Final Q&A for Questions Received During and Following the Pre-Bid Conference
Request for Proposals # OCA-133
Website Redesign Services

The New York State Unified Court System (UCS) thanks the vendors that submitted the questions below concerning the Website Redesign Services Request for Proposal (RFP) during and following the pre-bid conference held on July 27, 2023.

Below are responses to those questions. Please note that some questions have been edited for anonymity or clarity.

Vendor # 1

Question # 1.1: Are there any conditions in the contract regarding profit on this project by contractors or subcontractors?

> *Answer: No.*

Question # 1.2: Does the State of New York have IT or tech-related wage rates that we must adhere to?

> *Answer: Vendors must comply with New York's minimum wage legislation. There are no IT-specific minimum wage requirements applicable to this procurement.*

Vendor # 2

Question # 2.1: We are under the impression that UCS is conducting a content audit, and that UCS is expecting the content audit to be finished by the time the selected vendor comes onboard. Please respond to the following relative to this content auditing effort (will help us to understand exactly what tasks might still be necessary subsequent to award):

    a. Please explain the audit methodology that is being used.

    b. What are the main objectives of the audit?

    c. What sorts of insights does UCS expect to derive from the audit?

    d. What tools are being used to track the observations?

    e. If spreadsheets or some other manner of standard form are being used to accomplish the analysis, can UCS please provide sample data? Or could the UCS otherwise provide a list of the datapoints being collected?

    f. What tangible outcomes will be generated by the audit? Will there be some sort of formalized report of the results? If so, can UCS share a sense of the scope of topics that will be covered?

Answer:

a. UCS staff members are manually reviewing all content sections/pages in UCS's public and private websites. This is done by viewing the content in a web browser, looking at the folder structure on the web server, reviewing available WebTrends and Google Analytics, as well as looking at work request emails to identify the existing stakeholders.

b. and c. To determine: (i) What legacy (non-Drupal) content needs to be archived, rewritten, or restructured, and which of that content needs to be moved into Drupal; and (ii) Which of UCS's current Drupal content needs to be archived, rewritten, or restructured.

d. Except as explained above, there are no other tools being used.

e. Data is being collected in an Excel file. The data points are as follows: Site URL, Server, Monthly Views, Site Rank (Traffic), Editors, Reviewers, Training Completed (Editors), Approvers/Owners, # of pages, Last Updated, Site Purpose, Content Types Used, Last Audit Date, Name of Auditor, Comments, Should content be: Updated, Rewritten for Plain Language, Formatted for eye scanning, or Deleted?

f. This will be determined after analysis by, and in collaboration with the selected vendor.

Question # 2.2: Is UCS anticipating that the refreshed sites will use a component-driven content scheme? If so, please answer each of the following:

   a. Will fully detailed plans for the scheme be shared with the selected vendor, or will the vendor need to work with UCS to conceive the scheme?

   b. Does UCS presently anticipate that all resulting sites (internet, intranet, subsites, etc.) will ultimately share the same components?

   c. Does UCS already have a sense of the anticipated component scheme? If so, can UCS please provide bidders with some detail of what is presently envisioned? Perhaps a simple list of the necessary component types?

Answer: Yes, UCS anticipates that the refreshed sites will use a component-driven content scheme. Responses to the sub-questions are provided below.

a. The vendor will need to work with UCS to identify and formulate the scheme.

b. and c. If practical, the "locations" and "people" content types should be shared across all resulting sites. If that is not possible, the "locations" and "people" content

*types should be shared across all of the public-facing web sites. UCS does not have any
further information to share about the anticipated component scheme.*

Question # 2.3: It sounds like UCS is intending to accomplish a migration to Drupal 10 that will
most likely be finished by the time the selected vendor is brought onboard. Since UCS is doing
this migration now, immediately prior to award, we are accordingly curious what the expectation
would be relative to solution implementation. Would UCS expect the selected vendor to provide
a yet another wholly new Drupal instance, and thereafter accomplish another migration? Or is it
rather the expectation that the selected vendor will continue to work with the Drupal 10 instance
that UCS is already putting place?

> *Answer: UCS will look to the vendor's expertise and recommendations on this issue. (See
> Section 5.2.1.1 on pages 11–12 of the RFP for more information).*

Question # 2.4: In the response to question 21.10(b) in the initial Q&A document, UCS
indicated that it "needs a content strategy." The notion of "content strategy" can be interpreted in
very broad terms. Can UCS please clarify what it means by this? What exactly is UCS asking
the vendor to provide? (ex. governance is often considered a part of content strategy, but it seems
apparent that UCS has already planned a new a governance scheme, suggesting that another
aspect of content strategy is likely the point of interest). We just want to be precisely clear on
exactly what UCS had in mind in this regard.

> *Answer: UCS will look to the vendor to help us leverage whatever strategies or
> technologies are available to: (i) Make the updating of content as easy as possible;
> (ii) Make the content user-friendly (both easier to find and more readily understandable);
> and (iii) Ensure that UCS content is standardized across the enterprise, as much as
> possible.*

Question # 2.5: In the initial Q&A document, Question # 26.16 inquired about work that has
already been done to make the existing sites mobile responsive. The answer to that item from
UCS indicated that the Drupal 9 content has already been setup to render appropriately for
mobile devices. We are accordingly curious how the work that has been done would have a
bearing on the new contract. If the vendor is providing new theming, why would the current
mobile responsiveness of the existing Drupal 9 platform matter? Is UCS anticipating that the new
site will continue to make use of any of the same mobile responsive code? If so, please explain.

> *Answer: UCS does not require that the existing Drupal 9 mobile responsive code be used
> going forward, only that the new site(s) are mobile responsive. Furthermore, UCS fully
> expects all of its existing Drupal 9 content to have already been migrated into Drupal 10
> prior to the awarding of the vendor contract.*

Question # 2.6: The RFP and initial Q&A plainly expressed some interest in enabling publishing across multiple sites. However, the expectations relative to ongoing content sharing were less clear. Is UCS also expecting the ability to maintain shared content in a centralized manner? (i.e., the ability to edit once, in one place, and then, as a result of the one edit, have the updates instantly pushed-out to all appearances of the pertinent content across all UCS properties)?

> *Answer: See answer to Question # 2.2 (b) and (c), above.*

Question # 2.7: In UCS's response to Question # 14.19 in the initial Q&A, UCS indicated that UCS is "currently only able to publish one Drupal page at a time." It was moreover indicated that, "It would be beneficial for UCS to be able to publish a series of pages or even a set of subsites all at the same time." We want to be sure we understand what is being requested here. Is UCS referring to the ability to send content live? Are we correct in thinking that UCS wants some sort of batch control, allowing multiple pages to be simultaneously approved for live display? If something else is being requested here, please explain further.

> *Answer: Yes, UCS is looking for some way (batch control) whereby ONLY members with "publishing rights" (i.e., the OCA-WebTeam) would be able to send multiple pages of content LIVE, all at the same time. (Roles defined as "content-editors" will not need this ability).*

Question # 2.8: Regarding Component # E1 of Exhibit D, we would like to receive some indication of UCS's tolerance for narrative as a part of bidders' responses. We could easily answer Component # E1 with 15–20 pages of material, combining charts/timelines of significant steps/phases and corresponding explanatory narrative. In fact, it would seem that some of the information that we could submit in response to Component # E1 would actually be sufficient to address other items in the RFP as well. We certainly don't want to be disqualified for including too much content for Component # E1, when the guidelines otherwise seem to indicate that our responses to Component # E1. will not be counted against the 60-page limit. We previously posed this question in the prior Q&A, and also asked the question during the pre-bid conference. We have yet to receive an answer and were told that UCS would need to discuss the matter further and get back to us. Please provide some guidance as to how we should proceed.

> *Answer: UCS requests that vendors limit the information included in the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and associated initial schedule mentioned in Component E1 to a visual, hierarchical, and deliverable-oriented deconstruction of the website redesign project. The WBS and initial schedule should convey only the information necessary to provide UCS with a visual representation (and associated timeline) of how and when the vendor will accomplish the essential tasks associated with vendor's proposed solution. UCS expects the WBS to convey a high-level overview of how the vendor will organize the various discrete tasks associated with completing the website redesign project, and the vendor's initial schedule should offer a timeline showing when the vendor proposes*

that the Project Team begin those tasks, when the Project Team's efforts should focus its efforts on those tasks, and when the Project Team should complete those tasks. Vendors should refrain from padding these documents with information that is too voluminous to include in the main narrative, which has a maximum number of pages.

Vendor # 3

Question # 3.1: Regarding 5.2.2 Needed Features (J) - Integration of UCS internal PeopleSoft HR Directory (via data downloads) with the new intranet site so that users have access to an up-to-date directory of court employees along with their titles and contact information:

      a. Can you provide more info as to what mechanisms are available to pull down this data?

      b. How frequently is this data pulled?

Answer: UCS expects this will be done by scheduled file transfer of an extract from the PeopleSoft system once a day.

Vendor # 4

Question # 4.1: Could you provide additional details on what a successful use case for your enterprise-wide search would look like?

Answer: For example, if a user inputs the keyword term "Name," the search engine would provide a drop-down of common terms that start with that word. In this instance, since the user is looking to change his or her name, the user could select "Name Change Form" from the dropdown. Search results would be provided, including an option for a more "advanced search." Advanced Search would include the ability to: sort results by date or doc type (web page, pdf, .xls, or ppt), or even find links to referring pages.

Question # 4.2: Are you considering implementing a single-sign-on solution for log-ons? This would enable you to track user access to pages such as the Town and Village Courts.

Answer: Yes, UCS is looking to integrate our Active Directory credentials within Drupal. That will not solve the need for credentialing user groups, such as Town & Village Justices, that do not have access to the UCS private network. A separate mechanism will need to be in place to generate and track credentials for such users.

Vendor # 5

Question # 5.1: Figma is considered the modern industry standard for creating and managing visual wireframes and mockups. In modernizing www.nycourts.gov to the most current version

of Drupal, we do not recommend creating or converting website mockups and wireframes into Adobe Illustrator or Photoshop as it would have limited value and the conversion cost could be excessive. As an alternative and as per our recommendation, would NYS Courts be willing to use a tool like Figma to manage design system/web components, wireframes, and mockups?

When leveraging a modern solution image editing and more intricate illustration, such as iconography, logos, and artistic elements, can be done in Photoshop and Illustrator. However, Figma (or a similar product such as Sketch) is necessary when designing large and complex websites.

Figma has features such as:

- Component libraries that act both as a source of truth to ensure every web page stays visually consistent as well as increase the pace of designing mockups

- Prototyping tools to quickly demonstrate interaction

- File structure that allows designers to make sense of large projects

- Live collaboration so multiple people can work on and manipulate files and designs at the same time

A [Figma license costs](#) $45 to $75 per month per editor (typically one license per contributing designer). Also we do not profit or earn a commission if one of our clients becomes a Figma customer but we do recommend it or similar products to be leveraged in our implementations.

> *Answer: Yes. The toolkit UCS uses is based on the Adobe Creative Suite products. Consequently, the awarded contractor must ensure all image layers and assets, such as fonts, can be exported out of Figma and into Adobe without the layers merging together. UCS would consider keeping wireframes and mockups in Figma, as long as: (i) The vendor can demonstrate the benefits of such; and (ii) All other image assets, such as icons, logos, photos, etc., are done in Photoshop or Illustrator.*

Vendor # 6

Question # 6.1: Could you kindly forward the recorded session, as no one on our team has received it?

> *Answer: The video for the pre-bid conference is available in the row corresponding to RFP # OCA-133 (Website Redesign Services) at the following link:*
> *https://ww2.nycourts.gov/admin/bids/currentsolicitations.shtml*

Vendor # 7

Question # 7.1: In response to the initial Q&A's Question 5.5 about brand guidelines, UCS stated that they would display excerpts of their current Standards & Guidelines manual during the pre-bid conference. Since this was not shown, would it be possible to share a sample excerpt from the manual?

> *Answer: UCS previewed the Standards & Guidelines manual during the pre-bid conference. That appears at the 52:20 mark of the recorded video. Three of the pages shown during that video appear as Exhibit A at the end of this Q&A document.*

Question # 7.2: Item H1 in Exhibit D indicates that marketing and public relations guidance should be included in the Standards and Guidelines Manual. Can UCS provide additional information on their expectations around this topic?

> a. Is it expected that the vendor develop a communications plan for site roll out? If so, is there an expectation of associated content development?
>
> b. Do you anticipate that the expected guidance applies only to content on the site, or also to broader communications?
>
> c. Is there any current documented marketing or public relations guidance that UCS follows more broadly that we would be able to review prior to submission?

> *Answer:*
> a. *No. That will be handled internally.*
> b. *Mainly, site content. The UCS Director of Communications will direct broader communications.*
> c. *No.*

Question # 7.3: Regarding the form, Attachment-I (Standard Clauses Forms NYS UCS), page 7, this form is not applicable. How should this be handled? Should we just leave it blank?

> *Answer: If you have no information to report on the "Manufacturer's Affidavit of Recycled Content" form, then please indicate as such on the form and submit with your proposal.*

Vendor # 8

Question # 8.1: The following question (highlighted) was posed during the pre-bid conference held on July 27, 2023. For context, an edited and redacted portion of the discussion that preceded the question is included:

[Vendor # 8]: So is the content audit you mentioned that's part of the project: that's not part of what vendors would attempt to do before they submitted a proposal. The content that will be part of the scope of work?

[UCS]: I think because we would view ourselves as the content experts and most familiar with the content, we would take a first stab at that in conjunction with our content audit and then present that and hope that the vendor would have expertise to say, "Alright, this looks good. That is not a great idea, or let's go in a different direction."

Again, it's sort of a collaborative effort, but you would not be starting from ground zero, hopefully.

[Vendor]: OK. So just as we've gone through this. It sounds like how much information, information architecture, how much restructuring, how much design that might be needed for the next version of the Internet is kind of a bit open. The scope of work is kind of open on that, and we don't also know how the different content types function. As part of the bid, are you expecting an estimate of what we think it might take to rebuild this, or are you expecting a fixed bid? Can you provide any feedback on that?

> *Answer: The selected vendor is expected to build on—but not replicate—discovery work that UCS has already completed as UCS described in the RFP and during the pre-bid conference. UCS recognizes that additional discovery work is needed and is looking to the selected vendor to finalize that work within the scope of the website redesign project. Vendors must submit a fixed-price payment schedule for each category listed in Table One of Exhibit A, which includes all website redesign service costs, one-time onboarding costs, and costs for licenses. As explained in Section 4.1 on page 9 of the RFP, website redesign costs include costs for project management services, information architecture services, content scrubbing services, services to establish content development standards, training services, graphical design and branding services, and testing services. Vendors must also submit pricing on a time and materials basis for post-project technical support as described in Table Two of Exhibit A.*

Vendor # 9

Question # 9.1: The following question (highlighted) was posed during the pre-bid conference held on July 27, 2023. For context, an edited and redacted portion of the discussion that preceded the question is included:

[Vendor]: In terms of the bid: since it seems like there is a lot of discovery and probably very fruitful discussion, are you open to the proposal being phased, or do you want it to be as flat fee as we can imagine at this point?

> *Answer: Using Exhibit A (Pricing Sheet), vendors must submit a fixed-price payment schedule for each category listed in Table One of Exhibit A, which includes all website redesign service costs, one-time onboarding costs, and costs for licenses. As explained in Section 4.1 on page 9 of the RFP, website redesign costs include costs for project management services, information architecture services, content scrubbing services, services to establish content development standards, training services, graphical design and branding services, and testing services. Vendors must also submit pricing on a time and materials basis for post-project technical support as described in Table Two of Exhibit A.*

> *Regarding phasing the work, vendors must submit an initial schedule and an associated Work Breakdown Structure pursuant to Component E1 (see Exhibit D on page 40 of the RFP).*

Vendor # 10

Question # 10.1: The following question (highlighted) was posed during the pre-bid conference held on July 27, 2023. For context, an edited and redacted portion of the discussion that preceded the question is included:

[Vendor]: This pertains to the IT administration process. Specifically, it's a question about responses to E1, which is, I believe, where you wanted our work breakdown structure. What is the tolerance for narrative submission in relation to that component, because the pages are not counted? I'm trying to get a sense of exactly what is permissible to include in that section. I could include a great deal of information in a work breakdown narrative that would clarify everything. So, how much tolerance is there for information about the work approach in that particular item? Can I give you 15 pages, or are you just looking for a chart?

Item E1 asks for a work breakdown structure, and it specifically indicates that the response to that will not be included in the page count. So, I'm asking what the tolerance is for information to be submitted in relation to that. Can I provide narrative response, or are you just expecting a table? What is acceptable there?

> *Answer: UCS requests that vendors limit the information included in the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and associated initial schedule mentioned in Component E1 to a visual, hierarchical, and deliverable-oriented deconstruction of the website redesign project. The WBS and initial schedule should convey only the information necessary to provide UCS with a visual representation (and associated timeline) of how and when the vendor will accomplish the essential tasks associated with vendor's proposed solution. UCS expects the WBS to convey a high-level overview of how the vendor will organize the various discrete tasks associated with completing the website redesign project, and the vendor's initial schedule should offer a timeline showing when the vendor proposes*

that the Project Team begin those tasks, when the Project Team's efforts should focus its efforts on those tasks, and when the Project Team should complete those tasks. Vendors should refrain from padding these documents with information that is too voluminous to include in the main narrative, which has a maximum number of pages.

Exhibit A – Excerpts from the UCS Standards & Guidelines Manual

2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

18

Logos & Branding

There is no longer a need to incorporate one of the many versions of the New York State or UCS seals on a webpage since our layout templates have been created to:

- Continue using Gold, Navy Blue and Baby Blue as our branding colors.
- Plainly identify the "New York State Unified Court System."
- Use one image to exemplify "What we are about" (The NYCourts.gov address)

All sites should incorporate our current header logo at the top of each page:

NYCOURTS.GOV NEW YORK STATE UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM

The "white" version above should replace any instances of the older, previous header logo (from our 2003 Design):

New York State Unified Court System

Individual/Regional Logos

There will be instances where a particular court, support unit, or county will need to create or use a logo that is unique and specific to them. This is appropriate as long as the image:

- Appears below the NYCourts.gov logo.
- Meets all of the criteria laid out on page 14.

32

Layouts for Content

Not all content is created equal, so don't try displaying all of your content in one standard page layout. Different types of content are best served using different layouts. We have created (7) different templates which will cover a wide variety of content lengths, and you should become familiar with all of them:

MASTER-reg-315-315-withnav.shtml
This page is divided into two narrow columns, each being 315 pixels wide. It is perfect for displaying, short summary-type content side-by-side.

MASTER-reg-315-315xtop-630xbot-withnav.shtml
This page includes two narrow columns on the top, each being 315 pixels wide, and underneath it is one wider column (630 pixels wide). This page is perfect when you have content of varying lengths.

MASTER-reg-415-215-withnav.shtml
This page includes two columns of content side-by-side, however the column on the left (415 pixels wide), is wider than the column on the right (215 pixels wide). This layout is designed for summary-type content of varying lengths.

MASTER-reg-630-withnav.shtml
This page only includes one wide column of content (630 pixels wide), which should be used when you have a lot of lengthy content in paragraph format.