STATE OF COLORADO
SUPREME COURT LIBRARY

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Q&A

SOLICITATION NUMBER: **RFP-CSCL-01-WebSiteEAC**   **Date:** **February 23, 2016**

1. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? Yes.

2. Whether we need to come over there for meetings? There will be a need for face-to-face consultation.

3. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? Yes, but we express a strong preference for local staff, with familiarity of Colorado law and procedure.

4. Can we submit our proposals via email? No, a hard copy is required per the original solicitation instructions.

5. We understand that the EAC Website would be acting as a hub interfacing between several websites, how many websites are you expecting to interface with? Approximately 20 and the number will grow.

6. Could you elaborate on the expected behavior of the decision tree, preferably with an example? We seek collaboration around how to structure an interactive set of questions and answers to act as a model for self-represented litigants as they decide how or whether to hire a lawyer.

7. Is there a set budget for this project? No. Or a not-to-exceed amount? No.

8. Is there a preference for local versus out of state vendors? See answer to question 3.

9. Can the work be performed offsite with some onsite meetings? See answers to questions 2 and 3.

10. Is there an MBE or WBE preference? No.

11. Is there a hosting preference (i.e. onsite or on the cloud)? Onsite. Is there a hosting provider preference? No.

12. Is there a CMS preference? No.

13. What is the expected launch date for the new website? See RFP Section II, N.

14. How many people would be expected to be trained? Internal staff only, 5 or less.

15. How many pages are expected to be migrated? None. Will the vendor be solely responsible for this migration? Not applicable.

16. What operating system and hosting environments are available on the CSCL hardware? Can it support a LAMP hosting stack? We operate a fully-updated hybrid VMWare system that can support either IIS or LAMP.

17. Is CSCL willing to consider a solution hosted remotely that would connect the various information sources? No.

18. Can you describe the extent to which you see other sites "linking" to the Equal Access Center (EAC) hub? For example, do you anticipate that content contained on the sub-sites should be returned in search results performed on the hub (meaning that the hub will need to index all of the subsidiary sites)? If this type of multi-site indexing is imagined, please provide details on the technologies supporting each of these sites (e.g. CMS being used, database type etc.). The EAC is to act as a portal to other sites. Your definition of indexing is not currently envisioned. We have no CMS or DB preferences at this time.

19. As a follow up to the previous question, would it be appropriate to describe the role of the EAC hub as that of a "search engine," returning results from across the various Colorado Courts web properties? No.

20. Can you provide examples of the type of decision tree imagined? See answer to question 6. It would be helpful to understand the depth and logic involved. Are you able to estimate the number of decision trees that might be involved (or alternatively, the number of user types)? No.

21. The RFP suggests that certain content will only be accessible to users with the appropriate permission level. Is this content that will reside on the hub, or on the subsidiary sites? The hub. If it is the latter, is it anticipated that the subsidiary sites should honor the permissions/credentials of the hub site? Not applicable.

22. Does the Audit Trail (Requirement E) extend to all subsidiary websites? No. Is this for tracking activity of admin users only, or all potential users (even non-registered public users)? All users.

23. How much original content do you anticipate residing on the hub itself, and how much will be on the subsidiary sites? Expressing this as percentages of the whole would be fine. All newly-created (or licensed) content will reside on the hub. All linked material will remain on subsidiary sites. Percentages unknown.

24. Would it be helpful to have vendors break out costs in more detail for the stages needed to build the website? Yes--no standard format is required.

25. Is this a fixed-bid contract or are we open to work on a fixed budget under T&M? See answers to question 7. In addition, the not to exceed amount will be set by the successful offer's time and materials bid.

26. There is a fair amount of technical information that we need in order to ask more detailed questions. Will there be an opportunity to expand our questions after we receive the initial response from this inquiry? You may ask questions about the answers provided in this Q & A set.

27. What does the "Getting Started" portion of the site contain? Can the content be provided so we can determine what it will take to design and layout? If not, how much content and types of content? Will we be expected to produce any graphic designs, copy, etc? Please provide a definition and/or more information related to "robust indexing" - perhaps examples of what you envision? The site has not been built, so input on content is invited. Indexing refers to our internal content, PDFs, text, etc.

28. What other content oriented pages will be required beyond a landing page where the visitor can search the respective databases for legal documents, etc.? How many pages? What types of content? How much of the content is expected to be designed produced by us? See RFP Section II, F.

29. Languages = English - what languages are foreseeable? We assume Spanish... others? English and Spanish; others as time and resources allow.

30. A: Architecture: The chart in attachment C indicates multiple databases and multiple sources. What external databases will need to be accessed in this process and what are the connection/query specifications? Each database will likely have a different schema. Are those defined somewhere including the potential differences in each data point and its respective required security level and can you provide that to us? Perhaps more simply stated - where is the data, how is it structured and to what data can specific visitors access respectively? What metadata is available regarding search and does it support the search requirements? The databases will be built by the contractor. The contractor will also assist in the selection of a CMS, and determine the appropriate schemas and relational tables. Similarly, the contractor will assist/provide necessary metadata.

i. "The links should access the appropriate sub-pages of our partners' web sites, which will be selected for specific applicability" If the data provided to create the hub described is coming from other sites then where is the data that is going to provide the ability to identify that information going to come from? Is there existing referential data that allows searching or does all of this have to be created? If all of this has to be created, what process has been put in place to do this? If it exists what format is it in currently? CSCL will provide the data from various sources. The contractor is expected to provide a storage solution (CMS) and a reliable way to access/display the data.

ii. "The site must return text, forms, instructions, videos and clinical materials." These materials, in order to be searchable must contain certain levels of metadata, for instance some PDFs are not text but images of text and are not searchable in that form. Videos are not directly searchable but are generally tagged with some data that allows them to be returned based on searches. Does this data currently exist? CSCL will work with contractor on an efficient method for saving PDFs in OCR format to facilitate searching. A search engine will need to be created or integrated into the application to search internal material only. Videos do not need to be searched, but content inside the decision trees does. All content does not currently reside on our servers.

iii. What specific formats will be required? For example: video has many formats, are the videos already in a web friendly and compatible format that will work in all current platforms or will they need to be converted? All video formats are currently supported by You Tube.

31. C: Permissions: Please provide information about the permissions structure on connected applications/db's respectfully. Databases will be internal, and are not yet populated.

32. D: Decision Tree: Can we get the decision tree and content? See answer to question 6. If not, how many different subject-specific decision trees will need to be created and how many levels deep do they go. Number currently undetermined. How many initial selections will a user have and how far can they drill down with how many subsequent decisions at each level? A basic template is in development; the contractor will work with CSCL to customize it to the specific requirements of each legal subject.

33. E: Audit: User activity? Or administrator only? File recovery is generally at the server and file system level. Are you asking for the web application to have this functionality? Please note that this can be at application level but has associated overhead. Depending on the size of the application and data set, handling this at the application level can have detrimental effects to performance while routines are executing. The RFP specifically states "Speed" is important. Ideally, this is handled at the server level not the application level. Please confirm your expectations on Audit. Both administrative and user auditing is required. File recovery is needed for documents uploaded to the CMS. Auditing at the application level is limited to logging users' action, such as log-ins/log-outs, deletes, content changes, etc.

34. F: Notifications: Please provide more details about the expectations on Notifications. Please also provide information on what monitoring systems/software/services you might already have in place. Nothing is in place. Notifications are expected for status of the servers/applications. Real time notifications are expected for uptime/downtime.

35. J: Documentation: please provide more information or perhaps a document that defines/details "documentation best practices"? We anticipate offerors will outline/define parameters in their final proposals.

36. J: Documentation/Integrated Help System: Please provide more information regarding your expectations around the integrated help system? Is this for the visitor and/or admin? What are your expectations on how information is searched and presented? Documentation is for the administrative staff to familiarize them with how to use the CMS (uploading documents, managing content, etc.). The site map and associated aids should be designed to assist the user efficiently and rapidly navigate the site.

37. K: Hosting: Server environment: Can you provide more information about the server environment? While the hardware is helpful, we need to understand what operating system(s) is running? LAMP, MS stack, other? What version? See answer 16.

38. Do you have a particular code base or framework in mind for this portal? Front end code must result in the required mobile accessibility. Back end code should not be proprietary. Are there any programming languages that you would prefer or would definitely not be interested in? We are not interested in Drupal. Ruby on Rails is our preferred software language for projects of this size and complexity.

39. What type of legal content do you expect to display through the content management system for this site? All Colorado primary law and select procedural materials. Statutory law, judicial opinions, court rules, etc.? Or will you be linking to other sites for these materials? If you intend to hosting these materials in the portal, will you want the materials to be contained in a searchable database? See RFP, Attachment C, for the contemplated database array. The databases should be searchable, and we intend to host them.

40. What functionality from the CALI site would you like to see this site to contain as well? What things do you think can be improved upon? CALI's step-by-step methodology is sound; we hope to present an improved interface.

41. Are there any other sites or portals that contain examples of functionality that you like? We are unaware of any other site(s) that do what we envision.

42. We have discussed Section VII and are concerned that your current infrastructure may not be sufficient for the type of site that your RFP seems to call for. Is the project team open to infrastructure enhancements as part of this response? This may include data security enhancements, internet/intranet security policy enhancements, hardware enhancements, network enhancements, and open a discussion on virtual private cloud architecture. We are open to any discussion that meets requirements.