

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
FINAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
PHOENIX SAP SYSTEM INTEGRATION SUPPORT

RFP – TCAS-2020-08-LB

February 26, 2021

NOTE: Questions and answers 1 – 17 were received by the RFP due date and time of February 11, 2021, 3PM PT.

Questions and answers 18 – 19 were from the Pre-Proposal Conference on February 18, 2021.

#1 Can you please share the current support team structure for IT support at Judicial Council?

ANSWER: Please see RFP Documents, Page 1 of Attachment 12, Phoenix Program Background.

#2 Can we separate rates for onsite and offsite?

ANSWER: As stated in section 8.2 of the RFP, “The fixed hourly rate is a standard rate regardless of full-time continuous or part-time ad hoc assignment, whether on-site or remote, inclusive of travel to the assigned office at the Judicial Council.”

#3 Will Judicial Council need resources to work on full-time or part-time?

ANSWER: Resources might work full-time or part-time, depending on Judicial Council need.

#4 Please share details regarding customizations and interfaces

ANSWER: A recent inventory of custom objects can be found here:
<https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/IT-2019-60-RB-RFP-Ex-5-Custom-Object-Workbook.xlsx>

#5 Are systems currently hosted on premise or on Cloud?

ANSWER: As stated in Attachment 12, Phoenix Program Background, the current Phoenix technical landscape is housed at three primary technology center locations:

- *Production, located in Tempe, Arizona.*
 - *Non-Production, located in Omaha, Nebraska.*
 - *Development and Sandbox located on site at JCC, San Francisco, California.*
- The target Phoenix HANA landscape will host all environments in the Microsoft Azure public cloud. (Planned June 2021).*

#6 Is this a new RFP or there are any incumbents?

ANSWER: *The incumbent is Epi-Use America.*

#7 If there are incumbents whose resources are currently working with Judicial Council, will the new selected vendor need to hire them? Or will they be replaced?

ANSWER: *It is expected that a new vendor would bring its own resources, and these would replace the resources of the incumbent.*

#8 Does Judicial Council have any visa constraints for resources submitted? Is a resource on H1B visa acceptable?

ANSWER: *The Judicial Council does not sponsor work visas; however, there are no constraints so long as the resource is legally able to work in the U.S.*

#9 Any major projects planned by the Council that we should be aware of?

ANSWER: *It is expected that there will be some discovery of S/4HANA and cloud improvements available but not realized during the system migration. The selected vendor will support the JCC staff that will deploy the HCM solution to additional trial courts over the life of the agreement. Also, an update to SAP HCM functionality will be required before S/4 Compatibility Packs expire in 2025.*

#10 What is the average term of staffing placement for each position/Title?

ANSWER: *The term of each consultant varies based on need.*

#11 What is the notice period that Judicial Council will offer to fill a position?

ANSWER: *It is expected that the selected vendor will have a deep enough bench to fill a position within a reasonable amount of time. We realize that for some specialties more time may be required. Generally, for ad-hoc hourly support work, consultant resource types should be*

readily available within two days to one week. For longer term assignments, resources should be available within two to three weeks.

- #12 Will the Judicial Council expand on the anticipated transition period and approach when the current vendor would be available to transition work to a new vendor that might be awarded the work from this solicitation. Our experience is that at least one month transition is required for a project of this nature. Also, we request that the Judicial Council share the Transition Plans and obligations of the current vendor.

ANSWER: Some transition may be possible through knowledge transfer with the current project migration/implementation services and maintenance and support vendors, should schedules allow during a period that both contracts are valid. The anticipated time period in which both contracts overlap is approximately one month. In addition, the Judicial Council, itself, will have all the requisite materials, information, and knowledge for the consultant to successfully perform the requested services.

- #13 Will Judicial Council further explain specifically how the costs will be calculated for the evaluation?

ANSWER: For the evaluation, costs will be based upon the anticipated hours for the first year of engagement of consultants by the Judicial Council priced at Contractor's quoted hourly rates.

- #14 We request confirmation that all resources, including "currently utilized" resources, can work from any location within Continental United States with travel to Sacramento or San Francisco, for some specified amount of time (e.g., 10-20%).

ANSWER: The JCC currently has a "work-from-home" policy due to COVID-19, and this policy, while in effect, applies to consultants. If in the future, the JCC determines its workers can safely return to the office, at that point, consultants will generally provide services at either the San Francisco or Sacramento Office, though the JCC may permit some "work-from home," on a case by case basis.

- #15 We request that the Judicial Council specify the either amount of time or percentage of time required to work on-site either in Sacramento or San Francisco for each position.

ANSWER: Given all the unknowns with COVID-19, it is not possible to provide precise hours or percentages. The JCC has a "work from home" policy due to COVID-19, and this policy, while in effect, will also apply to prospective consultants. At some point, the JCC may determine that it is safe for workers to return on-site, and at that point, consultants will generally provide services

at either the San Francisco or Sacramento Office, though the JCC may permit some “work from home,” on a case by case basis.

#16 We request that the Judicial Council explain whether the contract awarded from this procurement will be co-terminus with the contract from Purchase document 54955? How is this procurement and resulting contract, and the contract from Purchase document 54955 related?

What is the Judicial Council's plan and approach for how both contracts/projects work together during the term that both contracts are valid?

ANSWER: This contract is unrelated to the Phoenix Migration - Professional Services and Implementation, Agreement 54955. The vendors providing migration/implementation services under agreement 54955 will provide warranty work related to that project. The vendor selected for this procurement will provide hourly maintenance and support services. However, it is likely that the vendor selected will participate in some knowledge transfer with the migration/implementation services vendors during the term that both contracts are valid.

#17 What was the start date of the contract when Epi-Use first begin work supporting the Phoenix project? We understand that Epi-Use won the 2016 project; however, the Epi-Use contract pre-existed the 2016 procurement.

ANSWER: The first contract with Epi-Use America for maintenance and support services began in 2008.

#18 RFP page 18 “Organization Background and Experience,” would like to clarify regarding the request for three business engagements references: do references need to be provided for customers within the United States or is it okay to provide references from outside the U.S.?

ANSWER: Yes, it is okay to provide references from outside the U.S. It is recommended that the references provided are for services that closely resemble the requirements for services to be provided as listed in the RFP.

#19 Regarding the attachment for foreign country access forms, it mentions that vendor access will be provided for non-production systems only. Is my understanding correct?

ANSWER: Correct, it is very rare that access to production systems will be allowed from outside of the United States.