhibit A-1 §A-1 Methodologies. Page 1. For scoring under Methodologies, does the Judicial Council prioritize depth of subcontractor relationships or breadth of coverage across classifications and regions?

Answer: Both depth and breadth.

49. Exhibit A-1 §A-1 Methodologies. Page 1. How will the Judicial Council evaluate methodologies for hard-to-fill roles when a proposer has limited historical demand in a specific classification?

Answer: The Judicial Council will review responses to Section A-1 to see how the proposer would source hard-to-fill positions and what kinds of timeline/constraints/policy considerations you would use.

50. Exhibit A-1 §A-1 Methodologies. Page 1. Is there a preferred or expected approach for statewide coverage (e.g., regional partners vs. centralized sourcing model)?

Answer: No Preference.

51. Exhibit A-1 §A-4 Acceptance of Master Agreement Page 8–9. Can the Judicial Council identify which Master Agreement provisions are historically considered “material” and most likely to render a proposal non-responsive if exceptions are taken?

Answer: Individual provisions of the Master Agreement itself will not be labeled as material or immaterial and exceptions will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as necessary.

52. Exhibit A-1 §A-4 Acceptance of Master Agreement Page 8–9. Will minor administrative or clarification-only exceptions negatively impact scoring even if deemed non-material?

Answer: Yes. Changes to the terms will affect the scoring.

53. Exhibit A-1 §A-5 Viability of Firm Pages 10–11 Will reviewed financial statements be scored differently than audited financials, or are they considered equivalent for evaluation purposes?

Answer: Equivalent for evaluation purposes.

54. Exhibit A-1 §A-5 Viability of Firm Pages 10–11. How does the Judicial Council define acceptable executive and Key Staff turnover rates for scoring viability?

Answer: Proposers with high turnover will receive a lower score. Turnover will be reviewed against other proposers.

55. Exhibit A-1 §A-5 Viability of Firm Pages 10–11 Are joint ventures or mentor-protégé arrangements acceptable, and if so, how will firm viability be evaluated across entities?

Answer: Viability of a firm refers only to the firm itself. Joint ventures or mentor-protégé arrangements will not be acceptable.

56. How many vendors does the Judicial Council expect to award per region under this RFP?

Answer: 10 per region.

Will this number vary by region?

Answer: The Judicial Council would like to establish 10 per region.

57. May proposers bid on one or multiple regions, and does bidding on multiple regions affect proposal evaluation?

Answer: Yes, Proposers may bid on multiple regions. Agreements will be awarded to the top 10 scoring vendors per region.

58. If a proposer is awarded in multiple regions, will the Judicial Council maintain separate regional rankings, or will there be one statewide ranking?

Answer: Separate regional rankings.

59. Should the cost proposal be submitted as a separate volume from the technical proposal?

Answer: See RFP Section 6. Submission of Proposals. Cost proposal should be submitted separately.

60. Is Judicial Branch-specific experience required, or will comparable state or local public sector experience be evaluated equally?

Answer: No. Comparable experience is acceptable.

61. Will proposing contractual exceptions impact proposal responsiveness or scoring?

Answer: See Answer to Question 52.

62. Does the disclosure clause mean that the entire proposal, including financial statements for the past three years, may be disclosed to the public or to other respondents upon request?

Answer: The entire proposal may be disclosed. All personal & financial information will be redacted.

If so, may a privately held company submit financial statements with the understanding that such information will be treated as confidential and disclosed only as required by applicable law?

Answer: Yes.

63. Since awards will be made by region, does the Judicial Council require proposers to submit separate proposals for each region, or should one combined proposal be submitted covering all regions being bid?

Answer: One proposal.

64. To ensure our proposal is submitted in full compliance with the solicitation requirements, could you please confirm the correct submission due date and time?

Answer: See RFP Section 3.0, Timeline for this RFP.

65. Do you require resumes to be submitted with the RFP response, and if so, should proposers submit actual candidate resumes or sample resumes?

Answer: See exhibit A-1 section A-3. Resumes are required for each individual that proposer proposes to be a designated key staff member. Candidate resumes will be required during the WOF process.

66. Can a vendor be selected for all 4 regions?

Answer: Yes.

67. Would the Judicial Council consider a two-week extension to the proposal submission deadline? This would change the proposal submission deadline from 2/24/2026 to 3/10/2026 effectively.

Answer: The timeline has been updated via addendum.

68. Timeline for This RFP - Is it possible to extend the proposal due date by two weeks to allow additional time for completion by our Staffing Practice and Legal?

Answer: See Answer to Question 67.

69. Submissions of Proposals - Do we need to respond to Exhibit A1 using the provided RFP Word document, or can we submit responses in an NWN-formatted PDF?

Answer: The Judicial Council prefers that you submit using the same format in Exhibit A1.

How should administrative attachments be submitted—separately, or combined into a single PDF?

Answer: Combining attachments is not required. Just ensure compliance and clarity.

70. Proposal Contents; 7.2 Cost Portion - The cost proposal uses two experience bands (3–10 years and 10+ years). How should JBEs handle resources with less than 3 years of experience—are they allowable, and if so, which rate band applies?

Answer: Less than 3 years of experience is not allowable.

For CPI-based rate adjustments: what specific CPI index/geography is used, and is the adjustment applied annually or only upon option exercise?

Answer: See section RFP section 1.2, The RFP, for the CPI index used. The adjustment is only applied when exercising an option term.

71. For Exhibit A1, should Proposers respond only to the Classifications and Regions they are bidding, or is a full response expected for all listed Classifications?

Answer: Proposer should respond to all classifications for each Region that they are bidding on.

72. Should Key Staff resumes be included in the Technical Proposal, or is role description sufficient?

Answer: See Answer to Question 65.

73. If a Proposer is highly ranked in one Region but not another, can the Judicial Council issue a partial award by Region and Classification?

Answer: Yes, the Master Agreements will be awarded by region.

74. Can you please confirm whether vendors are required to be located within California to submit a proposal for this RFP?

Answer: See Answers to Questions 38 and 45.

75. What is the minimum number of classifications defined in Exhibit A1 (Business and Technical Requirements) that a vendor must propose to qualify for this RFP?

Answer: No minimum is required to submit a proposal, but the Judicial Council is looking to award Master Agreements to vendors who can provide all classifications for the region(s) they are bidding on.

76. Are there any page limit restrictions applicable to the proposal responses?

Answer: No.

77. Can you please confirm whether vendors are required to complete and submit their responses directly within Exhibit A-1, Evaluation Criteria & Proposal Submission Forms, or if responses should be provided elsewhere in the proposal?

Answer: The Judicial Council prefers you to use the submission forms provided.

78. In Exhibit A-1, Evaluation Criteria & Proposal Submission Forms, under Part II – Financial Stability, vendors are asked to provide the latest three (3) years of financial reports. Is this requirement mandatory, and would audited financial statements for the past two (2) years be acceptable?

Answer: This is mandatory. 3 years are requested. If only 2 audited years exist, include them and the most recent reviewed year to meet the ‘3 years’ instruction.

79. Is possession of a California contractor’s license(s) required to submit a proposal for this RFP?

Answer: No.

80. Is possession of a Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) public works registration number required to submit a proposal for this RFP?

Answer: No.

81. Would there be an opportunity for vendors to bid on additional classifications that were not included in their initial proposal?

Answer: No.

82. Must Proposers complete Exhibit A2 responses for every listed Classification, or only for the Classifications and Regions they are bidding on?

Answer: All classifications for the region(s) they are bidding on.

83. If a Proposer is bidding on a Classification in multiple Regions, should the Exhibit A2 response be duplicated for each Region or provided once and applied across all Regions?

Answer: Exhibit A-2 Colum C allows you to indicate which regions are being bid on. No need to duplicate responses.

84. If equivalent tools or platforms are used in place of those listed, how should equivalency be documented in Exhibit A2 for evaluation purposes?

Answer: For equivalent tools, it should explicitly detail what tool is equivalent to what is required.

85. Are the minimum years of experience listed per Classification strict individual requirements, or may closely related experience or aggregate team experience be used to satisfy them?

Answer: Closely related experience may be counted; aggregate team experience will not count.

86. Where certifications are listed for a Classification, must they be held at the time of proposal submission, or may they be satisfied when a consultant is proposed under a WOLF?

Answer: They may be satisfied when a consultant is offered under a WOLF.

87. How are “preferred” certifications weighted during evaluation relative to required certifications?

Answer: Required certifications must be held when proposed for a WOLF. Preferred certifications bolster evaluation but are not mandatory.

88. Are Exhibit A2 responses evaluated strictly on a pass/fail basis for minimum compliance, or do the depth and quality of responses affect scoring?

Answer: Depth and Quality of response affect scoring.

89. Are incomplete or partially filled rows in Exhibit A2 for a bid Classification ground for deeming a non-responsive proposal?

Answer: It will not be deemed non-responsive, but the Judicial Council is seeking vendors who can provide all classifications in the region they are bidding on.

90. If responses in Exhibit A2 conflict with narratives in Exhibits A1 or A2, Sections A-1 through A-5, which document takes precedence for evaluation?

Answer: Please ensure narratives don’t conflict.

91. For Exhibit A-1 methodology, should the staffing and sourcing methodology be provided once at an enterprise level, or tailored by Classification and/or Region?

Answer: Enterprise level.

92. When describing the ability to fill positions statewide, is a remote-first sourcing model acceptable, or is physical presence in each Region expected?

Answer: Remote-first sourcing is acceptable, but If proposer is awarded a master agreement for a certain region, they are expected to provide onsite options if required during a WOLF.

93. If a Proposer does not intend to offer a Classification in a specific Region, should the corresponding rate be left blank or explicitly marked as not offered?

Answer: No Preference. Although the Judicial council prefers you to offer all classifications in the region you are bidding on.

94. Is there any preference or scoring consideration for Proposers that can support all Regions versus those bidding selectively?

Answer: All regions will be scored and awarded individually.

95. Market Benchmarking - Are there any benchmark figures or historical rate ranges used by the Judicial Council for evaluating hourly rates under this Master Agreement?

Answer: No. The hourly rates will be scored against the other proposers' hourly rates.

96. Staff retention philosophy- Please clarify if it is mandatory to provide the turnover rate? In case of no turnover, can vendors simply mention no turnover?

Answer: "no turnover" is acceptable if is true.

97. Is the Judicial Council willing to grant an extension to the proposal due date, if needed?

Answer: See Answer to Question 67.

98. If financial statements are included in the proposal, may they be redacted or marked as confidential?

Answer: See Answer to Question 62.

99. In Part IV – Additional Documents of Exhibit A, vendors are instructed to provide any additional certifications or documents required under the SOW. May vendors submit certifications or documents beyond those specifically listed (Proposer's/Subcontractor(s) California contractor's license(s), Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) public works registration number)?

Answer: Yes.

If so, should these documents be included at the end of Exhibit A or submitted as separate attachments?

Answer: No preference.

100. For Exhibit A1, Sections A1–A5, should vendors submit the required information as separate attachments, or should all documentation be included directly within the form (with additional pages added as necessary)?

Answer: The Judicial Council prefers the use of the form. If proposers use separate attachments, this should be clearly indicated on the form.

101. RFP: Section 9.0: Evaluation of Proposals and Section 7.2 Cost Portion. 2. Section 9.0: Evaluation of Proposals and Section 7.2 Cost Portion of the RFP seem to indicate that vendors can bid on any of the classifications listed in Exhibit B if included a fixed hourly standard rate for a senior and junior version of each role.

Answer: Not a question.

102. The Evaluation criteria shows the Cost is 50% of the total points. Will there be a certain number of points allotted per resource category?

Answer: The Cost points will be evaluated per classification/per region.

Or is the only way to maximize the full 50 points to bid on all the classifications?

Answer: To receive the full 50 points in a region, you must have the lowest cost for every category in that region.

Please provide a breakdown of the evaluation points per resource category if vendors are proposing different regions and job classifications.

Answer: Each region and classification will be worth equal number of points.

Please describe how the Judicial Council plans to evaluate the cost proposals if vendors are proposing different regions and job classifications.

Answer: Each classification and region will be worth equal number of points. The lowest rate per classification in a particular region will be awarded with the highest score. Each subsequent proposer will receive a score based on the percentage of cost they are relating to the lowest cost.

103. Will the JCC consider an extension of the proposal submission due date? (Preferably a 3-week extension, please?)

Answer: See Answer to Question 67.

Background & Historical Data

104. RFP (General). Will the Judicial Council publish any historical usage data (e.g., prior spend, number of placements, or most frequently requested classifications) to inform proposal assumptions?

Answer: Historical use data will not be released as part of the RFP. In 2025, more than twenty requests were sent out to participating vendors and the Judicial Council did not receive responses.

105. RFP (General) Is there an estimated total contract value, annual not-to-exceed amount, or projected volume of work associated with this master agreement?

Answer: The value of individual placements varies greatly based on project need and contractors placed, so an estimated total value is not available. There is not a not-to-exceed amount. In 2025, more than twenty requests were sent out to participating vendors.

106. RFP §1.0 Background Information Pages 1–2 Can the Judicial Council clarify the primary business drivers for this IT Consulting Managed Services RFP (e.g., workload surge, skills gap, procurement consolidation, cost control, or long-term staffing strategy)?

Answer: The goal is to establish MSAs supporting evolving IT needs across JBEs statewide. Requests are based on project need at a given time and only for temporary work on that project. No single project, or group of projects, has a majority of contractors.

107. RFP §1.0 Background Information Pages 1–2. Is this RFP intended to replace or supplement any existing master agreements or vendor pools currently used by the Judicial Council or trial courts?

Answer: Our Current IT Managed Services Master Agreement ends in June 2026. The Current IT Consulting Master Agreements have an option term that ends October 2026. This Agreement will replace those two agreements.

108. RFP §1.0 Background Information Pages 1–2. What level of direct engagement is anticipated between awarded vendors and individual trial courts versus centralized Judicial Council oversight?

Answer: JBE’s (including trial courts) enter Participating Addenda’s and issues WORFs directly. The Establishing JBE (Judicial Council) sets the master terms but individual JBEs manage their own engagements.

109. RFP §1.0 Background Information Pages 1–2 Are there known technology domains, programs, or initiatives (e.g., CMS modernization, cloud migration, cybersecurity) that are expected to drive the majority of resource requests?

Answer: Requests are based on project need at a given time and only for temporary work on that project. No single project, or group of projects, has a majority of contractors.

110. RFP §1.0 Background Information Pages 1–2. Does the Judicial Council anticipate uneven demand across regions, or should proposers assume relatively balanced statewide utilization?

Answer: In the past, the Northern Region (Sacramento) and Bay Region (San Francisco) have seen more demand.

111. RFP §1.0 Background Information Pages 1–2 Are there anticipated minimum or maximum numbers of vendors the Judicial Council expects to award under this RFP?

Answer: See Section 1.2 of the RFP. The goal of this RFP is to establish Master Agreements, up to ten (10) per geographic region.

112. Is this RFP for a new Master Agreement, or is it a replacement or renewal of an existing IT Consulting Managed Services Master Agreement?

Answer: See Answer to Question 107.

If it replaces a prior agreement, could the Judicial Council please provide the previous RFP number(s) and contract term(s)?

Answer: The Prior RFPs are IT-2020-64-RB and RFP-IT-2021-80RB. To obtain additional information not available on the courts website, Contractors will need to submit a records request through Public Access to Judicial Administrative Records (PAJAR).

113. Are there current Master Agreement vendors providing IT Consulting Managed Services? If yes: How many vendors currently hold agreements?

Answer: Yes. There are currently forty-five agreements.

Will those vendors continue under their existing agreements after the new Master Agreements are awarded?

Answer: Those vendors will finish any current Work Orders that have been awarded. All new WORFS will be sent to the new Master Agreement holders.

114. Can the Judicial Council share historical workload or usage information, such as:

- The approximate number of RFOs issued each year:

Answer: There are currently more than sixty resources with more than twenty requested in the past year.

- How work has typically been distributed by region or job classification (if available)?

Answer: See Answer to Question 110.

115. Are certain regions or Judicial Branch Entities (JBEs) historically higher users of consulting services than others?

Answer: See Answer to Question 110.

116. Can the Judicial Council provide historical spend information for IT Consulting Managed Services, such as:

- By fiscal year,
- By region, or
- By job classification (if tracked)?

Answer: See Answer to Question 104.

117. Is there an anticipated total spend estimate or ceiling associated with the Master Agreements, even if it is non-binding?

Answer: The value of individual placements varies greatly based on project need and contractors placed, so an estimated total value is not available. There is not a not-to-exceed amount. In 2025, more than twenty requests were sent out to participating vendors.

118. Is this a new contract, or does it replace an existing contract?

Answer: See Answer to Question 107.

119. What was the total amount spent on previous contracts, if applicable?

Answer: See Answer to Question 104.

120. Can the Judicial Council provide a list of incumbent vendors who worked or are currently working under previous contracts?

Answer: See Answer to Question 104.

121. What is the anticipated budget for this contract?

Answer: See Answer to Question 105.

122. Are there any challenges or pain points with the current or previous contract vendors?

Answer: There are not any discernable pain points with current or former contract vendors.

123. What are the most requested job classifications?

Answer: Requests are based on project need at a given time and only for temporary work on that project. The classifications listed in the RFP may all be needed over the course of the agreements.

124. Is there an estimated annual or multi-year budget range allocated for services procured under this Master Agreement, either at the Judicial Council level or aggregated across Participating JBEs?

Answer: See answer to Question 105.

125. For planning and capacity purposes, can the Judicial Council share high-level historical spend ranges for similar IT consulting or managed services agreements in previous years?

Answer: See answer to Question 105.

126. Approximately how many FTE-equivalent consultants were engaged annually across JBEs under comparable agreements in the past one to three years?

Answer: See Answer to Question 114.

127. What is the percentage of spend/consultant usage per region?

Answer: See Answer to Question 105.

128. Is this a brand-new solicitation, or are you adding vendors to an existing pool?

Answer: See Answer to Question 107.

129. What is the current annual spend in this space and per region?

Answer: See Answer to Question 105.

130. How many IT consultants does the Judicial Council have across CA currently?

Answer: See Answer to Question 114.

131. Can the Judicial Council provide details on the current master agreement, such as number of work orders issued, nature of work orders, amount spent, etc.?

Answer: See Answer to Question 114.

132. Master Agreement Objective and Process - Do the JBEs have projected demand forecasts for each job classification and/or region during the initial contract term?

Answer: This is unknown.

Which job classifications do you anticipate will be the highest volume or highest priority in the first 12–24 months?

Answer: Requests are based on project need at a given time and only for temporary work on that project. The classifications listed in the RFP may all be needed over the course of the agreements.

Are there particular technologies, systems, or transformation initiatives (e.g., cloud migration, cybersecurity programs, CMS modernization) driving near-term staffing needs?

Answer: No. This RFP is not driven by any particular project needs.

133. Are there any incumbents for this engagement? If yes, please provide the names of the incumbent.

Answer: Yes, there are incumbents. To obtain additional information not available on the courts website, Contractors will need to submit a records request through Public Access to Judicial Administrative Records (PAJAR).

134. Can you provide the spend by classification? Can you provide the yearly spend? What is the budget for this engagement?

Answer: See Answer to Question 105.

135. Are there any Classifications that are expected to be primarily onsite, regardless of region?

Answer: See Answer to Question 132.

136. Is there an estimated budget or not-to-exceed amount associated with this RFP?

Answer: See Answer to Question 105.

137. Incumbent Insight - Please share the current or incumbent vendors supporting similar IT consulting or managed services engagements for the Judicial Branch.

Answer: See Answer to Question 133.

138. Budget Visibility - Is there an estimated budget range for this Master Agreement or for typical WORFs issued by Participating JBEs?

Answer: See Answer to Question 105.

139. Are there any known pain points or performance gaps with the current incumbent(s) that the Judicial Council can share?

Answer: See Answer to Question 122.

140. What is the current budget for the MSA contract?

Answer: See Answer to Question 105.

WORF Process

141. RFP (Contract Structure) Will work be issued through competitive secondary solicitations among awarded vendors, direct selection, or rotation?

Answer: See the RFP, Section 1.4, WORF Process.

142. RFP (Contract Structure) Is there a standard task order template or SLA framework that will be used post-award?

Answer: See the RFP, Exhibit H, Sample Work Order Request Form.

143. WORF Process - How many WORFs does the Judicial Council anticipate issuing annually?

Answer: We are unable to determine at this time. Requests are based on project need at a given time for all JBE's.

What is the typical turnaround expectation for vendor submissions to WORFs?

Answer: Typically, there is a two to three-week turnaround.

Will JBEs award WORFs based strictly on cost, technical fit, or a scorecard approach?

Answer: Scorecard approach.

For an individual WORF, will a JBE award to one Master Agreement holder, or can it award to multiple vendors (e.g., split by role, phase, or geography)?

Answer: Each WORF will be for one specific role for one specific location.

Will interviews be required for all WORFs, or only for certain classifications/roles?

Answer: The majority will require interviews.

Will the Judicial Council provide a standard WORF template and/or evaluation scorecard for JBEs to use, or is the format entirely JBE-specific?

Answer: See Answer to Question 142.

How will WORFs be distributed (email distribution list, portal, procurement system), and how can vendors confirm they are included for the correct regions?

Answer: Each WORF will be sent via email to the contact provided for each vendor in the region the WORF is advertised for.

What is the typical lead time from WORF award to resource start date (including onboarding/access approvals)?

Answer: It can vary depending on the needs of the JBE.

144. Managed services expectations - For this RFP, does "Managed Services" include outcome-based operational ownership (e.g., service desk operations, platform administration), or is it primarily staff augmentation via WORFs? Do JBEs have standard SLA expectations (severity definitions, response times, uptime expectations) that commonly apply to managed services WORFs?

Answer: Primarily staff augmentation via WORFs.

Do JBEs commonly require 24x7 coverage or on-call rotations for certain functions, or only when specified per WORF?

Answer: This would be specified in the WORF.

Are there standard expectations for documentation, runbooks, knowledge transfer, and offboarding/credential turnover at WOLF completion?

Answer: This would be specified in the WOLF & Resulting Work Order.

145. Deliverables / IP - For custom deliverables created under a WOLF (scripts, automations, configurations, code), does the JBE assume full IP ownership, or is there a standard licensing approach?

Answer: JBE assumes full ownership.

146. Evaluation of Proposals / 10.0 Interviews - Will interviews be required for all WOLFs, or only for certain classifications/roles? (If this is intended to be answered here rather than in 1.4: either placement is fine keeping for emphasis.)

Answer: Section 9 and 10 of the RFP are speaking specifically to potential interviews before awarding Master Agreements. All WOLFS will require interviews.

147. Prevailing Wage - Can the Judicial Council clarify which types of work, classifications, or scenarios most commonly trigger prevailing wage/public works determinations for this vehicle (directional guidance is helpful)?

Answer: Prevailing wage may apply to certain work (installation, public works). Further details will be provided during the WOLF process.

What background checks are required for vendor resources (e.g., Live Scan/DOJ/FBI), who pays, and what are typical clearance timelines? (If background checks are governed elsewhere, please point us to the controlling exhibit/section.)

Answer: When each WOLF is awarded. The vendor will need to provide a recent background check to the JBE prior to executing the Work Order.

148. Is the intent that all awarded Master Agreement Holders will be considered equally eligible for WOLFs within a Region, or may Participating JBEs maintain preferred vendor lists?

Answer: Master Agreement holders will be equally eligible for WOLF's within the regions they are awarded.

149. Are Participating JBEs required to issue WOLFs to all Master Agreement Holders in a Region, or only a subset that best aligns with their anticipated needs?

Answer: Participating JBE's will issue WOLFs to all Master Agreement holders in a region.

150. Will WOLFs typically be issued for:

- Single classifications, or
- Multi-classification teams?

Answer: Single Classifications.

151. Is there an anticipated minimum or maximum duration for typical WOLFs (e.g., short-term staff augmentation vs. long-term managed services)?

Answer: No minimum or maximum are required. WOLFs are typically bid out for a 1-year term.

152. Under Section 1.4 – WORF Process, the RFP states that “for each IT project, the JBE will send out a minimum number of WORFs.” Can you please clarify what the minimum number of WORFs is?

Answer: The minimum number of WORFS will be determined in each JBE’s participating addendum to the master agreement.

153. WORF Continuity. Will Participating JBEs be allowed to issue follow-on or successive WORFs to an incumbent Master Agreement holder to ensure continuity of service and knowledge retention?

Answer: No. Incumbent Master Agreement holders will only be able to finish current Work Orders that were awarded prior to Agreement end date.

154. Managed Services Model - Can WORFs be structured to request teams or service pods (e.g., PM + Developers + QA) rather than only individual staff augmentation roles?

Answer: WORFS are only solicited for individual classifications.

155. Engagement Duration - Are JBEs permitted to issue long-duration WORFs (12–36 months) for sustained programs and ongoing IT initiatives?

Answer: Yes. This is common.

156. Pricing Flexibility - Can vendors offer lower, blended, or volume-discounted rates at the WORF level without requiring a Master Agreement amendment?

Answer: Vendors can offer lower rates than what is listed in the master agreements. Vendors can never offer higher rates.

157. WORF Evaluation - Will WORF responses be evaluated on overall value (experience, delivery model, continuity) in addition to hourly rates, rather than strictly on lowest cost?

Answer: WORFs will be awarded based on best value.

158. Prevailing Wage - Will JBEs explicitly state within each WORF whether prevailing wage requirements apply, rather than requiring vendors to determine applicability?

Answer: Yes.

159. Performance Visibility - Will a vendor’s performance on WORFs with one JBE be visible or considered by other Participating JBEs for future WORF evaluations?

Answer: No.

160. Volume Assurance - Is there any minimum number of positions, hours, or WORFs expected or assured for awarded Master Agreement holders?

Answer: No.

161. Can the WORF be performed offshore, or must all work be performed remotely within California?

Answer: no work can be performed offshore. All work must take place in the continental U.S.

162. RFP: Section 1.4.a Please indicate whether the work can be performed remotely (anywhere within the USA and/or offshore) or does the work need to be performed locally in California (based on each JBE and approved WORF)?

Answer: If the work is remote, it can be done anywhere in the continental United States. Vendor must also be able to provide in-office support when the WORF requires it.

163. Are the Participating Addenda going to be subject to negotiations as a part of the WORF process?

Answer: No.

Can you clarify the elements of a Participating Addendum and provide an example of what that would look like (whether in form of SOW or the WORF)

Answer: See Attachment 2, Appendix E for an example of the Participating Addendum. See Exhibit H of the RFP for an example of the WORF.

Security

164. Security / data handling requirements - Is there a standard security/control exhibit that vendors must meet for access to JBE systems (e.g., MFA, encryption, device management/MDM, endpoint protection, VPN/logging requirements)?

Answer: See Attachment 2, Judicial Council Master Agreement Terms and Conditions. Further details will be provided when a Work Order is executed.

Tools & Certifications

165. Exhibit A2- Job Classifications and Description tab. Are certifications listed for job classifications mandatory or preferred? Are tools listed for job classifications mandatory or preferred?

Answer: Certifications and tools listed are mandatory.

166. For Exhibit A-1/A-2, under “Tools to be provided by Contractor”, should proposers list only tools, platforms, or resources already provided or enabled by the proposer, excluding tools owned or provided by Judicial Branch Entities?

Answer: Yes, it refers to tools that the resources should have access to enabled by the proposer.

167. If a proposer does not provide proprietary or licensed tools, is it acceptable on the Response Sheet to describe the approach to enabling consultants using industry-standard tools and JBE-approved systems, rather than listing specific contractor-owned tools?

Answer: Yes

168. Regarding Exhibit A2 – Business & Technical Requirements & Response (Columns D and E), could you please provide additional clarification on what is meant by the “list of available tools” and “certifications” as they relate

to each job classification? For example, for the Agile Coach role, should Column D include the relevant tools and technologies an Agile Coach is typically expected to have experience with, and Column E list the common or preferred certifications associated with that role?

Answer: Yes. List the tools that the classification would have.

169. Are all tools and technologies listed under each Classification mandatory, or may Proposers indicate partial or equivalent support where certain tools are client-specific, legacy, or not universally required?

Answer: It refers to tools that the resources should have access to and that area available for the resource to utilize.

Key Staff

170. Exhibit A-1 §A-3 Key Staff Page 7. Are Key Staff required to be dedicated exclusively to Judicial Council work, or may they support multiple clients concurrently?

Answer: Not required to be exclusive.

171. Exhibit A-1 §A-3 Key Staff Page 7. If a Key Staff member has been in their role for less than two years due to promotion or reorganization, how will stability be evaluated?

Answer: See Exhibit A-1 Section A-3 Part III. The stability will be evaluated by reviewing the narrative provided. Proposer must “describe the reasons for a short tenure and identify how long their predecessor(s) served in those roles, and why the predecessor left that role”.

172. Exhibit A-1 §A-3 Key Staff Page 7. Are Key Staff expected to participate in onboarding, issue escalation, or performance management with trial courts directly?

Answer: Section A-3 defines key staff roles as single points of contact. If a Trial Court executes a participating addendum and WORE, then its direct involvement is consistent with the role.

173. Is the vendor required to identify and provide the Key Staff roles— (1) Sourcing Manager, (2) Account Representative, and (3) Accounting Lead—for each geographic region?

Answer: No. Only provide the key staff that will be working on this Master Agreement. If a vendor has different key staff for each region, then they should all be included. If key staff are the same for all regions, that is fine.

174. Can (2) Account Representative, and (3) Accounting Lead be the same person, or is it mandatory to provide two separate key personnel for these positions?

Answer: You may identify one person serving in multiple key staff roles if appropriate.

Rates & Pricing

175. RFP (General) Will pricing be evaluated separately or is this RFP strictly qualifications-based with pricing negotiated or competed at the task order level?

Answer: See Section 9 of the RFP, Evaluation of proposals. Pricing is worth 50 points.

176. Payment Information; 5.2 Travel - How often do JBEs approve travel expenses, given travel is only reimbursed when pre-approved?

Answer: Travel requirements will be noted on the WORF.

177. General pricing / billing interpretation under Payment + Cost model - Will JBEs commonly expect rates lower than the published maximum rate in the Master Agreement?

Answer: Each WORF will have a max listed rate. Each Master Agreement holder must provide a rate at or under the WORF max rate and it cannot be more than the rate listed in their individual Master Agreement.

Do JBEs have typical budget constraints or standard rate ranges by classification?

Answer: Each WORF will have a max listed rate. Each Master Agreement holder must provide a rate at or under the WORF max rate and it cannot be more than the rate listed in their individual Master Agreement.

Are the Master Agreement hourly rates hard ceiling rates for all WORFs under all conditions (e.g., expedited timelines, after-hours, weekends/emergency response), given the RFP indicates no OT/holiday premiums?

Answer: Yes. Master Agreement hourly rates are hard ceiling rates.

Beyond half-hour increments, are there any minimum billing rules JBEs commonly apply (e.g., minimum daily hours, minimum dispatch charge), or is billing strictly actual time worked?

Answer: Billing is time worked.

178. When work is performed remotely by a consultant located in one Region for a JBE located in another Region, which Region's hourly rate applies for billing and evaluation purposes?

Answer: The hourly rate listed for the region listed on the JBE location/WORF will apply.

179. Remote Delivery - For fully remote resources, should pricing be based solely on the JBE's Region, regardless of the consultant's physical location?

Answer: See Answer to Question 78.

180. Describe if there is a limitation that the rates provided against this RFP are required to be aligned to or match to one's CMAS rates?

Answer: This is not a CMAS agreement and is not tied to a DGS CMAS agreement in any way.

Can the rates be independent from CMAS?

Answer: Yes.

181. If rates can be independent of CMAS Rates, can rates for the same job classification differ the rates for the same job classification in another region?

Answer: Yes.

Do the rates for the same job classification have to be the same for the four regions?

Answer: No.

182. Similar question regarding the rates - it appears the rates cannot change (as in increase) once rates are set, but will vendors be able to modify rates in the future?

Answer: Rates can be modified after the initial term and each option term.

183. Is a vendor required to provide rates for every job classification in the region, or is a vendor able to not submit a rate for a job classification within a region?

Answer: It is preferred that a vendor provides all rates for job classifications in each region they are bidding on.

Generative AI

184. Generative Artificial Intelligence - Does GenAI disclosure apply only to deliverables provided to JBEs, or also to internal vendor tools used to produce work (e.g., drafting, coding assistants, summarization)?

Answer: Disclosure of GenAI tools will be necessary at any time GenAI may be used. Additionally, GenAI tools cannot be used to produce contracted work unless they have been disclosed and approved for use by the JBE prior to the work being done.

If GenAI is used in a WOLF deliverable, is there required security/legal review process or standard addendum language JBEs will require?

Answer: Language regarding the use of GenAI and required disclosure will be in the master agreement with contracted companies. Additionally, GenAI tools cannot be used to produce contracted work unless they have been disclosed and approved for use by the JBE prior to the work being done.

Are there explicit prohibitions on using JBE data with third-party GenAI services (even if de-identified), and/or an approved tool list?

Answer: GenAI tools cannot be used to produce contracted work unless they have been disclosed and approved for use by the JBE prior to the work being done. A JBE may have a list of approved tools, however, sharing JBE data with any GenAI tool is controlled and may be prohibited.

185. Does the requirement to disclose GenAI usage apply to:

Internal delivery tools only, or Only when GenAI directly affect JBE systems or deliverables?

Will the Judicial Council provide standard GenAI contract language during negotiations, or should Proposers anticipate custom provisions?

Answer: See Attachment 2, Master Agreement Terms and Conditions, for GenAI contract language.

186. Generative AI - Is Generative AI permitted for internal productivity (e.g., analysis, estimation, documentation drafts) when it does not materially impact deliverables or systems?

Answer: See Answer to Question 184.

Other:

187. Can remote work be performed outside the USA (say, India)?

Answer: No.

188. Are electronic signatures allowed?

Answer: Yes.

189. Please confirm that this solicitation is not a Managed Service Provider model, and that awarded vendors are not expected to manage other suppliers or deliver firm-level managed services.

Answer: Confirmed.

190. Please confirm whether this Master Agreement is limited to Judicial Branch Entities only and is not intended for cooperative or piggyback use by other agencies.

Answer: Correct. Judicial Branch Entities only.

191. Are there any mandatory participation or utilization goals associated with this solicitation?

Answer: The JBE's are free to conduct their own solicitations not connected with this RFP or any resulting agreement. The JBE's are not obligated to purchase services under any Master Agreement that may result from this RFP.

192. Does the JCC intend the master agreement that vendors must function primarily as staff-augmentation or personnel placement providers, or may vendors also propose project-based and consulting services delivered by their own employees, where the value is in specialized expertise and defined outcomes rather than candidate placement? For example, on Exhibit G, Sample List of Supported Software, at line 63 Video/Meeting/Conference Systems is listed and at line 68 Court Call(sic)/Telephonic/Video Appearance is listed.

Can Court Call bid to provide those services to a JBE (and/or other services it believes it is qualified to provide)?

Answer: The intention is for staff-augmentation or personnel placement. This is not a project-based solicitation.

Similarly, at line 55 reference is made to Case Management. Can we bid to provide those services to interested JBEs?

Answer: No. See Exhibit B for the items you can bid on.

And, as a final example, at lines 76 and 77 Lexis Nexis and West Law are referenced. Can those companies submit bids to support their products?

Answer: See Exhibit B for the items you can bid on.

193. Does the Judicial Council prefer local bidders?

Answer: No preference.

194. Can the Judicial Council confirm whether remote work within continental US is permitted for all Classifications, provided the Proposer has bid on the applicable Region?

Answer: Yes, but if awarded a Master Agreement for a region, the vendor must also be able to provide onsite options if required in the WORF.

195. Experience Definition - Can the Judicial Council confirm the experience range expectations for Senior and Junior (less-senior) resources across Classifications?

Answer: Experience ranges are 3-9 years (less senior) and 10+ years (senior).

196. Under 'Part III – Turnover Rate of Executives and Key Staff: Describe and discuss the turnover rate of key executives and the designated Key Staff members.

Answer: This is not a question.

197. If there is not enough space in the PDF document, are vendors permitted to convert it into Word and then fill it in?

Answer: Yes.

198. What is the process for adding, modifying, and removing roles?

Answer: If awarded a Master Agreement, contractor will be expected to provide all roles which they bid on and were awarded. Roles will not be added at a later date.