RFP Number: RFP-FS-2022-12-KO-Security System Evaluation

ATTACHMENT A ADMINISTRATIVE RULES GOVERNING RFPS (IT SERVICES)

1. COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA REGARDING THE RFP

Except as specifically addressed elsewhere in the RFP, Consultant's must send any communications regarding the RFP to <u>Solicitations@jud.ca.gov</u> (the "Solicitations Mailbox"). Consultant must include the RFP Number in subject line of any communication.

2. QUESTIONS REGARDING THE RFP

Cosultants interested in responding to the RFP may submit questions via email to the Solicitations Mailbox on procedural matters related to the RFP or requests for clarification or modification of the RFP no later than the deadline for questions listed in the timeline of the RFP. Once submitted, questions become part of the procurement file and are subject to disclosure. Consultant's are accordingly cautioned not to include any proprietary or confidential information in questions. If the Consultant is requesting a change, the request must set forth the recommended change and the Consultant's reasons for proposing the change. Questions or requests submitted after the deadline for questions will not be answered. Without disclosing the source of the question or request, a copy of the questions and the Judicial Council responses will be made available prior to the proposal due date and time.

3. ERRORS IN THE RFP

- A. If, before the proposal due date and time listed in the timeline of the RFP, a Consultant discovers any ambiguity, conflict, discrepancy, omission, or error in the RFP, the Consultant must immediately notify the Judicial Council via email to the Solicitations Mailbox and request modification or clarification of the RFP. Without disclosing the source of the request, the Judicial Council may modify the RFP before the proposal due date and time by releasing an addendum to the solicitation.
- B. If a Consultant fails to notify the Judicial Council of an error in the RFP known to the Consultant, or an error that reasonably should have been known to the Consultant, before the proposal due date and time listed in the timeline of the RFP, the Consultant shall propose at its own risk. Furthermore, if the Consultant is awarded the agreement, the Consultant shall not be entitled to additional compensation or time by reason of the error or its later correction.

RFP Title: Consultation Services for Electronic Security Systems Evaluations RFP Number: RFP-FS-2022-12-KO-Security System Evaluation

4. ADDENDA

A. The Judicial Council may modify the RFP before the proposal due date and time listed in the timeline of the RFP by issuing an addendum. It is each Consultant's responsibility to inform itself of any addendum.

B. If any Consultant determines that an addendum unnecessarily restricts its ability to propose, the Consultant shall immediately notify the Judicial Council via email to the Solicitations Mailbox no later than one day following issuance of the addendum.

5. WITHDRAWAL AND RESUBMISSION/MODIFICATION OF PROPOSALS

A Consultant may withdraw its proposal at any time before the deadline for submitting proposals by notifying the Judicial Council in writing of its withdrawal. The notice must be signed by the Consultant. The Consultant may thereafter submit a new or modified proposal, provided that it is received at the Judicial Council no later than the proposal due date and time listed in the timeline of the RFP. Modifications offered in any other manner, oral or written, will not be considered. Proposals cannot be changed or withdrawn after the proposal due date and time listed in the timeline of the RFP.

6. ERRORS IN THE PROPOSAL

If errors are found in a proposal, the Judicial Council may reject the proposal; however, the Judicial Council may, at its sole option, correct arithmetic or transposition errors or both. If these corrections result in significant changes in the amount of money to be paid to the Consultant (if selected for the award of the agreement), the Consultant will be informed of the errors and how they were corrected, and given the option to abide by the corrected amount or withdraw the proposal.

7. RIGHT TO REJECT PROPOSALS

- A. Before the proposal due date and time listed in the timeline of the RFP, the Judicial Council may cancel the RFP for any or no reason. After the proposal due date and time listed in the timeline of the RFP, the Judicial Council may reject all proposals and cancel the RFP if the Judicial Council determines that: (i) the proposals received do not reflect effective competition; (ii) the cost is not reasonable; (iii) the cost exceeds the amount expected; or (iv) awarding the contract is not in the best interest of the Judicial Council.
- B. The Judicial Council may or may not waive an immaterial deviation or defect in a proposal. The Judicial Council's waiver of an immaterial deviation or defect shall in no way modify the RFP or excuse a Consultant from full compliance with RFP specifications. Until a contract resulting from this RFP is signed, the Judicial Council reserves the right to accept or reject any or all of the items in the proposal, to award the contract in whole or in part and/or negotiate any or all items with individual Consultants if it is deemed in the Judicial Council's best

RFP Number: RFP-FS-2022-12-KO-Security System Evaluation

interest. A notice of intent to award does not constitute a contract, and confers no right of contract on any Consultant.

- C. The Judicial Council reserves the right to issue similar RFPs in the future. The RFP is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract and in no way is the Judicial Council or the State of California responsible for the cost of preparing the proposal.
- D. Consultants are specifically directed **NOT** to contact any Judicial Council personnel or consultants for meetings, conferences, or discussions that are related to the RFP at any time between release of the RFP and any award and execution of a contract. Unauthorized contact with any Judicial Council personnel or consultants may be cause for rejection of the Consultant's proposal.

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

- A. The Judicial Council will follow the following process in evaluating proposals.
 - 1. The Judicial Council will first open the non-cost portion of each proposal received by the appropriate deadline to confirm that it meets the format requirements specified in the RFP.
 - 2. The Judicial Council will complete its evaluation of the non-cost portions of all such proposals using the methods specified in the RFP.
 - 3. The Judicial Council will publish the results of the completed non-cost evaluation at the following location: https://www.courts.ca.gov/rfps.htm. Because the small business preference and DVBE incentive cannot be properly applied until both the non-cost and cost portions of the proposals have been scored, these factors will be excluded when publishing the results of the completed non-cost evaluation.
 - 4. The Judicial Council will publicly open the cost portion of the proposals as specified in the RFP. The Judicial Council will not, however, open the cost portion of any proposal determined to have a material deviation in the non-cost portion.
 - 5. The Judicial Council will evaluate the cost portion of the proposals opened in item A.4 above. All figures entered on the cost portion must be clearly legible.
- B. Proposals that contain false or misleading statements may be rejected if in the Judicial Council's opinion the information was intended to mislead the evaluation team regarding a requirement of the RFP.
- C. During the evaluation process, the Judicial Council may require a consultant's representative to answer questions with regard to the consultant's proposal. Failure of a consultant to demonstrate that the claims made in its proposal are in fact true may be sufficient cause for deeming a proposal non-responsive.
- E. The Judicial Council 's Small Business Preference Procedures for the Procurement of Information Technology Goods and Services ("Small Business

RFP Number: RFP-FS-2022-12-KO-Security System Evaluation

Procedures") address the resolution of certain ties involving the small business preference. In the event of a tie not addressed in the Small Business Procedures, the contract will be awarded to the winner of a single coin toss. The coin toss will be witnessed by two Judicial Council employees. The Judicial Council will provide notice of the date and time of the coin toss to the affected Consultants, who may attend the coin toss at their own expense.

9. DISPOSITION OF MATERIALS

All materials submitted in response to the RFP will become the property of the Judicial Council and will be returned only at the Judicial Council 's option and at the expense of the consultant submitting the proposal.

10. PAYMENT

- A. Payment terms will be specified in any agreement that may ensue as a result of the RFP.
- B. THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL DOES NOT MAKE ADVANCE PAYMENT FOR SERVICES. Payment is normally made based upon completion of tasks as provided in the agreement between the Judicial Council and the selected consultant. The Judicial Council may withhold ten percent of each invoice until receipt and acceptance of the final deliverable. The amount of the withhold may depend upon the length of the project and the payment schedule provided in the agreement between the Judicial Council and the selected consultant.
- C. Upon a consultant's timely request, the Judicial Council may consider a consultant's "best financing alternative" (including lease or purchase alternatives). If the RFP is posted more than 30 days before the proposal due date and time listed in the timeline of the RFP, the consultant's request must be received by the Judicial Council at least 30 days before the proposal due date and time. If the solicitation is posted less than 30 days before the proposal due date and time, the consultant's request must be received by the Judicial Council by the day that is halfway between the posting date and the proposal due date. The Judicial Council may determine that a specific financing alternative should not be considered.

11. AWARD AND EXECUTION OF AGREEMENT

- A. Award of contract, if made, will be in accordance with the RFP to a responsible Consultant submitting a proposal compliant with all the requirements of the RFP and any addenda thereto (including any administrative or technical requirements), except for such immaterial defects as may be waived by the Judicial Council.
- B. A Consultant submitting a proposal must be prepared to use a standard Judicial Council contract form rather than its own contract form.
- C. The Judicial Council will make a reasonable effort to execute any contract based on the RFP within forty-five (45) days of selecting a proposal that best meets its

RFP Number: RFP-FS-2022-12-KO-Security System Evaluation

requirements. However, exceptions taken by a Consultant may delay execution of a contract.

D. Upon award of the agreement, the agreement shall be signed by the Consultant in two original contract counterparts and returned, along with the required attachments, to the Judicial Council no later than ten (10) business days of receipt of agreement form or prior to the end of June if award is at fiscal year-end. Agreements are not effective until executed by both parties. Any work performed before receipt of a fully-executed agreement shall be at the Consultant's own risk.

12. FAILURE TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT

The period for execution set forth in Section 11 ("Award and Execution of Agreement") may only be changed by mutual agreement of the parties. Failure to execute the agreement within the time frame identified above constitutes sufficient cause for voiding the award. Failure to comply with other requirements within the set time constitutes failure to execute the agreement. If the successful Consultant refuses or fails to execute the agreement, the Judicial Council may award the agreement to the next qualified Consultant.

13. NEWS RELEASES

News releases or other publicity pertaining to the award of a contract may not be issued without prior written approval of the Judicial Council.

14. ANTI-TRUST CLAIMS

- A. In submitting a proposal to the Judicial Council, the consultant offers and agrees that if the proposal is accepted, the consultant will assign to the Judicial Council all rights, title, and interest in and to all causes of action it may have under Section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. Sec. 15) or under the Cartwright Act Chapter 2, commencing with Section 16700, of Part 2 of Division 7 of the Business and Professions Code), arising from purchases of goods, materials, or services by the consultant for sale to the Judicial Council pursuant to the proposal. Such assignment shall be made and become effective at the time the Judicial Council tenders final payment to the consultant. (See Government Code section 4552.)
- B. If the Judicial Council receives, either through judgment or settlement, a monetary recovery for a cause of action assigned under this section, the consultant shall be entitled to receive reimbursement for actual legal costs incurred and may, upon demand, recover from the Judicial Council any portion of the recovery, including treble damages, attributable to overcharges that were paid.
- C. Upon demand in writing by the consultant, the Judicial Council shall, within one year from such demand, reassign the cause of action assigned under this section if the consultant has been or may have been injured by the violation of

RFP Number: RFP-FS-2022-12-KO-Security System Evaluation

law for which the cause of action arose and (a) the Judicial Council has not been injured thereby, or (b) the Judicial Council declines to file a court action for the cause of action. (See Government Code section 4554.)

15. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

The Judicial Council complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and similar California statutes. Requests for accommodation of disabilities by consultant's should be directed to the Judicial Council.

16. FEASIBILITY STUDIES AND ACQUISITION RECOMMENDATIONS

Proposals in response to procurements for assistance in the preparation of feasibility studies or the development of recommendations for the acquisition of IT goods and services must disclose any financial interests (e.g., service contracts, original equipment manufacturer (OEM) agreements, remarketing agreements) that may foreseeably allow the consultant to benefit materially from the Judicial Council's adoption of a course of action recommended in the feasibility study or of the acquisition recommendations.