

RFI IT-2020-65-RB

ADDENDUM TO ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

1. Has funding been approved for this? If so, through what means?

Funding has been requested. We anticipate its approval when the State Budget is finalized.

2. Is there an estimated cost of budget?

While funding for the project has been requested, it has not been approved by the Legislature. For that reason, final numbers on the budget cannot be provided at this time.

3. What is the predicted timeline of procurement if this RFI greenlights a solicitation based on the desire to implement services by early FY 2020?

Timeline is FY2020-2021.

4. Reading section 10, page 14, this does not constitute a solicitation. Will a separate formal solicitation be issued for the pilot?

This RFI is a solicitation in the broadest definition of the term. Solicitations include not only RFI but also RFQ, RFO, and RFP. It is our intent that an RFP will be issued for the pilot.

5. Will the RFI responses be used in developing requirements/scope for the pilot?

Yes.

6. Rule 3.670 is oriented around a specific business model for providing remote appearances. With the advancements in technology and vendor space, is a possible outcome of this RFI that the JCC may consider alternative methods of providing a solution?

One of the goals of this pilot is to identify and prove new solutions based on available technology. Results of this pilot will influence decisions regarding future use of remote

video technologies in the courts. Refer to the 2017 Futures Commission Report at <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/futures-commission-final-report.pdf> for additional information.

7. Page 4 Section A (Equipment) states: The vendor's solution shall be no cost to the JCC. Is the vendor chosen expected to provide a pilot in 20 courtrooms at no cost to JCC?
 - a. If yes, is that same vendor guaranteed future incremental business?
 - b. If yes, and the pilot cost is \$0, why is pricing requested?
 - c. How is vendor supposed to recoup costs of providing a solution? Who pays the fees?

There will be no cost to the JCC for costs incurred in responding to this RFI for submitting a proposed solution. Pricing is requested as a tool to understand the fiscal impact of the pilot program and for future cost estimation.

An RFP is planned to be issued. A vendor who would be able to offer defined services will be awarded the contract.

8. Do any of the existing 20 Courtrooms have existing video equipment, such as H.323 endpoints, computers/laptops, etc. with webcams? If yes, can we get a detailed inventory of what exists so we can factor this into equipment cost projections?

Assumption should be made that courtrooms will not have any equipment. Any cost/ or effort estimates should be provided based on that assumption.

9. What are the CMS integration requirements? What CMS systems are in use among the 20 Courtrooms for the pilot? How many courts comprise the pilot?

Key Case Management System (CMS) integration requirements focus on the remote solution providing the ability to schedule appointments and share content for evidence sharing requirements.

As specific courts have not yet been selected, the systems may be identified during the RFP phase. CMS in use across the state include eCourt, Odyssey, FullCourt, Thomson-Reuters, Vision, V3, One Solution. Note this is not a definitive or exhaustive list and is only provided as a reference of the types of systems in place.

Please reference page 3 section 3 of the RFI. A total of up to 10 courts and 40 courtrooms comprise the pilot.

10. Can you provide a list of the types of cases will be heard?

Potential case types include:

- *Traffic infraction*

- *Domestic violence related services*
- *Family law proceedings*
- *Hearings on orders to show cause*
- *Law and motion*
- *Readiness conferences*
- *Trial setting and status conferences*
- *Settlement conferences*
- *Fee waiver hearings*
- *Small Claims*
- *Participant Scheduling*
- *Process for documenting agreements*
- *Video display during hearing*
- *Facilitation of private discussions*
- *Calendar management*
- *Evidence exchange and presentation (discovery)*
- *Facilitation of evidence exchange*
- *Video remote interpreting*
- *Integration with court case management system (CMS)*

11. In the criteria is stated "Fresno-type on premise solution as described in Appendix A" – *Preferred.*

No, Fresno type solution is not necessarily the preferred solution. It is an example of a potential solution that has been developed.

12. Is there a preference for Cisco equipment?

No.

ANSWERS TO SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS

13. Is it contemplated that an RFP will follow this RFI? If so, must a party participate in this RFI in order to participate in the RFP process?

An RFP is anticipated to follow this RFI. It is not a requirement to respond to this RFI to participate in the RFP. Notwithstanding, the responses to the RFI will greatly contribute to the development and scoping of the RFP.

14. The RFI does not appear to make any reference to the COVID-19 Pandemic and there are questions that arise from the activities of various courts in response to the Pandemic:

- a. Does the RFI anticipate fully remote bench trials and if so, does that change anything about the terms or scope of the RFI?
- b. Does the RFI anticipate fully remote jury trials and if so, does that change anything about the terms or scope of the RFI?

Potential case types and functionality the RVS solution shall address include, but is not limited to:

- *Traffic infractions*
- *Domestic violence related services*
- *Family law proceedings*
- *Hearings on orders to show cause*
- *Law and motion*
- *Readiness conferences*
- *Trial setting and status conferences*
- *Settlement conferences*
- *Fee waiver hearings*
- *Small Claims*
- *Participant Scheduling*
- *Process for documenting agreements*
- *Video display during hearing*
- *Facilitation of private discussions*
- *Calendar management*
- *Evidence exchange and presentation (discovery)*
- *Facilitation of evidence exchange*
- *Video remote interpreting*
- *Integration with court case management system (CMS)*
- *Other Criminal Matters*

Fully remote jury trials are not currently in the scope but may be added in the future.

15. Will the parties allowed to provide the Phase 1 and/or Phase 2 pilot services be selected from those who participate in this RFI? If so, on what basis are the participants being evaluated and selected?

The party who will provide Phase 1 and/or Phase 2 pilot services will be selected from those who will participate in the RFP, not this RFI.

Selection criteria will likely include:

- *Cost - Best value of Vendor's proposed solution, including equipment (complete for all hardware and software), implementation, support and maintenance*

- *Vendor's RVS Solution Meets Requirements - Degree to which the vendor's proposed solution exceeds the minimum functional and programmatic requirements and provides benefit to the judicial branch*
- *Implementation - Ability to easily or readily install and integrate with existing equipment and infrastructure in a courtroom setting*
- *Scalability - Ability for the solution to expand to meet needs of multiple courts*
- *Acceptance of the JCC's Terms and Conditions - Reasonableness of vendor's proposed contract exceptions, if any*

16. If there will be five courts for Phase 1, will five different solutions be evaluated? How many solutions does the JCC plan to allow to serve during the pilots? Is there a minimum or maximum number?

There is no minimum or maximum number of solutions that JCC has currently identified.

17. If there will be five courts for Phase 2, will they be the same courts as started in Phase 1 or a different group? If a different group, will five different solutions be evaluated?

Courts for Phase 2 implementation could be different or the same as those selected in Phase 1. The RFP will govern which solutions will be selected for the entire pilot initiative.

18. Have the five courts to participate in each Phase been selected? If so, which courts? If not, how and by when will those courts be selected?

We are currently in the process of selecting courts for Phase 1 and 2. Selection criteria includes, but is not limited to, geographic location, community/public benefit and level of court readiness and interest. Selection of courts are expected to take place prior to July 15, 2020

19. Can the JCC be more specific as to the start dates for each Phase, the duration of each Pilot Phase and the metrics by which each Pilot Phase or component thereof is being evaluated?

The implementation of the pilot would start as soon as possible after the RFP selection phase, which is targeted to conclude Q3 2020. Vendors will also be evaluated on the duration and timeline of each pilot phase. The metrics for evaluation shall be identified during the RFP and implementation phases.

20. JabberVideo and Skype business were mentioned, by name in the RFI. Are there features of those platforms that are preferred over other platforms? Were the features of other platforms viewed, as well? Please describe the process by which JabberVideo and Skype business were viewed or evaluated.

No, JabberVideo and Skype were mentioned as examples; they are not preferred solutions. JCC is open to other platforms that would meet the requirements (such as BlueJeans, WebEx, Microsoft Teams, etc.).

21. Are "software end point video conferencing" solutions preferred over browser-based platforms? If so, why?

The RVS solution should include both capabilities and not require participants to download any software to connect via remote video.

22. Will the Pilots include courts that will conduct remote arraignments?

Yes, it is possible. The solution should be robust enough to allow for the ability to serve the varied uses of the potential case types.