

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS RFP-5DCA-091417-Self-Help-WV-RFP

INTERACTIVE APPELLATE SELF-HELP AND LEARNING CENTER WEBSITE

October 6, 2017

- Whether companies from Outside Canada can apply for this?
(like, from India or USA)
 - Proposers must be duly registered to conduct business in the State of California including, but limited to, obtaining a federal tax identification number.

- Whether we need to come over there for meetings?
 - Travel may be required for this project.

- Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside Canada?
(like, from India or USA)
 - No. The company needs to be located in the United States due to logistical considerations.

- Can we submit the proposals via email?
 - No. Please refer to submission requirements in the RFP.

- Do you provide the Subject matter experts / legal experts to assist in the development of the project?
 - Yes, the Judicial Branch will have subject matter experts as part of the project team for operational and technical type of subjects. Legal experts can also be engaged within the Judicial Branch as related to content and anything “legal” that directly impacts the Judicial Branch.

- The cost structure listed on page 15 totals 110 points whereas Section 9.0 states this is a 100-point scale. Can you please clarify which of them may be incorrect?
 - The point distribution for evaluation of proposals has been updated in Revision Number One to the RFP.

- With “Cost” accounting for 50% of the available points in the evaluation process it appears that this is a “low bid wins” project. Is that correct? If not, please clarify.
 - There will be a cost and non-cost evaluation portion of the proposals. The final determination will be based on adding both portions to establish the highest overall scored proposal.

- Does the Courts of Appeal have a budget in mind for this project? Given it is about 50% of the deciding factor, we are eager to hear back on this detail so we work within your range.
 - The Courts of Appeal have been appropriated a budget for this project. Proposers should bid the best competitive pricing available to them that meets the needs of the project.

- Would it be acceptable to provide a CMS built with instructive materials, courses, and interactive forms as opposed to strictly a Learning Management System?
 - The Courts of Appeal are receptive to this approach.
- Are the Courts of Appeal open to the vendor using an existing learning or content management system, such as Drupal, Moodle, or WordPress, as the framework for the website?
 - The Courts of Appeal are receptive to this approach.
- Can you provide more information about the Courts of Appeal e-filing solution, TrueFiling EFS? For example is there an API available for integrating it with the website? Are there technical issues that need to be considered for incorporating its forms?
 - Yes, TrueFiling (by ImageSoft) does have an API available, and integration with that API requires that ECF (Electronic Court Filing) standards are leveraged/followed.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electronic_court_filing

http://www.ncsc.org/ncsc_org/Services%20and%20Experts/Technology%20tools/Court%20specific%20standards.aspx

- What roles and associated permissions does the Courts of Appeal need for the website's users?
 - The Courts of Appeal envisions support for traditional content management workflow roles: Editor, Author, Administrator, etc.
- What types of courses do the Courts plan to post to the site? For example, multimedia SCORM-compliant modules, text-based, video, or some other format?
 - We would look to the vendor to recommend the most effective format to presenting various types of material.

- What types of tests do the Courts plan to develop? What question types will be required (i.e. multiple choice, drag-and-drop, etc.)?
 - There are no plans to create any “tests”, but rather questionnaires. The questionnaires are intended to “guide” the user(s) to the correct forms/templates. The format may be multiple-choice, checkboxes, drag-n-drop widgets, or any other most-appropriate method, etc.

- Will the Courts of Appeal provide translated Spanish-language content, or are you looking for the vendor to provide translation services as part of this contract?
 - The vendor should provide the translation services as part of the proposed contract. The cost should be broken out separately so that it can either be included or not, depending upon overall budget and cost. The company or person(s) who provide the translation services must be certified/licensed in California for interpretation of Spanish.

- What levels of service are required? Do you have any guidance on expected uptime, frequency of backups, or technical support hours that will be required?
 - SLA: Require 99.0% uptime and a 30-minute response to acknowledgement/reaction of any downtime or technical issues. Minimum technical support contact window would be 8AM-6PM PST, Monday-Friday. A full backup should be taken daily with a reasonable retention time period.

- Are there any requirements for ongoing content support or will Courts staff be responsible for adding and updating forms, courses, and other materials on the site?
 - There are no requirements for any ongoing content support/change by the vendor, at this time.

- With regard to the various types of interface forms, how will the data need to be handled? When a user submits a form, is the data stored in the system? Will it be passed through to a different database or system? Will it be emailed to a recipient at the Courts of Appeal?
 - Once the form/data is transmitted via the API to TrueFiling for the purposes of eFiling, there is no need for the form/data to be stored or retained in this website/system. If a form is left incomplete, the system/website shall retain it for a period of time. Please reference 3.1.5.5 in the RFP.

- How long does each of the animated videos described in sections 3.1.3.1, 3.1.3.2, and 3.1.3.3 need to be?
 - The exact length of the animated videos has not yet been determined and will be decided upon with the vendor at a later date. *Each video is not anticipated to exceed five (5) minutes.*

- Will Courts subject matter experts be available to provide content for and help draft scripts for the videos?
 - Yes, subject matter experts will be available.

- Are you able to share any budget limits or time details from your grant that we should be aware of while preparing the proposal?
 - We are unable to specify budget limits. Please refer to the timeline in section 4.0 of the RFP for timing details.

- Is there a need to collect, store, and report on user learning data? For example, assessment results, course completions, or certification status?
 - No, user learning data is not requested or required. The purpose of the assessments, etc. is to help educate public users and to help guide them to the correct forms/templates/etc.

- What is the budget for years 2, 3, 4, and 5?
 - N/A. There is no ongoing annual budget scheduled at this time.

- Will JCC consider partial response for a particular set of requirements? Example: Response for Analytics.
 - No, but sub-contracting is permitted in case a vendor cannot solely complete all requested items.

- How many forms will be included in the rollout of the site, can you share samples?
 - Please reference samples/examples as included in the RFP. Complete requirements are detailed in section 3.1.2.

- Is integration with TrueFiling EFS included in scope or will it be just a link to?
 - Yes, integration is strongly desired and included within the scope for purposes of filing/transmission.

- What is the expected number of users/visitors to the site?
 - Unknown. The number of new appeals filed statewide during the judicial branch's 2016 calendar year was slightly over 15,200. A large percentage of these appeals was filed by counsel, who we believe will be less likely to use the self-help website than self-represented litigants. Of course, we anticipate that additional users will access the website to file writ proceedings (rather than appeals) and still others who are not involved in appeals will access the learning center as part of the website.

- Establish account: Please clarify requirement for identity management of such accounts
 - Please refer to section 3.1.5 in the RFP.

- Does JCC already own Identity Management software? If so, will it be leveraged for this project?
 - No. Please refer to section 3.1.5 in the RFP.

- Hosted Web or Learning CM Platform. What are the expected formats and media types of the instructional content?
 - Apart from general formats, such as video, text, audio, the Courts of Appeal are not requiring specific file formats. All media must have sufficient cross-browser compatibility.

- What are the expected roles for content authoring and publishing?
 - Answered above.

- Is there a need to store test results? For how long?
 - No, unless related to questions being asked that have guided the user(s) to the forms/templates relevant to their visit/submission, in which case they should be stored until the transmission into TrueFiling has completed, or filling in subsequent/related forms.

- Interactive Learning Center Components. Will JCC provide content for these video's or will the vendor need to produce the content of the videos?
 - The project will incorporate certain/existing videos that can be repurposed for this project. Additionally, all new videos being created as part of the project will be animated. The Judicial Branch will provide subject matter experts to assist with the content and/or scripting. The vendor will be fully responsible for creating the animated videos.

- Platform analytics. What are the key performance indicators that must tracked and analyzed?
 - Analytics (KPI's) will include standard Google Analytics metrics, but other metrics/KPI's may be determined at a later date.

- Intake Questionnaire. How many fields does this form have?
 - Not yet determined.

- What are the workflow steps associated with the form?
 - Not yet determined.

- What is the system/product that maintains the vexatious litigant database?
 - The information is on a PDF on the Judicial Branch website. Internal databases that contain this information will not be exposed for purposes of this project.

- Please provide more detail on the current Microsoft/Azure cloud environment. Are there any requirements for hosting? Is the project open to using AWS or would they prefer to use Azure?
 - Azure, government cloud.

- Where is the current FAQ repository hosted? What type of data/file?
 - There are multiple sources of FAQ's in HTML format.

- What are the requirement for data retention? Please elaborate.
 - Please reference section 3.1.5.5 in the RFP.

- Would a print-out of our active registration from the California Secretary of State website be adequate for proof of good standing or do we need a Certificate of Good Standing?
 - A Certificate of Good Standing is required.

- If you wanted us to host, it would it need to be on a GovCloud service?
 - Yes

- Multi-lingual support and content delivery. Would we be able to use Google Translate or would they want to hire a translator?
 - Translator, certified/licensed in California for the Spanish translation. We would also be open to Google translate for other languages and overall website translation.

- Platform analytics. Would you like this to be part of your backend or would using Google Analytics be O.K to use?
 - Using Google Analytics is acceptable.

- Will Google Analytics satisfy the requirement for robust analytic tools? (3.1.1.7)
 - Yes, Google Analytics is acceptable.

- Seeking clarification on Section 3.1.2.3, 3.1.2.4 and 3.1.2.5. Does a “template” refer to a single document that the input questions would mapped to? If so, what does the Court mean by “Generic” templates? Is this just a data collection mechanism that might be used across various documents?
 - This project envisions some specific templates that are to be used for one purpose only and some generic templates that can be customized by the user for different purposes. Neither generic nor specific templates will need to have a feature by which information in them will need to be exported or mapped to other materials; however, certain information input by the user on the intake questionnaire or elsewhere on the site will need to be imported or mapped to the templates. Examples of information that will need to be imported into the templates from other sources include the user’s name and address and the case caption (including case name and number).

- Would any other Bot Architecture be considered for the 3.1.4.1 requirement?
 - Yes, the Judicial Branch is receptive to other recommendations.

- Section 3.1.5.5 suggests that a system that does purge data might be considered. Are there any requirements of the Court that specific data gathered by the site and its users be retained for a given period of time?
 - See above regarding data retention and the purpose(s) of doing so.

- Is the Interactive timeline described in section 3.1.6 a static entity, in the sense that it won't need to be changed often? Or will it need to be dynamic with the ability to update and change defined milestones?
 - We don't envision that changes will occur often, but it should be agile and editable to some level in that the Judicial Branch can make changes to it should changes to rules of court occur, etc.

- Section 3.1.2.1 describes an option to Download a final form. What formats should the download be made available in?
 - PDF

- What browser requirements does the Court have in terms of support. IE Do we need to support legacy versions of Internet Explorer, etc...If legacy browsers must be supported, is the Court ok with a "degrade gracefully" approach for unsupported features?
 - Legacy browser support with a "degrade gracefully" approach is acceptable.

- Throughout the requirements, there are references to specific solutions such as Microsoft Azure IAM, Microsoft's Bot Framework, and HotDocs. Is it the intention of the Court to acquire these specific solutions or have preference for these specific solutions?
 - They were simply used as points of reference and the Judicial Branch is open to any and all product recommendations or approaches.

- Was there a previous proposal provided to the Courts for a similar solution?
 - The Judicial Council does not disclose information regarding previous proposal unless the steps for a formal request for records are made.

- In part 3.1.5, it says "the architecture should be Azure Identity Management." Is it the intention for us to plan to use their solution and for us not to present other solutions?
 - It was simply used as point of reference and the Judicial Branch is open to any and all product recommendations or approaches.

- Will the Judicial Council provide the material and scripts for the animated videos that are being requested? If not, how is direction for these deliverables expected to be provided?
 - The Judicial Branch will have subject matter experts as part of the project team.

- In regard to 3.1.6.1, is there an example of the interactive timeline that is expected?
 - No, not the "interactive component", but there is an example of the timeline in the RFP. The Judicial Branch is relying on the vendor to make the timeline "interactive".

- What are the values of a small business and DVBE incentive?
 - Please consult your own legal counsel for further advice if you determine necessary. <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbcl-manual.pdf>

- We see that there are the initial implementation, customization, and other costs along with recurring costs. Which costs will be used for evaluation? Should the recurring costs be calculated in annual amounts?
 - All submitted cost data will be used to evaluate the cost portion. Recurring costs should be provided in the annual amount total. Please refer to Attachment 11 of the RFP.