

STATE OF COLORADO
SUPREME COURT LIBRARY

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
FOLLOW UP Q&A**

SOLICITATION NUMBER: RFP-CSCL-01-WebSiteEAC

Date: February 25, 2016

1. You say you are not interested in Drupal in response to question 38, yet you say you have no CMS or DB preferences for question 18. Which is correct?

The correct response is that with the exception of not having an interest in Drupal, there is no preference.

2. Re the answer to question 30 below, which databases will be built by the contractor? Will your current databases will be migrated to new ones built by the contractor? Or is this just referring to the databases for the CMS storage solution referenced in 30.i.?

There is no current database. There are at least 3 databases that will need to be created, at a minimum the three identified in attachment C. Future growth may lead to additional databases.

3. Decision Tree - question 6 & 20: 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. Interactive Q&A with multiple choice can extend very deep very quickly. With no current structure, we have no way to scope the tree. Do you want a dynamic Q&A module that allows for CSCL to design, manage and maintain a question tree on their own per the requirements? Would the tree provide just one document or link at each end point or more? What type of questions - yes/no only or will it include multiple choice?

CSCL will provide data and resources and intends to engage a contractor to work collaboratively to design a system such that yes/no answers with links to additional resources will result.

4. Architecture/Databases - question 30: Without more definition of your data, meta-data and content, we will need to put parameters or assumptions around the breadth and depth of such. Can you provide an estimate or range of how many in-house items (documents, videos, etc) there are? Also, can you provide an estimation of what meta-data will be required (e.g. levels, types, keywords, descriptions, categories, etc.)?

We seek a contractor with familiarity of Colorado law and procedure sufficient to address these issues.

5. Linking to other sites - question 30. Will linking be to the home pages of the partner sites or to an unknown number of sub-pages within those partner sites? Who will provide the

links to those? What format? How many fields will be required to define, describe and categorize those links? Linking to 20 home pages is not complex. Linking to an unknown number of sub-pages with an unknown number of categories/definitions/descriptions/sorting options (if necessary) can be a quite significant undertaking. Can you provide more description or explanation and range of quantities to create for us a better understanding/vision of this requirement?

Subpages, provided by partners to CSCL. Please see response above.

6. **Audit - question 33:** We believe we understand your audit requirements for users with admin/edit capabilities. To clarify for non-admin/edit visitor users - Is it sufficient to track anonymous visitor users broadly via a google analytics style approach? And is it sufficient to track login and logout only for authenticated visitor users plus track these authenticated visitor users broadly via a google analytics style approach? What reporting do you envision?

Google analytics is the minimum required functionality. Reports will be based on what google analytics can provide but will be greater than just login and logout.

7. **Assumptions - many questions:** Finally, you have responded in the answers that you are wanting the offerer to provide a fair amount of input or "consulting". Due to that not having much definition and due to a fair amount of unknowns in the responses, we believe we will need to essentially put a "box" or parameters/assumptions around the RFP response. What is considered acceptable in regards to defining assumptions or the "box"? Do you have an expectation here?

We expect offeror's to propose what they are capable of doing and for CSCL to evaluate this proposal and select the Offeror that provides the best solution.

8. Will there be an extension to the Feb 29th deadline to accommodate further clarifications?

No, the closing date remains the same.