

RFI IT-2020-65-RB

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 an 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?
- If yes, is that same vendor guaranteed future incremental business?
 - If yes, and the pilot cost is \$0, why is pricing requested?
 - 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.