



Judicial Council of California

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

FINANCE DIVISION

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-7739 • Fax 415-865-7217 • TDD 415-865-4272

RONALD M. GEORGE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

WILLIAM C. VICKREY
Administrative Director of the Courts

RONALD G. OVERHOLT
Chief Deputy Director

STEPHEN NASH
Director, Finance Division

TO: **POTENTIAL PROPOSERS**

FROM: ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION

DATE: January 29, 2009

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**
Information Services Division (ISD), a division of the Administrative Office of the Courts, seeks the services of a consultant to provide a quality analyst manager/tester for the deployment phase of the California Courts Protective Order Registry project (CCPOR).

ACTION REQUIRED: You are invited to review and respond to the attached Request for Proposals (RFP):
Project Title: QUALITY ANALYST MANAGER/TESTER, CALIFORNIA COURTS PROTECTIVE ORDER REGISTRY
RFP Number: ISD 200811-xx CCPOR-LM

QUESTIONS TO THE SOLICITATIONS MAILBOX: Questions regarding this RFP should be directed to solicitations@jud.ca.gov by **Tuesday, February 10, 2009, no later than 3 p.m. (PST)**

DATE AND TIME PROPOSAL DUE: There will not be a pre-proposal conference for this RFP.
Proposals must be received by **Tuesday, February 17, 2009, no later than 3 p.m. (PST)**

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Proposals must be sent to:
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP No. ISD 200811-xx CCPOR-LM
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 7th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 BACKGROUND

1.1.1 The Judicial Council of California, chaired by the Chief Justice of California, is the chief policy making agency of the California judicial system. The California Constitution directs the Council to improve the administration of justice by surveying judicial business, recommending improvements to the Courts, and making recommendations annually to the Governor and the Legislature. The Council also adopts rules for Court administration, practice, and procedure, and performs other functions prescribed by law. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency for the Council and assists both the Council and its chair in performing their duties.

1.2 INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION (ISD)

1.2.1 The Information Services Division, a division of the AOC, coordinates court technology statewide, and supports coordination throughout the judicial branch; manages centralized statewide technology projects; and optimizes the scope and accessibility of accurate statewide judicial information.

1.3 CALIFORNIA COURTS PROTECTIVE ORDER REGISTRY (CCPOR)

1.3.1 At the direction of the Judicial Council, on the recommendation of the Domestic Violence Task Force, the AOC initiated an effort to develop the California Courts Protective Order Registry, a centralized system for viewing protective and restraining orders and related information for the judicial branch, law enforcement, and other justice partners.

1.3.2 Following completion of a fact-finding phase in 2007 to better understand the various local court practices related to restraining and protective orders, the CCPOR has scheduled functional Joint Application Design sessions (JADs) and technical workshops with the six initial superior courts participating in the CCPOR program. Requirements will be finalized in September 2008, and it is expected that CCPOR development will be completed the first quarter of 2009. CCPOR will begin deployment to the six initial courts in 2009, and will deploy to additional courts from 2010 through 2012.

1.3.2 ISD is currently seeking a Quality Analyst Manager/Tester consultant for supporting the CCPOR project. This position will be responsible for ensuring that all quality

requirements for project are met during the project lifecycle. This position will create test plans/cases and execute hands-on testing.

2.0 TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

- 2.1 The AOC has developed the following list of key events from the time of the issuance of this RFP through the intent to award contract. All dates are subject to change at the discretion of the AOC.

EVENT	KEY DATE
RFP issued	January 29, 2009
Deadline for questions to solicitations@jud.ca.gov	Tuesday, February 10, 2009 No later than 3 p.m.
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted	Tuesday, February 17, 2009 No later than 3 p.m.
Evaluation of proposals (<i>estimate only</i>)	Wednesday, February 18, 2009
Interview of top candidates (<i>estimate only</i>)	Thursday-Friday, February 19-20, 2009
Notice of Intent to Award (<i>estimate only</i>)	Tuesday, February 24, 2009
Negotiations and execution of contract (<i>estimate only</i>)	Friday, February 27, 2009

3.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

- 3.1 The AOC seeks the services of a contractor for 15 weeks plus 2 days to perform QA Manager/Tester responsibilities for the deployment phase of CCPOR.
- 3.2 The expected contractual responsibilities and work requirements are set forth in *Attachment 2, Contract Terms, Exhibit D, Work to be Performed*.

4.0 RFP ATTACHMENTS

- 4.1 Included as part of this RFP are the following attachments:
- 4.1.1 Attachment 1, Administrative Rules Governing Request for Proposals. Proposers shall follow the rules, set forth in *Attachment 1*, in preparation and submittal of their proposals.
- 4.1.2 Attachment 2, Contract Terms. Contracts with successful firms will be signed by the parties on a State of California Standard Agreement form and will include terms appropriate for this project. Terms and conditions typical for

the requested services are attached as *Attachment 2, Contract Terms* and include: *Exhibit A, Standard Provisions; Exhibit B, Special Provisions; Exhibit C, Payment Provisions; Exhibit D, Work to be Performed; Exhibit E, Contractor's Key Personnel* (to be determined); and *Exhibit F, Acceptance of the Work and Sign-off Form*

4.1.3 Attachment 3, Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms. Proposers must either indicate acceptance of Contract Terms, as set forth in *Attachment 2, Contract Terms*, or clearly identify exceptions to the Contract Terms, as set forth in this *Attachment 3*.

4.1.3.1 If exceptions are identified, then proposers must also submit (i) a red-lined version of *Attachment 2, Contract Terms*, that clearly tracks proposed changes to this attachment, and (ii) written documentation to substantiate each such proposed change.

4.1.4 Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form. The AOC is required to obtain and keep on file, a completed Payee Data Record for each vendor prior to entering into a contract with that vendor. Therefore, vendor's proposal must include a completed and signed *Payee Data Record Form*, set forth as *Attachment 4*, or provide a copy of the form previously submitted to AOC.

5.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals will be evaluated by the AOC using the criteria set forth below, in order of descending priority. *A proposal may include multiple candidates. A proposal shall not exceed (two) 2 candidates.* Each proposed key personnel will be evaluated separately in accordance with these criteria:

- 5.1 Specialized Expertise and Technical Competence. Proposals will be evaluated considering the type of services required and the complexity of the project, with special consideration for the following: over five (5) years of IT project management experience; and seven (7) years of quality assurance testing experience. Recent experience and expertise with projects of a similar type will be a key consideration.
- 5.2 Past Record of Performance. Proposals will be evaluated considering past performance, especially on contracts with government agencies or public bodies, including such factors as control of costs, quality of work, ability to meet schedules, cooperation, responsiveness, and other managerial considerations.
- 5.3 Reasonableness of Cost Proposal. Proposals will be evaluated in terms of reasonableness of cost, proposed rate structure for the position, including breakdown of salary, overhead and profit.
- 5.4 Ability to Meet Requirements of the Project. Proposals will be evaluated in terms of compliance with proposed contract terms and project scheduling.

6.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL

6.1 Specialized Expertise and Technical Competence.

6.1.1 Demonstrate the proposed key personnel's relevant experience and technical competence, especially in the areas listed below.

- Minimum of 7 years of IT overall experience.
- Minimum of 5 years for QA Project Management experience with open systems applications and Web Services.
- Experience creating test plans, creating test cases, executing test cases, and test scripts, discovered bugs, and verifying fixed bugs, etc. required
- Good communication skills, with both technical and non-technical audiences
- Knowledge of the principles of systems design, implementation, and development.
- Knowledge of the Software Development Lifecycle required
- Court Systems experience is a plus.
- Knowledge of system test plan development and execution software
- Experience with the California judicial branch, local court operations, court business practices, and the administration of justice preferred
- Enterprise test management suite (ETMS: IBM Rational tool) experience a plus
- Bachelor's Degree in Computer Science or related disciplines a plus

6.1.2 Contact information. Provide proposer's point of contact, including name, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone and facsimile numbers in a cover letter.

6.1.3 Provide most the recent resume and the names, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of three (3) clients for whom the proposed key personnel has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the proposer.

6.2. Past Record of Performance. Discuss the proposed key personnel's record of performance on past programs, quality of work, ability to meet schedules, cooperation, responsiveness, and other managerial considerations.

6.3 Reasonableness of Cost Proposal. See below, *RFP: 7.0 Specifics of a Responsive Cost Proposal*.

6.4 Ability to Meet Requirements of the Project.

6.4.1 Discuss the key personnel's availability and ability to complete the work within the project schedule, set forth in *Attachment 2, Contract Terms, Exhibit D, Work to be Performed*.

- 6.4.2 For purposes of this RFP, vendors are to estimate a total of 540 hours of work for the fifteen (15) weeks and two (2) days; additionally, the eventual contractor will not work more than thirty-six (36) hours per week unless pre-approved, in writing, by the Project Manager.
- 6.4.3 Compliance with Contract Terms. Complete and submit *Attachment 3, Vendor's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms*. Also, if changes are proposed, submit a version of *Attachment 2, Contract Terms* with all tracked changes, as well as written justification supporting any such proposed changes.
- 6.4.4 Tax recording information. Complete and submit *Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form*, or provide a copy of the form previously submitted to the AOC.

7.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE COST PROPOSAL

The following information shall be included as the cost portion of the proposal:

7.1 Reasonableness of Cost Proposal.

- 7.1 Provide the fully burdened hourly rate of the proposed key personnel, and include the salary, overhead, and profit rate structure breakdown for the rate.
- 7.2 The cost proposal should also include separate line items for travel and lodging. Travel expenses, if any, will be reimbursed in accordance with the provisions set forth in *Attachment 2, Contract Terms, Exhibit C, Payment Provisions*. For purposes of this RFP, vendors are to assume allowable travel expenses will not exceed **\$5,000.00**.
- 7.3 Include a total not to exceed contract sum for the work and allowable expenses considered by this RFP, bearing in mind that (i) the total cost for consultant services will range between **\$54,000.00 - \$64,800.00**, inclusive of personnel, materials, overhead, profit, and travel costs and expenses, and (ii) the method of payment to the consultant is anticipated to be by cost reimbursement.

8.0 SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

- 8.1 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted in *Section 6.0, Specifics of a Responsive Proposal*, above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.
- 8.2 Proposers will submit **one (1) original and three (3) copies** of the proposal, signed by an authorized representative of the company, including name, title, address, and telephone number of one individual who is the responder's designated representative.

- 8.3 In addition to submittal of the original and three copies of the proposals, as set forth in *Section 7.2*, above, proposers are also required to submit an electronic version of the entire proposal on **CD-ROM**.
- 8.4 Proposals must be delivered to the individual listed under this *Submission of Proposals*, as set forth on the cover memo of this RFP
- 8.5 Only written responses will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered or certified mail or by hand delivery.

9.0 INTERVIEWS

The AOC anticipates conducting interviews with top ranked proposed key personnel candidates to clarify aspects set forth in the written proposal. If conducted, interviews will likely be conducted at the AOC's offices in San Francisco. The AOC will not reimburse candidates for any costs incurred in traveling to or from the interview location. The AOC will notify prospective vendors regarding interview arrangements.

10.0 RIGHTS

The AOC reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, as well as the right to issue similar RFPs in the future. This RFP is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract and in no way is the AOC or the State of California responsible for the cost of preparing the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and will become a public record.

11.0 CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

The Administrative Office of the Courts policy is to follow the intent of the California Public Records Act (PRA). If a vendor's proposal contains material noted or marked as confidential and/or proprietary that, in the AOC's sole opinion, meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then that information will not be disclosed pursuant to a request for public documents. If the AOC does not consider such material to be exempt from disclosure under the PRA, the material will be made available to the public, regardless of the notation or markings. If a vendor is unsure if its confidential and/or proprietary material meets the disclosure exemption requirements of the PRA, then it should not include such information in its proposal.

END OF FORM