

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO



Questions and Answers

RFP 38-20-001 – Legal Research Software

Q1: Sections 6.3 & 6.5 – Proposal Submission Method (page 5). Section 6.3 indicates that proposals are to be submitted via email. Section 6.5 indicates that “Proposals may not be transmitted by fax or email.” Given the current COVID-19 mitigation efforts recommended by the CDC and federal, state, and local authorities (which include active work-from-home orders), can the Court please confirm that it will accept proposal submissions via email (per Section 6.3)?

A1: Thank you for identifying this discrepancy. The Court will only accept proposals submitted by email to solicitationsmailbox@sftc.org. We are waiving the proposal submission requirements listed in Section 6.5. We will post an amended RFP our website to resolve similar discrepancies. Please note that in the amended RFP, this section is now on p.6.

Q2: Section 9.0 – Evaluation of Proposals (page 7). Section 9.0 indicates that the Court “will evaluate the proposals on a 100-point scale”. However, the table provided includes 65 points for the Cost Proposal and 45 points for the Technical Proposal, which totals 110 points.

Q2(a): Can the Court please clarify the point value it will use during evaluation (i.e., 100 or 110 points)?

A2(a): The Court will use a 100-point scale to evaluate the proposals. Please note that in the amended RFP, this section is now on p.8.

Q2(b): If the Court will be using a 100-point scale, can the Court please clarify the points available to both the Cost and Technical proposals (e.g., 55 points to Cost and 45 points to Technical)?

A2(b): The Court will award a maximum of 60 points to the Cost Proposal and 40 points to the Technical Proposal.

Q3: Section 10.0 – Interviews (page 7). Section 10.0 indicates that interviews will be a part of the evaluation process. The section indicates “JBE will notify eligible Proposers regarding interview arrangements.” Given the current COVID-19 environment, can the Court provide any further information on what format the interviews will take? If the interviews will take place online, can the Court provide information on who will provide the meeting links?

A3: The Court will host interviews through an online meeting platform such as Zoom or Microsoft Teams. A court staff involved in the solicitation process will provide the meeting link.

Additional details (subject to change): The meeting will likely take place during a one-hour block at lunch time (between 12:00 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. PST) to allow judicial officers and staff to participate. Each bidder will have the same amount of time for their presentation. Selected bidders should budget time into their presentation to allow for questions and answers. They should also be prepared to answer written questions submitted by Court staff after the presentation but before the final scoring. The final scoring will take place within approximately one week of the presentation.

The meeting may be recorded to allow judicial officers and court staff to review the materials. If this option is exercised, the presentation material and recordings will remain confidential and will be stored in the Court's internal shared drive. This information may be retained after the RFP is complete and a contract has been awarded. Please note that in the amended RFP, this section is now on p.8.

Q4: Attachment 1, Section 8 – Evaluation Process (page 11). Section 8 of Attachment 1, subsection E, indicates that the “JBE will evaluate the proposals on a 100-point scale using the criteria set forth in the table below.” However, there is no table provided. Can the Court please confirm that it is referencing the Evaluation Table located in Section 9.0?

A4: Yes, in this section, the Court is referring to the Evaluation Table located in Section 9.0. This will be resolved and clarified in the amended RFP. Please note that in the amended RFP, this section is now on p.12.

Q5: Attachments 3-8 (pages 28-36). Beginning on page 28, the RFP header changes to “RFP Title: HP EliteDesk 705 G4 Desktop Mini PC RFP Number: 38-19-002”. This appears to be a copy and paste error. Can the Court please confirm that these are the correct attachments referenced earlier in the RFP and that they are applicable to this solicitation?

A5: Yes, this is a copy and paste error. The attachments are correct, and the typo has been corrected. Please note these attachments must be completed and submitted to the Court by the specified deadline in order for the bid to be considered responsive. Please note that in the amended RFP, this section is now on p.29-37.

Q6: In Section 6.3, the instructions proposal responses to emailed to solicitationsmailbox@sftc.org. However, Section 6.5 states “Only written proposals will be accepted. Proposals must be sent by registered or certified mail, courier service (e.g. FedEx), or delivered by hand. Proposals may not be transmitted by fax or email”. Can San Francisco Superior Court RFP please clarify how proposal responses are to be submitted?

A6: Thank you for identifying this discrepancy. The Court will only accept proposals submitted by email to solicitationsmailbox@sftc.org. We are waiving the proposal submission requirements listed in Section 6.5. We will post an amended RFP our website to resolve similar discrepancies.

Q7: Section 2.0 says that the San Francisco Superior Court RFP is requesting “Up to 162 User IDs for staff with cost estimates for additional user accounts.” For pricing purposes we'd like

additional clarification on how many are "Professional Users" (i.e. attorneys, judges, librarians) versus "Staff Support Users" (i.e. paralegals, interns, legal secretaries or other administrative staff).

A7: We will require a minimum of 80 “Professional Users” and 27 “Staff Support Users” IDs. Please note these figures are estimates that may be modified as needed. Please continue to provide a per unit cost breakdown in your cost proposal for both IDs. If the per unit costs are scaled based on requested order’s volume, please indicate those thresholds in the cost proposal as well.

Q8: Can San Francisco Superior Court provide information about the price they are currently paying the incumbent for Legal Research Software?

A8: The Court is interpreting this question as a public information request. We have a formal process to manage such requests, as specified in Rule 10.500 of the California Rules of Court. While the Court cannot provide information in this document, we encourage you to formally submit these request following the instructions on our [website](#).

Please note that there are no changes to the existing RFP Timeline.