

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

Date 9/17/2026

ADDENDUM # 1

Intranet Modernization Using M365 G5/SharePoint Online

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL RFP# 81326C

Item	Vendor Question (Q)	Official Court Response (A)
1	Could you please let us know if there is an allocated budget or an estimated funding range for this project? Having an understanding of the available budget would help us align our proposed solution and pricing appropriately with the Court's expectations. We understand that the RFP indicates the budget will be discussed during contract negotiations, but any guidance you can provide regarding the anticipated budget range would be greatly appreciated.	The Court has an established budget but will not be disclosing it publicly. Vendors are expected to understand the scope as described in the RFP and pre-proposal meeting and submit their best and final offer accordingly. The award will go to the vendor whose proposal best aligns with the Court's needs and value — not necessarily the lowest bid.
2	Since content migration will be manual and collaborative rather than tool-driven (Section 1), does the Court expect the vendor to provide any migration/content-transfer tooling (e.g., bulk upload utilities, metadata tagging tools) to assist Court staff during discovery, or will migration be done entirely through native SharePoint upload/drag-and-drop?	The Court does not require automated or bulk migration tooling. Content migration will be a collaborative effort between the vendor and Court IT/content owners, with files selectively identified and placed into the appropriate document libraries once the new framework is established. Native SharePoint upload methods are acceptable; however, vendors are welcome to propose value-added tooling as an optional line item if they believe it would benefit the process.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

3	Should vendor effort supporting the collaborative content migration (Section 2.6.2) be priced within the Discovery phase deliverable, or as a separate cost-proposal line item?	Vendor effort supporting collaborative content migration should be included within the Discovery phase deliverable. If the vendor wishes to propose additional migration support services beyond what is included in Discovery, those should be identified as separate optional line items in the cost proposal.
4	What is the approximate volume of content (page count, document count, total storage size) on the current IIS-hosted intranet?	The current IIS-hosted intranet contains approximately 17 GB of content. However, not all of this content will be migrated — the Court will lead the effort to analyze and identify what is relevant for migration. Vendors should not assume full migration of this volume. Content discovery and inventory will be a collaborative effort led by Court IT, with vendor support as needed during the Discovery phase.
5	Does the Court's M365 G5 tenant already contain any existing SharePoint Online site collections, or would this project start from a clean tenant?	This is a new, clean project. The Court's M365 G5 tenant is configured, but the intranet build should be treated as starting from a clean slate with no existing SharePoint Online site collections to carry forward.
6	Is there a records retention schedule or existing content taxonomy the Court can share prior to discovery?	No. There is no existing content taxonomy or records retention schedule currently in place. Defining naming conventions, metadata standards, and a content taxonomy will be part of the vendor-led discovery phase, in collaboration with Court IT and content owners.
7	Can the Court share an anticipated budget range for this project, or reference values from prior comparable contracts, to help vendors scope an appropriately sized proposal	The Court has an established budget but will not be disclosing it publicly. Vendors are expected to understand the scope as described in the RFP and pre-proposal meeting and submit their best and final offer accordingly. The award will go to the vendor whose proposal best aligns with the Court's needs and value — not necessarily the lowest bid.
8	Beyond static content, does the current IIS-hosted intranet include any custom .NET applications, web forms, or interactive tools (e.g., request forms, calculators, dashboards) that will need equivalent functionality rebuilt in the new intranet?	No. The current intranet does not contain any existing custom workflows, InfoPath forms, .NET applications, or other interactive tools. The system is primarily static content. Vendors are welcome to propose value-added workflows or forms as part of their onboarding approach.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

9	Does the Court have an existing inventory or list of custom functionality/applications on the current intranet, or will identifying these be part of the vendor-led discovery phase?	No existing inventory is available. Identification of any functional needs beyond static content will be part of the vendor-led discovery phase.
10	Does the Court currently use SharePoint Online, Power Automate, InfoPath, or other Microsoft form/workflow tools anywhere else in its M365 tenant that should be considered for integration into the new intranet?	The Court operates on M365 G5 and has Power Apps and Power BI licenses. The Court is open to expanding Power Automate licensing as needed. Teams is used extensively but Teams SharePoint sites are not required to be integrated into the new intranet. InfoPath is not in use.
11	Can the Court confirm the specific M365 G5 SKUs/licenses currently provisioned (e.g., Purview add-ons, Copilot licenses) so vendors can scope accurately within existing entitlements?	The Court operates as a full M365 G5 shop, which includes SharePoint Online, Power Apps, Power BI, and Teams. The Court holds some Copilot licenses but does not currently use Copilot Studio. Vendors must rely solely on Court-owned M365 G5 licensing; no additional licensing costs should be included in the base proposal. Optional AI features should include professional services/configuration costs only.
12	Is Power Platform (Power Automate, Power Apps, Copilot Studio) already enabled and governed in the tenant, or would enablement be required as part of this project?	Power Apps and Power BI are available under the Court's M365 G5 licenses. The Court is open to expanding Power Automate licensing. Copilot Studio is not currently in use. Governance of the Power Platform within the tenant may be assessed and recommended by the vendor as part of the governance workstream.
13	Does the Court have an existing Microsoft Entra ID conditional access policy set, or will this be defined as part of this engagement (Section 2.3.3)?	The Court uses both Active Directory and Microsoft Entra ID. The existing tenant is configured, but the Court is receptive to the vendor evaluating current governance and recommending or implementing enhancements, including conditional access policies, as part of the base scope.
14	Is Microsoft 365 Copilot currently licensed and/or enabled for any users today?	The Court holds some Copilot licenses but they are not currently in active use. Copilot Studio is not licensed. AI readiness features are optional and must be priced as separate line items in the cost proposal.
15	Does the Court have an existing AI governance policy that proposals should align with?	No formal AI governance policy is currently in place. The Court expects the selected vendor to recommend and implement appropriate AI governance guardrails,

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

		permissions hygiene, and content governance standards as part of the optional AI readiness scope.
16	Are there existing naming convention or metadata standards documents in place today, or will these be created from scratch during discovery?	No existing naming convention or metadata standards are in place. These will be created from scratch during the discovery phase in collaboration with the vendor, IT, and content owners. All department/division sites are expected to adopt standardized naming conventions and metadata post-implementation.
17	Does the Court have specific Microsoft certification requirements for key personnel (e.g., SC-401 SharePoint Administrator, PL-400 Power Platform Developer, MS-600 M365/SPFx Developer), or is it left to the vendor to propose relevant credentials?	No specific certifications are mandated by the Court. Vendors should propose qualified personnel and include copies of relevant Microsoft certifications as part of the proposal submission, along with a narrative summary of qualifications.
18	Is there a minimum number of years of SharePoint Online/M365 experience expected for the lead architect or project manager role?	No minimum years of experience are specified. Vendors should propose qualified personnel and demonstrate relevant experience through their proposal narratives and references.
19	Should copies of individual staff Microsoft certifications be submitted with the proposal, or is a narrative summary of qualifications sufficient, with certificates provided upon request?	Vendors must include copies of relevant staff certifications as part of the proposal submission. A narrative summary of qualifications should also be provided alongside the certification copies.
20	Section 10.1(b)(3) requires proposers to provide references from similar assignments but does not specify the number or required format. Please confirm the minimum or maximum number of references to be submitted and the information required for each reference. Please also confirm whether client contact information is sufficient or whether signed	There is no minimum or maximum number of references required, and no prescribed format. Vendors may submit references in whatever format they find appropriate. Client contact information is sufficient; signed reference letters or forms are not required.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	reference letters/forms are required.	
21	For purposes of Section 10.1(b)(3), please clarify whether a “similar assignment” must specifically involve SharePoint Online intranet modernization, or whether broader Microsoft 365/SharePoint engagements involving SPFx development, enhanced search, governance, security, content migration, and related capabilities will be considered similar.	A "similar assignment" does not need to be a SharePoint Online intranet modernization project specifically. Broader Microsoft 365/SharePoint engagements involving SPFx development, enhanced search, governance, security, or content migration will be considered similar. References from federal and commercial clients are acceptable. Government or court experience is preferred but not required.
22	Section 10.1(b)(4) requires proposers to identify key personnel and relevant Microsoft certifications. Please confirm whether resumes are required for proposed key personnel at the proposal stage. If resumes are required, please identify the expected roles and/or minimum number of resumes to be submitted.	Resumes are not required at the proposal stage. However, vendors must include copies of relevant staff certifications as part of the proposal submission, along with a narrative summary of key personnel qualifications and experience.
23	Please confirm whether proposed key personnel must be current employees of the prime contractor, or whether proposers may include qualified personnel from proposed subcontractors or other committed contract resources who will be available to perform the work if awarded.	Vendors may include qualified personnel from proposed subcontractors, provided those resources are committed and available to perform the work if awarded. The Court is open to nearshore and offshore resources as long as they align with the Court's work schedule and comply with remote access policies. The awarded vendor is responsible for vetting all resources.
24	The Terms and Conditions state that subcontracting requires the Court's written approval, while the proposal instructions require copies of applicable licenses,	Vendors must include all subcontractor information (licenses, certifications, and relevant credentials) as part of the proposal submission. Court approval of subcontractors is not required prior to proposal submission — award of the contract will serve as the Court's approval of the proposed subcontractors.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	certifications, or credentials for subcontractors. Please clarify whether Court approval of proposed subcontractors is required before proposal submission or after award, and identify any proposal-stage subcontractor documentation required, such as a letter of commitment, scope of work, licenses/certifications, or personnel resumes.	
25	The RFP states that selected and relevant content will be manually migrated collaboratively rather than through a full lift-and-shift migration. Please provide, if available, an estimated volume of existing content expected to be reviewed and/or selectively migrated, such as the approximate number of documents, pages, libraries, lists, or other content objects. Please also indicate whether an existing content inventory will be available to the selected vendor.	The current intranet is a self-hosted IIS-based website containing operational and financial business process documents, HR-related documents, employee resources, Judicial Officer pages, and reports. The current system holds approximately 17 GB of content; however, not all content will be migrated. The Court will lead the analysis to determine what is relevant for migration. No formal content inventory will be provided prior to award. Vendors should not assume full migration of this volume — only approved, active content will be selectively migrated, and the Court does not require bulk or automated migration tooling.
26	To assist proposers in appropriately sizing the discovery, configuration, and implementation effort, please indicate whether the Court can provide a high-level description of the current Microsoft 365 / SharePoint Online tenant configuration, including existing SharePoint sites or hub sites, SPFx App Catalog configuration, search configuration, Microsoft Purview configuration,	The Court's M365 G5 tenant is already configured with identity, licensing, and security policies. Both Active Directory and Microsoft Entra ID are in use. However, a formal description of the current tenant configuration is not available for distribution prior to award. Vendors should treat assessment of the existing tenant configuration as part of the Discovery phase scope. The Court is receptive to the vendor evaluating current governance controls and recommending enhancements.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	Conditional Access, sensitivity labels, Entra ID groups, and existing governance controls.	
27	The RFP requires proposers to rely solely on Court-owned M365 G5 licensing and states that additional licensing costs should not be included, while the optional AI scope references Microsoft 365 Copilot, SharePoint Agents, Copilot Studio, and related capabilities. Please confirm whether optional AI pricing should include professional services/configuration costs only and exclude any additional Microsoft licensing costs, with the Court providing any additional licenses that may ultimately be required. Please also indicate whether the Court currently has Microsoft 365 Copilot and/or Copilot Studio licensing available.	Confirmed. Optional AI pricing should include professional services and configuration costs only — no additional Microsoft licensing costs should be included in the proposal. The Court holds some Microsoft 365 Copilot licenses but they are not currently in active use. Copilot Studio is not currently licensed.
28	Please confirm whether the Court has a prescribed cost proposal template or pricing form that proposers must use. If not, may proposers submit their own cost schedule provided it presents the required fixed-price, turnkey Not-to-Exceed amount by phase/deliverable and separately identifies the required optional AI and post-go-live support items?	The Court does not have a prescribed cost proposal template. Vendors may submit their own cost schedule format, provided it presents the required fixed-price, turnkey Not-to-Exceed amount by phase/deliverable and separately identifies optional AI and post-go-live support line items.
29	The RFP states that the Court prefers a phased implementation delivered as soon as possible, that the implementation schedule	The Court is targeting a project kickoff around October 1st , with a goal of having the new intranet live by January 1st , though this is not a hard deadline. Phase 1 is defined as a successful deployment to a pilot group (one representative per division/business

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	should be refined through discovery, and that a pilot is expected before enterprise-wide rollout. Please indicate whether the Court has any preferred target duration or target dates for discovery, pilot launch, and enterprise-wide go-live that proposers should use when developing their work plans.	owner). Enterprise-wide rollout follows the pilot. The implementation timeline is flexible and should be refined through the discovery phase. Vendors should propose a work plan that reflects this phased approach.
30	Please clarify whether the existing IIS-based intranet and/or the Court's current Microsoft 365 environment is presently supported by an incumbent vendor or implementation partner that the selected contractor will be expected to coordinate with during discovery or transition, or whether the existing environment is maintained entirely by Court personnel.	There is no incumbent vendor. The existing IIS-hosted intranet and the Court's M365 environment are maintained entirely by Court IT personnel.
31	Please confirm whether Attachment 5 – Small Business Declaration and Attachment 6 – Payee Data Record (in lieu of IRS W-9) are required to be completed, signed, and submitted with the proposal at the time of submission, or only upon award.	Yes. Attachment 5 (Small Business Declaration) and Attachment 6 (Payee Data Record) must be completed, signed, and included as part of the proposal submission.
32	Please confirm whether the Court previously issued and/or awarded a solicitation or contract for the same or substantially similar intranet modernization initiative that was subsequently cancelled or terminated. If so, please provide the prior solicitation/contract number	The Court has not previously awarded a contract for this or any substantially similar intranet modernization initiative.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	and explain the reason for the cancellation or termination.	
33	If an incumbent or prior contractor previously supported this initiative or the Court's intranet/Microsoft 365 environment, please identify any significant implementation, performance, technical, schedule, adoption, governance, or other challenges encountered under the prior engagement that the Court would like the selected vendor under RFP 81326C to address or avoid.	The Court's existing intranet and M365 environment have been maintained entirely by internal Court IT personnel.
34	If a prior contract for the same or substantially similar services was awarded, please provide the name of the awarded contractor and the original and/or final awarded contract amount, including any amendments or change orders, if applicable.	This is a new procurement with no prior work performed.
35	Please provide, if available, the actual utilization or expenditure under the prior contract, including the total amount invoiced/paid or otherwise utilized against the awarded contract value prior to completion, cancellation, or termination.	Not applicable. No prior contract was awarded for this or any substantially similar intranet modernization initiative. This is a new procurement with no prior work performed.
36	What is the estimated budget or total contract value for this engagement?	The Court has an established budget but will not be disclosing it publicly. Vendors should submit their best and final offer based on the described scope. Budget will be discussed during contract negotiation with the selected vendor.
37	Is there an incumbent contractor currently providing the services described in this RFP? If so, could you please provide the name of the	There is no incumbent contractor. The Court's existing intranet and M365 environment are maintained entirely by internal Court IT personnel. No prior vendor has been engaged for these services.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	incumbent contractor(s), the contract budget or value, and historical spending information, if available?	
38	Could the Court please provide guidance on how to submit a Public Records Act request to the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, for information related to this previously released opportunity, including the appropriate contact and the procedure for submitting such a request?	As mentioned in the RFP, PROPOSALS ARE SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE PURSUANT TO APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC CONTRACT CODE AND RULE 10.500 OF THE CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT. Court will not disclose (i) social security numbers, or (ii) balance sheets or income statements submitted by a Proposer that is not a publicly-traded corporation. All other information in proposals will be disclosed in response to applicable public records requests. Such disclosure will be made regardless of whether the proposal (or portions thereof) is marked "confidential," "proprietary," or otherwise, and regardless of any statement in the proposal (a) purporting to limit Court's right to disclose information in the proposal, or (b) requiring Court to inform or obtain the consent of the Proposer prior to the disclosure of the proposal (or portions thereof). Any proposal that is password protected, or contains portions that are password protected, may be rejected. Proposers are accordingly cautioned not to include confidential, proprietary, or privileged information in proposals. Public records requests may be submitted to the Court at media@scscourt.org .
39	Does the existing M365 G5 tenant have any existing SharePoint sites, hub configurations, or SPFx solutions already deployed that need to be assessed, reused, or decommissioned	This is a new, clean project. The intranet build should be treated as starting from a clean slate. Assessment of the existing tenant configuration, including any SharePoint sites, hub configurations, or SPFx solutions currently present, will be part of the vendor-led Discovery phase scope.
40	Can the Court please share current tenant details - e.g., whether Microsoft Purview, Conditional Access (Entra ID P1/P2), and sensitivity labels are already configured - or would these be set up from scratch as part of this project?	The Court's M365 G5 tenant is already configured with identity, licensing, and security policies. However, a formal description of the current tenant configuration is not available for distribution prior to award. Vendors should treat assessment and evaluation of current Purview, Conditional Access, and sensitivity label configurations as part of the Discovery phase. The Court is receptive to vendor recommendations and expects the selected vendor to implement approved governance controls within the scope of the project.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

41	How is the Court's identity setup currently structured - is Entra ID synced with an on-premises Active Directory (hybrid), or is it cloud-only?	The Court currently operates in a hybrid identity environment, with both on-premises Active Directory and Microsoft Entra ID in use.
42	Can the Court provide an estimate of the content volume of the current intranet (approximate page count, document/file count, and total storage in GB) to help scope discovery and any content decisions?	The current IIS-hosted intranet contains approximately 17 GB of content. A formal page count or document count is not available at this time. Not all content will be migrated — the Court will lead the effort to analyze and identify what is relevant. Vendors should not assume full migration of this volume. Content discovery and inventory will be a collaborative effort during the Discovery phase.
43	What is the estimated budget or total contract value for this engagement?	The Court has an established budget but will not be disclosing it publicly. Vendors should submit their best and final offer based on the described scope. Budget will be discussed during contract negotiation with the selected vendor.
44	Is there an incumbent contractor currently providing the services described in this RFP? If so, could you please provide the name of the incumbent contractor(s), the contract budget or value, and historical spending information, if available?	There is no incumbent contractor. The Court's existing intranet and M365 environment are maintained entirely by internal Court IT personnel. No prior vendor has been engaged for these services.
45	Could the Court please provide guidance on how to submit a Public Records Act request to the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, for information related to this previously released opportunity, including the appropriate contact and the procedure for submitting such a request?	As mentioned in the RFP, PROPOSALS ARE SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE PURSUANT TO APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC CONTRACT CODE AND RULE 10.500 OF THE CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT. Court will not disclose (i) social security numbers, or (ii) balance sheets or income statements submitted by a Proposer that is not a publicly-traded corporation. All other information in proposals will be disclosed in response to applicable public records requests. Such disclosure will be made regardless of whether the proposal (or portions thereof) is marked "confidential," "proprietary," or otherwise, and regardless of any statement in the proposal (a) purporting to limit Court's right to disclose information in the proposal, or (b) requiring Court to inform or obtain the consent of the Proposer prior to the disclosure of the proposal (or portions thereof). Any

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

		proposal that is password protected, or contains portions that are password protected, may be rejected. Proposers are accordingly cautioned not to include confidential, proprietary, or privileged information in proposals. Public records requests may be submitted to the Court at media@scscourt.org .
46	Does the existing M365 G5 tenant have any existing SharePoint sites, hub configurations, or SPFx solutions already deployed that need to be assessed, reused, or decommissioned?	This is a new, clean project. The intranet build should be treated as starting from a clean slate. Assessment of the existing tenant configuration will be part of the vendor-led Discovery phase.
47	Can the Court please share current tenant details - e.g., whether Microsoft Purview, Conditional Access (Entra ID P1/P2), and sensitivity labels are already configured - or would these be set up from scratch as part of this project?	The Court's M365 G5 tenant is already configured with identity, licensing, and security policies. A formal description is not available prior to award. Vendors should treat assessment of Purview, Conditional Access, and sensitivity label configurations as part of Discovery. The Court expects the selected vendor to implement approved governance controls within scope.
48	How is the Court's identity setup currently structured - is Entra ID synced with an on-premises Active Directory (hybrid), or is it cloud-only?	The Court operates in a hybrid identity environment, with both on-premises Active Directory and Microsoft Entra ID in use.
49	Can the Court provide an estimate of the content volume of the current intranet (approximate page count, document/file count, and total storage in GB) to help scope discovery and any content decisions?	The current IIS-hosted intranet contains approximately 17 GB of content. A formal page or document count is not available. Not all content will be migrated — the Court will lead the effort to identify what is relevant. Content discovery and inventory will be collaborative during the Discovery phase.
50	May a Proposer rely upon and include the qualifications, relevant Microsoft 365/SharePoint Online project experience, customer references, certifications, and key personnel qualifications of a proposed subcontractor or teaming partner when demonstrating compliance	Yes. Proposers may rely upon and include the qualifications, project experience, customer references, certifications, and key personnel of a proposed subcontractor or teaming partner when demonstrating compliance with the Experience on Similar Assignments and Staff Credentials requirements, provided the subcontractor or teaming partner is clearly identified in the proposal.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	with the RFP's requirements for Experience on Similar Assignments and Staff Credentials ?	
51	For purposes of demonstrating experience on similar assignments, must the qualifying projects/references have been performed directly by the Prime Proposer, or may relevant projects successfully performed by a proposed subcontractor or teaming partner also be included in the Proposer's response?	Relevant projects successfully performed by a proposed subcontractor or teaming partner may be included in the Proposer's response. Projects do not need to have been performed directly by the Prime Proposer, provided the subcontractor or teaming partner is identified and their role in the referenced project is clearly described.
52	If subcontractor/teaming partner experience is permitted, may the Proposer demonstrate the required qualifications through the combined experience and capabilities of the proposed team , provided that the subcontractor/teaming partner is identified and its specific role and responsibilities are clearly described?	Yes. The Court will evaluate the combined experience and capabilities of the proposed team. Proposers must clearly identify each subcontractor or teaming partner and describe their specific role and responsibilities within the engagement.
53	Can the Teams conference recording be made publicly accessible? The link provided does not appear to allow external access.	Vendors who were unable to attend the conference should rely on the RFP documents and this Q&A addendum for all relevant information.
54	What is the current status of Microsoft Purview, sensitivity labels, retention policies, and information classification within the M365 G5 tenant?	The current status of Microsoft Purview, sensitivity labels, retention policies, and information classification is not available for distribution prior to award. The Court does not have a mature Purview implementation currently in place. The selected vendor will assess the current state during Discovery and is expected to recommend and implement Purview configuration, sensitivity labels, and retention policies within the project scope.
55	Can the Court provide examples of intranet experiences, information	The Court does not have specific examples of intranet experiences or designs that it considers successful or unsuccessful. Vendors are encouraged to draw on their

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	architecture designs, or search experiences that it considers successful?	own portfolio of prior work and present design concepts and wireframes as part of their proposal. The more design detail provided, the better the Court will be able to evaluate proposals.
56	The RFP identifies approximately 600 internal users. Please confirm the expected number of users, administrators, site owners, content authors, and other specialized users.	The Court has approximately 600 internal users. Approximately 12 administrators and site owners are anticipated for initial training. The specific breakdown of content authors and other specialized user roles will be defined during the Discovery phase in collaboration with the vendor and stakeholders.
57	Are all users internal employees, or are external users, contractors, temporary employees, or anonymous users expected to access any portion of the intranet?	All users are internal employees of the Court. No external users, contractors, temporary employees, or anonymous users are expected to access any portion of the intranet.
58	How many distinct user personas/roles should the solution support?	The specific number of distinct user personas and roles has not been formally defined at this time. Identifying and documenting user personas will be part of the vendor-led Discovery phase. Vendors should include persona development as a Discovery deliverable and propose an approach accordingly.
59	How many users are expected to participate in UAT?	The Court has a dedicated business stakeholder group of approximately 10 people who will participate in requirements validation and UAT. The exact number of UAT participants will be confirmed during the Discovery phase. Vendors should propose a UAT approach and plan based on this estimate.
60	The RFP mentions approximately six stakeholder departments for discovery and "a couple dozen" divisional/department sites. Please provide the exact number of sites required for Phase 1.	The exact number of sites for Phase 1 has not been finalized. The Court anticipates a couple dozen divisional/department sites in total. The specific sites to be included in Phase 1 versus subsequent phases will be determined during the Discovery phase. Vendors should propose a flexible phased approach and not fix their scope to a specific site count.
61	Please provide the proposed list of departments/divisions and corresponding site names.	A formal list of departments, divisions, and corresponding site names is not available at this time. This will be developed collaboratively during the Discovery phase. Vendors should include a content and site inventory exercise as part of their Discovery deliverables.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

62	Are all department sites expected to have the same functionality and design, or will some departments require unique layouts, web parts, workflows, permissions, or navigation?	All department sites are expected to follow a standardized layout, consistent design, and shared framework. While content and permissions will vary by department, significant department-specific customizations to layouts, web parts, or navigation are not anticipated in Phase 1. Any unique requirements identified during Discovery will be addressed through the vendor-defined change control process.
63	Should the vendor provision all department sites, or only create a reusable template and have Court IT provision them?	The vendor is expected to provision all department sites under the base scope of this engagement. The vendor is also expected to develop a reusable department site template so that Court IT can provision future sites independently post-go-live. Automated site provisioning tools should be developed and handed off to Court IT as part of the project deliverables.
64	Does the Court already have an approved information architecture, or should the vendor design the complete IA from scratch?	The Court does not have an existing approved information architecture. The vendor is expected to design the complete information architecture from scratch during the Discovery phase, in collaboration with Court IT and key stakeholders.
65	Is there an existing Court intranet branding/design standard that must be followed?	No. The Court does not have an existing intranet branding or design standard. Vendors are expected to propose a design. The Court requires full WCAG 2.1 Level AA accessibility compliance as a baseline standard.
66	Are there any pre-defined brand guidelines and design standards that should be followed, including approved logos, fonts/typography, color standards, accessibility standards, and other design assets?	No pre-defined brand guidelines, approved logos, fonts, color standards, or design assets exist for the intranet. Vendors should propose their own design approach. The one firm requirement is WCAG 2.1 Level AA accessibility compliance. Vendors are encouraged to include design concepts and wireframes in their proposals.
67	How many unique page templates/layouts are required?	The number of unique page templates and layouts has not been defined. This will be determined during the Discovery phase based on stakeholder requirements and the information architecture design. Vendors should include page template definition as a Discovery deliverable and propose an estimated number based on their experience with similar engagements.
68	How many homepage designs are required—one global homepage or different	One global homepage is required. Department and division sites will have their own landing pages consistent with the standardized site template, but these are distinct from the global intranet homepage.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	homepages for departments/divisions?	
69	Please confirm whether the requirement is specifically WCAG 2.1 Level AA and whether the Court has additional accessibility standards.	Yes. The requirement is WCAG 2.1 Level AA. The Court does not have additional accessibility standards beyond this at this time. Given the government context, alignment with Section 508 is also expected where applicable.
70	Is formal accessibility testing/certification required, and if so, which testing tools or standards must be used?	Formal accessibility testing is required as part of the vendor's quality assurance process prior to go-live. The Court does not prescribe specific testing tools — vendors should propose their approach. Testing must demonstrate WCAG 2.1 Level AA compliance. Accessibility remediation must be completed before UAT sign-off.
71	Who will perform the final accessibility acceptance testing—the vendor, Court, or a third party?	The vendor is responsible for accessibility testing and remediation prior to UAT. The Court will conduct final acceptance testing as part of the UAT process. No third-party accessibility certification is required at this time, though vendors may propose it as a value-add.
72	Please identify the specific functionality that the Court expects to be implemented using custom SPFx web parts rather than standard SharePoint functionality.	The specific functionality requiring custom SPFx web parts has not been predefined. This will be identified during the Discovery phase based on stakeholder requirements and design decisions. The Court's expectation is a modern, dynamic intranet — not a basic out-of-the-box SharePoint site — and vendors should assume custom SPFx development will be required where native SharePoint capabilities are insufficient to meet the design and functional requirements.
73	How many custom SPFx web parts are currently anticipated?	The number of custom SPFx web parts has not been defined at this time. This will be determined during Discovery. Vendors should include a reasonable estimate in their fixed-price proposal based on their experience with similar engagements and propose a change control process for requirements identified post-kickoff.
74	Are custom extensions such as Application Customizers, Field Customizers, Command Sets, or custom forms required?	Custom extensions such as Application Customizers, Field Customizers, and Command Sets may be required where justified by design and functional requirements identified during Discovery. Vendors should propose an approach and include estimates in their fixed-price proposal. Custom forms using Power Apps are optional.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

75	Are custom Power Apps or Power Automate solutions expected in addition to SPFx?	Custom Power Apps and Power Automate solutions are not required as part of the base scope. Vendors may propose them as optional line items where they add value to the solution. The Court is open to Power Platform components where they are well-justified.
76	Which homepage widgets are required for Phase 1—for example news, events, calendar, tasks, quick links, alerts, weather, employee resources, or personalized content	Required homepage widgets for Phase 1 include at minimum: news and announcements, quick links, calendar/events, and employee resources. The complete list of homepage widgets will be refined during the Discovery phase. Personalized content and audience-targeted widgets are not required.
77	How many homepage components/web parts should be included in the base estimate	The exact number of homepage components and web parts has not been defined. Vendors should propose a reasonable estimate based on the required features described in the RFP and their experience with similar engagements. The full component list will be confirmed during Discovery.
78	Should homepage content be personalized based on department, security group, job role, or user profile?	Homepage personalization based on department, security group, job role, or user profile is not required. A single, consistent global homepage experience is expected for all users.
79	What file types and file sizes are included?	No specific file type or size restrictions have been defined. The Court's content primarily consists of standard office documents (Word, Excel, PDF) and related files. Specific file type and size considerations will be assessed during the Discovery phase.
80	Are there legacy files that require conversion, remediation, metadata enrichment, or restructuring before migration?	Content cleanup and remediation is expected as part of the migration process. The Court does not have a predefined list of files requiring conversion or restructuring. The vendor and Court IT will collaboratively identify and address content remediation needs during the Discovery phase.
81	Are content types already defined, or should the vendor design and implement them?	No content types are currently defined. The vendor is expected to design and implement content types from scratch as part of the Discovery and build phases, in collaboration with Court IT and content owners.
82	The RFP states that there is no lift-and-shift migration and that approved active content will be selectively migrated collaboratively. Please confirm that the vendor is not	Confirmed. The vendor is not responsible for bulk migration of the legacy intranet. The Court and vendor will collaborate to selectively migrate only approved, active content. Court IT and content owners will lead the identification of content to be migrated, and placement will be handled collaboratively once the new framework is established.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	responsible for bulk migration of the legacy intranet.	
83	Who is responsible for identifying which legacy content should be migrated?	Court IT will lead the effort to identify which legacy content should be migrated, in collaboration with content owners during the Discovery phase. The vendor is expected to provide guidance and a framework to support this process.
84	Who is responsible for content cleanup, duplication removal, validation, metadata assignment, and ownership assignment?	Content cleanup, duplication removal, validation, metadata assignment, and ownership assignment is a shared responsibility. Court IT and content owners will lead content preparation and decision-making. The vendor is expected to provide guidance, tools recommendations, and a governance framework to support the process. Final content decisions rest with Court IT and content owners.
85	What percentage or estimated number of legacy documents/pages should the vendor assume will be migrated?	The percentage of legacy content to be migrated has not been defined. The Court's current intranet contains approximately 17 GB of content, but not all will be migrated. Vendors should not assume a fixed percentage. The scope of migration will be determined collaboratively during Discovery, led by Court IT.
86	How many legacy intranet pages need to be recreated in SharePoint?	The number of legacy pages to be recreated in SharePoint has not been defined. The current intranet is a static IIS-hosted website, and page content will be rebuilt as modern SharePoint pages rather than migrated as-is. The volume of pages to be recreated will be determined during Discovery.
87	Are legacy web pages being migrated manually, redesigned, or simply recreated as new SharePoint pages?	Legacy web pages will be rebuilt as new modern SharePoint pages. There is no lift-and-shift migration of legacy pages. Page content and structure will be redesigned within the new SharePoint Online framework during the build phase.
88	Does migration include documents, images, links, navigation, permissions, metadata, and page content?	Migration will not include version history, permissions, or metadata recreation from the legacy system. Only approved, active documents and relevant content will be selectively migrated. Navigation, links, and page content will be rebuilt in the new SharePoint Online environment rather than migrated from the legacy system.
89	Is migration tooling expected, or will Court staff manually upload the content?	The Court does not require automated migration tooling. Native SharePoint upload methods are acceptable for the base scope. Vendors may propose value-added migration tooling as an optional line item if they believe it would benefit the process.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

90	How many migration iterations/pilot migrations should be included?	One pilot launch to a representative group is expected before enterprise-wide rollout. The number of migration iterations will be determined based on the phased approach proposed by the vendor and agreed upon during Discovery.
91	Is any third-party migration tool, such as ShareGate, currently available for the migration? If not, can a suitable third-party migration tool be procured and made available for the project?	No third-party migration tool is currently available in the Court's environment. Vendors may propose a suitable migration tool as an optional line item in their cost proposal. If proposed, the tool should be included with associated professional services costs. Any additional licensing costs for third-party tools should be clearly identified.
92	The RFP states that out-of-the-box Microsoft Search is insufficient. Please provide the expected search experience and use cases.	The Court requires an enhanced search experience that goes beyond out-of-the-box Microsoft Search. Expected capabilities include custom managed properties, search refiners and verticals, promoted results for authoritative content, people directory integration, and metadata-driven filtering. Specific search use cases — such as policy lookup, employee directory, document discovery, and department-specific content — will be defined during Discovery. Vendors should propose a comprehensive search architecture.
93	Are the required search rules already defined? If not, can you provide an approximate number of search rules that will be required for the migration?	Search rules have not been predefined. The number and type of search rules, managed properties, and refiners will be determined during the Discovery phase. Vendors should include search schema design as a Discovery deliverable and propose an estimated scope based on their experience with similar engagements.
94	Please provide the Court's security baseline and required cybersecurity standards that must be incorporated into the solution.	The Court's security baseline is role-based access control (RBAC) and Microsoft security best practices. The solution must support secure authentication via SSO and Active Directory/Entra ID integration, conditional access policies, sensitivity labels, and audit logging. Additional cybersecurity standards will be assessed and defined during Discovery in collaboration with Court IT.
95	Which existing Conditional Access policies should be reviewed or modified?	The specific Conditional Access policies currently in place are not available for distribution prior to award. The selected vendor will assess all existing Conditional Access policies during Discovery and recommend modifications or additions as appropriate. The vendor is expected to implement approved changes as part of the base scope.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

96	Is the vendor responsible for implementing Conditional Access policies or only making recommendations?	The vendor is responsible for both recommending and implementing Conditional Access policies as part of the base scope. The Court expects the selected vendor to evaluate the current state, recommend enhancements, and implement approved changes in collaboration with Court IT.
97	How many sensitivity labels are currently configured, and how many new labels are expected?	The current number of configured sensitivity labels is not known at this time. The vendor will assess the current state during Discovery. The number of new labels required will be determined based on the Court's data classification needs as defined during Discovery. Vendors should include sensitivity label design and implementation as part of their base scope.
98	What audit logging and reporting requirements must be implemented?	Audit logging and reporting are required as part of the base scope. The specific requirements will be defined during Discovery. At minimum, vendors should propose an audit logging approach consistent with M365 G5 native capabilities, covering user access, content changes, and administrative actions.
99	Are security assessments, penetration testing, vulnerability scanning, or security certification required?	No. Security assessments, penetration testing, vulnerability scanning, and formal security certification are out of scope for this engagement. The solution will rely on native SharePoint Online permissions and Microsoft's built-in security capabilities within the Court's M365 G5 environment.
100	The RFP calls for Microsoft Purview data classification and retention. Please clarify whether the vendor must fully implement Purview retention/classification or only provide an implementation roadmap.	The vendor is expected to fully implement Microsoft Purview data classification and retention as part of the project scope. A roadmap-only approach is not sufficient. The Court recognizes that full implementation may be phased based on Discovery findings, and vendors may propose a foundational Phase 1 implementation with more advanced policies delivered as a near-term follow-on within the contract period.
101	How many retention labels, retention policies, sensitivity labels, auto-apply rules, and record categories are expected?	The specific number of retention labels, retention policies, sensitivity labels, auto-apply rules, and record categories has not been defined at this time. These will be determined during the Discovery phase based on the Court's content classification and governance needs. Vendors should include Purview taxonomy design as part of their Discovery deliverables and propose an estimated scope based on their experience with similar government engagements.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

102	Has the Court already established a records retention schedule?	No. The Court does not currently have an established records retention schedule for intranet content. Developing a retention schedule will be part of the vendor-led governance and Purview workstream during the Discovery phase, in collaboration with Court IT and relevant stakeholders.
103	Is the vendor responsible for developing the retention taxonomy, or will the Court provide the approved taxonomy?	The vendor is expected to develop and recommend the retention taxonomy in collaboration with Court IT and content owners. The Court does not have an existing taxonomy to provide. The vendor should lead the taxonomy design process during Discovery, with Court approval of the final taxonomy before implementation.
104	Does Purview implementation apply only to the new intranet content or to the broader M365 tenant?	For the purposes of this engagement, Purview implementation should focus on the new intranet content and the SharePoint Online environment. If broader tenant-level Purview governance is recommended as part of the vendor's assessment, those recommendations should be presented as a separate optional line item for the Court's consideration.
105	Does the Court already have a Microsoft 365/SharePoint governance framework?	No. The Court does not have an existing Microsoft 365 or SharePoint governance framework in place. The vendor is expected to design and implement a comprehensive governance framework as part of this engagement.
106	If not, should the vendor create the complete governance framework?	Yes. The vendor is expected to design and implement a complete governance framework, including site provisioning processes, naming conventions, lifecycle management, role definitions, and access control standards. The framework should be developed in collaboration with Court IT and approved by the Court before implementation.
107	How many governance policies/processes are expected as deliverables?	The specific number of governance policies and processes has not been predefined. The scope of governance deliverables will be determined during Discovery. At minimum, vendors should plan for governance covering site provisioning, naming conventions, content lifecycle management, role-based access, and Purview classification. Vendors should propose an estimated scope based on their experience with similar engagements.
108	What lifecycle states are required for sites—active,	The Court expects the governance framework to support site lifecycle management including at minimum active, inactive, archived, and deleted states.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	inactive, archived, deleted, etc.?	The specific lifecycle workflow and approval process for each state will be defined during Discovery in collaboration with Court IT.
109	Who will approve new sites after implementation?	New site creation and approval will be restricted to specific roles within Court IT. The vendor should design the site provisioning process to route approval through IT, with the CIO serving as the escalation point for disputes or exceptions.
110	What approval process is required for site provisioning?	The Court expects a semi-automated site provisioning process with IT approval. The vendor should design a provisioning workflow that includes a request, review, and approval step before a new site is created. The specific approval workflow will be defined in detail during Discovery.
111	Should automated site provisioning include approval, naming validation, template selection, security-group creation, metadata configuration, and notifications?	Yes. Where feasible, automated site provisioning should include approval workflow, naming validation, template selection, security group creation, metadata configuration, and notifications. PnP or Power Platform-based approaches are acceptable. The full provisioning feature set will be defined during Discovery.
112	What is the expected provisioning process for a new department site?	The provisioning process for a new department site should follow a structured workflow: request submission, naming and metadata validation, IT approval, automated site creation from the standard template, security group assignment, and notification to the requestor and site owner. The detailed process will be defined during Discovery.
113	Should provisioning be fully automated or semi-automated with IT approval?	Semi-automated with IT approval is the preferred approach. The Court wants oversight of new site creation to ensure governance and security standards are maintained. Full automation without an approval step is not desired.
114	Should provisioning automatically create libraries, lists, pages, navigation, permissions, branding, metadata, and web parts?	Yes. The automated provisioning process should create all standard site components — including document libraries, lists, pages, navigation, permissions, branding, metadata configuration, and web parts — consistent with the approved site template. This ensures all department sites maintain a consistent look, feel, and structure.
115	The RFP requires separate Dev, QA, and Production environments as site collections. Please confirm	Yes. Separate Dev, QA, and Production environments as distinct site collections within the existing M365 G5 tenant is the required approach for this engagement.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	whether this environment model is mandatory.	
116	Are separate Microsoft 365 tenants required, or will all environments reside in the existing tenant?	All environments — Dev, QA, and Production — will reside within the Court's existing M365 G5 tenant as separate site collections. Separate Microsoft 365 tenants are not required or desired.
117	Who will provision and administer the environments?	The vendor is expected to provision and configure the Dev, QA, and Production site collections as part of the project scope. Court IT will administer the environments post-go-live, with knowledge transfer and documentation provided by the vendor before project close.
118	Are deployment pipelines/ALM required for SPFx, Power Platform, SharePoint configuration, and content?	Deployment pipelines and application lifecycle management (ALM) for SPFx and Power Platform components are recommended and should be proposed by the vendor. The Court expects a structured deployment process from Dev through QA to Production. Vendors should propose an ALM approach as part of their technical solution.
119	The RFP states that no third-party integrations are required beyond the Microsoft stack. Please confirm the complete list of Microsoft 365 services that must be integrated.	Integration requirements are limited to the Microsoft 365 stack. Required integrations include SharePoint Online, Active Directory and Microsoft Entra ID for authentication and the employee directory, and Microsoft Search for enhanced search capabilities. Optional integrations include Microsoft Teams, Microsoft Copilot, and Power Platform components. No integrations outside the Microsoft stack are required.
120	Is Microsoft 365 Copilot already licensed for the intended users?	The Court holds some Microsoft 365 Copilot licenses; however, they are not currently active or in use. The number of licensed users is limited. Copilot integration is optional and must be priced as a separate line item. Vendors should not assume broad Copilot availability across all 600 users for the base scope.
121	How many users should be included in any Copilot-related pilot?	The number of users to be included in a Copilot-related pilot has not been defined. This will be determined post-award based on available licensing and stakeholder interest. Vendors should propose a recommended pilot size and approach as part of their optional AI readiness scope.
122	Is actual Copilot integration required in Phase 1, or only architecture/readiness?	Actual Copilot integration is not required in Phase 1. The base scope for AI readiness focuses on architecture, permissions hygiene, metadata structure, and content governance that positions the intranet for Copilot enablement in the future. Full Copilot

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

		integration should be priced as a separate optional line item.
123	Is an intranet-specific SharePoint Agent or chatbot required?	An intranet-specific SharePoint Agent or chatbot is not required as part of the base scope. It is optional and of interest to the Court for future phases. Vendors may propose it as an optional line item with associated professional services costs.
124	What use cases should the chatbot support—search, Q&A, summarization, navigation, document discovery, etc.?	If proposed as an optional feature, the chatbot should be scoped to intranet-specific use cases, including content search, policy Q&A, document discovery, and navigation assistance. The chatbot should not be designed to answer general Court business questions outside of intranet content. Specific use cases will be refined post-award if the option is selected.
125	Is Copilot Studio expected to be used?	Copilot Studio is not currently licensed in the Court's tenant and is not required as part of the base scope. Vendors may propose Copilot Studio as an optional line item with professional services costs only, noting that the Court would need to acquire licensing separately if selected.
126	What AI governance, security, privacy, prompt/data protection, and approval requirements must be implemented?	No formal AI governance policy is currently in place. The vendor is expected to recommend and implement AI governance guardrails as part of the optional AI readiness scope. This should include permissions hygiene to ensure Copilot surfaces only content appropriate to each user's access level, data protection standards consistent with M365 G5 security capabilities, and a content governance framework that supports responsible AI use. Specific requirements will be refined during Discovery.
127	Are there Court-specific restrictions on using generative AI with Court data?	No formal Court-specific restrictions on generative AI use with Court data are currently in place. The vendor should propose appropriate guardrails and governance standards as part of the AI readiness scope, consistent with Microsoft's responsible AI framework and the Court's existing security policies.
128	Does the Court require documentation of any GenAI used by the vendor? The RFP contains specific GenAI disclosure and responsible-use requirements.	Yes. Documentation of any generative AI tools used by the vendor during the engagement is required. Vendors must disclose their use of generative AI in accordance with the responsible-use requirements set forth in the RFP.
129	Should the vendor perform the production deployment or	The vendor is expected to perform the production deployment. Court IT will be involved and kept

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	provide deployment instructions for Court IT?	informed throughout the deployment process. The vendor should also provide deployment documentation and instructions as part of the knowledge transfer deliverables so Court IT can manage future deployments independently.
130	Is a single enterprise-wide launch expected after the pilot, or will deployment occur in multiple waves?	A single enterprise-wide launch following a successful pilot is the preferred approach. The pilot will validate the solution with a representative group before the full rollout. The vendor may propose a multi-wave rollout if justified by the phasing plan, but the Court's preference is to minimize the time between pilot and enterprise launch.
131	If phased, how many deployment waves should be assumed?	The Court's preference is for a pilot followed by a single enterprise-wide launch. If the vendor believes a multi-wave deployment is preferable based on their proposed approach, they should clearly justify it in their proposal. The number of waves is not prescribed.
132	What blackout/change-free periods must be considered?	No known blackout or change-free periods currently exist that would constrain delivery. The Court will communicate any scheduling constraints that arise during the engagement.
133	The RFP identifies approximately 12 administrators and site owners for train-the-trainer training. Please confirm the exact number.	The Court anticipates approximately 12 administrators and site owners for the initial training cohort. This number may be refined during Discovery. Vendors should use 12 as their planning assumption for proposal purposes.
134	How many training sessions are expected?	The number of training sessions has not been defined. Vendors should propose a training plan that covers administrators, site owners, and the train-the-trainer approach for broader user adoption. The training plan should include a recommended number of sessions and estimated duration for each audience.
135	Which audiences require training—administrators, site owners, content authors, end users, governance staff, or IT support?	Training is required for administrators and site owners via remote live train-the-trainer sessions. Content authors will be trained through the train-the-trainer model by the trained site owners. End-user training for the broader ~600-user population is expected to be delivered through self-service documentation and recorded modules — not direct vendor-led sessions. IT support staff should receive knowledge transfer as part of the project close deliverables.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

136	How many training materials/manuals/videos are expected?	The specific number of training materials, manuals, and videos has not been defined. Vendors should propose a training materials package that covers all required audiences and use cases. The Court expects a combination of live training, recorded modules, and written user guides as deliverables.
137	What activities will be performed by Court IT versus the vendor?	The vendor will lead design, development, configuration, deployment, and training. Court IT will be responsible for tenant administration, environment access provisioning, security policy approval, and DNS/URL configuration, with vendor guidance and support. Content preparation, cleanup, and migration is a shared responsibility. Post-go-live, Court IT will manage the intranet, search schema, and ongoing governance with the support of the knowledge transfer deliverables provided by the vendor.
138	Who is responsible for tenant administration, permissions, security policies, environment creation, DNS/URLs, and Microsoft 365 configuration?	Court IT is responsible for tenant administration, DNS/URL configuration, and Microsoft 365 platform-level configuration. The vendor is expected to assist with SharePoint site collection setup, permissions configuration, security policy implementation, and environment provisioning as part of the project scope, with Court IT retaining administrative ownership.
139	Who is responsible for content preparation and migration?	Content preparation — including identification, cleanup, and organization of content to be migrated — is the responsibility of Court IT and content owners. The vendor is responsible for providing the framework, guidance, and tools recommendations to support this process. The actual placement of content into the new SharePoint environment is a collaborative effort between the vendor and Court staff.
140	What Court resources will be assigned to the project and at what approximate percentage of availability?	The Court will assign a core stakeholder group of approximately 10 people for requirements validation and UAT. The project manager will be the IT Application Manager and the executive sponsor is the CIO. Specific resource availability percentages will be confirmed at project kickoff. Vendors should plan for reasonable stakeholder availability for discovery sessions, design reviews, and UAT activities.
141	The RFP requires optional pricing for 30–60 days of hypercare and ongoing managed services. Please	The Court has not defined a specific hypercare duration requirement. Vendors should propose their recommended hypercare duration as part of their optional post-go-live support line items. A range of 30–90 days is suggested as a planning baseline. The

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	confirm the desired hypercare duration.	Court will evaluate and select the appropriate tier post-award.
142	How many support hours/tickets should be assumed during hypercare?	The Court has not defined a specific number of support hours or tickets for the hypercare period. Vendors should propose tiered hypercare options with estimated hours or ticket volumes included in each tier. The Court estimates approximately 10–20 hours per month for ongoing managed services post-hypercare, which may serve as a general reference for hypercare sizing.
143	What SLA response and resolution times are expected?	The Court does not have prescribed SLA response and resolution targets. Vendors should propose SLA tiers for P1 through P4 issues based on their experience with similar engagements. The Court will evaluate and select appropriate tiers post-award.
144	What support hours/time zone should be covered?	Business-hours support aligned with Pacific Time is expected as the baseline. The Court does not require 24/7 support coverage. Vendors may propose extended coverage as an optional tier.
145	What types of post-go-live enhancements should be included versus treated as change requests?	Post-go-live enhancements will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Minor bug fixes and configuration adjustments during hypercare should generally be included. New functionality, additional web parts, or scope expansions discovered after go-live should be treated as change requests subject to the vendor-defined change control process. Vendors should define the boundary between included fixes and billable change requests in their proposal.
146	Please confirm that all Microsoft 365, SharePoint, Power Platform, Copilot, Purview, and other Microsoft licensing required for the proposed solution will be provided by the Court.	Confirmed. All Microsoft 365 licensing required for the proposed solution will be provided by the Court under its existing M365 G5 entitlement. Vendors must not include Microsoft licensing costs in their base proposal. If a proposed feature requires a license not included in M365 G5, it must be identified as a Court-owned licensing dependency and presented as an optional item separate from the vendor's cost proposal.
147	If a proposed solution requires a Microsoft license that is not included in the Court's existing G5 entitlement, should it be excluded from the solution or presented as a customer-owned dependency?	If a proposed solution requires a Microsoft license not included in the Court's M365 G5 entitlement, it should be presented as a customer-owned licensing dependency and clearly identified in the proposal. The associated professional services or configuration costs may be included as an optional line item, but the licensing cost itself must not be included in the vendor's cost proposal.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

148	Which provisions of Attachment 2 (Court Standard Terms and Conditions) constitute 'Minimum Terms'?	As stated in RFP 81326C – Intranet Modernization Using M365 G5/SharePoint Online, any exception to a Minimum Term will render a proposal non-responsive. Therefore, while you may submit a proposal, any proposal that includes an exception to the Minimum Term (refer to Attachment 2 of the RFP) will be deemed nonresponsive.
149	Can the Court provide the estimated contract value or budget range for this solicitation?	The Court has an established budget but will not be disclosing it publicly. Vendors are expected to submit their best and final offer based on the scope described in the RFP. Budget will be discussed during contract negotiation with the selected vendor.
150	Are Attachment 7 (Iran Contracting Act) and Attachment 8 (Unruh/FEHA) required for this solicitation, given its estimated value?	Yes required for the estimated value.
151	Attachments 9 (Bidder Declaration) and 10 (DVBE Declaration) are referenced in Section 15 but are not included in the RFP package. Can the Court confirm the correct current forms?	Please use the hyperlink attached in section 15 http://www.scsccourt.org/general_info/vendors/dvbe.shtml
152	RFP Section 4.7 states that offshore resources are acceptable, while Attachment 2 Section 12.12 states that Work may not be performed outside the United States without the Court's prior written approval. Which governs, and will the Court grant advance approval for offshore delivery?	Section 4.7 of the RFP governs for purposes of this solicitation. Offshore resources are acceptable. The Court confirms that offshore delivery is permitted, subject to compliance with the Court's remote access policies and security requirements. Vendors who intend to use offshore resources must disclose this in their proposal. Submission of a proposal including offshore resources will be treated as the Court's advance approval for that delivery model, provided the vendor complies with all applicable security and access requirements.
153	At which WCAG 2.1 conformance level must the solution conform - A, AA or AAA?	The solution must conform to WCAG 2.1 Level AA. This is the minimum required accessibility standard. Given the government context, alignment with Section 508 is also expected. WCAG 2.1 Level AAA conformance is not required but may be proposed as a value-add.
154	Section 12 refers to the public cost opening occurring 'at the date and time noted in Section	Cost opening is scheduled for 10/28/2026

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	3.0', but the timeline appears in Section 5. Please confirm the opening is 10/28/2026.	
155	The page footer reads 'Page 1 of 32' on the cover page and 'Page X of 53' thereafter. Please confirm the RFP is complete at 53 pages and that no attachment is missing.	That is an oversight. All Pages are included.
156	Section 2.4.4 invites proposals leveraging Copilot Studio, but the Court stated at the pre-proposal conference that it does not use Copilot Studio. Is Copilot Studio licensed and available in the tenant?	Copilot Studio is not currently licensed or available in the Court's tenant. The reference to Copilot Studio in Section 2.4.4 reflects the Court's interest in exploring it as a future optional capability. Vendors may propose Copilot Studio as an optional line item with professional services costs only. Any Copilot Studio licensing required would need to be acquired separately by the Court and should not be included in the vendor's cost proposal.
157	Is premium Power Automate licensing (premium connectors) available in the tenant, or should solutions be constrained to the seeded Power Automate capabilities included in M365 G5?	Solutions in the base scope should be constrained to the seeded Power Automate capabilities included in the Court's M365 G5 entitlement. If a proposed solution requires premium Power Automate connectors or licensing, this should be identified as a Court-owned licensing dependency and presented as an optional line item. The Court is open to expanding Power Automate licensing if justified by the proposed solution.
158	Attachment 2 Section 7.1.5 requires Commercial Crime insurance with a minimum liability limit stated as '\$.' - the figure is blank. Please specify the required limit, or confirm the coverage is not applicable to this engagement.	The minimum liability limit for the Commercial Crime Insurance is one million dollars (\$1,000,000).
159	Is implementation of Microsoft Purview for data classification and retention required within Phase 1, or is a near-term roadmap placement acceptable?	Microsoft Purview implementation is ideally included in Phase 1. However, the Court recognizes that full implementation may need to be phased based on Discovery findings and the complexity of the retention taxonomy. Vendors may propose a foundational Phase 1 Purview implementation — covering initial classification and sensitivity labeling — with more advanced retention policies delivered as a near-term follow-on within the contract period. A roadmap-only

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

		approach without any implementation in Phase 1 is not acceptable
160	Can the Court identify the approximately 6 key stakeholder departments and confirm the number and names of the divisional/department sites in scope?	A formal list of the six key stakeholder departments and the divisional/department sites in scope is not available for distribution at this time. The Court anticipates sites across three major branches and four divisions, including subgroups such as HR, Facilities, and Payroll. The complete list of departments and site names will be developed during the Discovery phase. Vendors should include stakeholder identification and site inventory as Discovery deliverables.
161	Does the Court have an existing brand guideline, style guide or design system the intranet must conform to?	No. The Court does not have an existing brand guideline, style guide, or design system for the intranet. Vendors are expected to propose a design approach. The Court requires WCAG 2.1 Level AA accessibility compliance as the baseline design standard.
162	Should hypercare support be priced within the base scope or exclusively as an optional line item?	Hypercare support must be priced exclusively as an optional line item, separate from the base implementation cost. It should not be bundled into the fixed-price base proposal.
163	For the October interviews, will demonstrations be conducted in the Proposer's own environment, and will they be virtual or in person?	Interviews and demonstrations will be conducted virtually. Demonstrations should be presented in the Proposer's own environment.
164	Are there page limits, formatting requirements or file format requirements for the non-cost proposal?	No. There are no page limits, formatting requirements, or specific file format requirements for the non-cost technical proposal.
165	For automated site provisioning 'where feasible' (2.2.4), will Court IT operate the provisioning solution post-go-live, and are PnP or Power Platform based approaches acceptable?	Yes. Court IT will operate the site provisioning solution post-go-live. The vendor is responsible for developing the provisioning solution, providing full documentation, and conducting knowledge transfer to Court IT before project close. PnP and Power Platform-based approaches are both acceptable.
166	Does the Court have a required SLA tier structure, or will vendor-recommended tiers be accepted as proposed?	The Court does not have a prescribed SLA tier structure. Vendor-recommended SLA tiers will be accepted as proposed. Vendors should propose P1 through P4 response and resolution targets based on their experience with similar government engagements.
167	The timeline shows a contract start of 12/1/2026 and end of 11/30/2029, while the	Vendors should build their work plans against the October 1, 2026 kickoff target, with a Phase 1 pilot goal of January 1, 2027. The formal contract period begins

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	conference described an October 1 kickoff with Phase 1 by January 1. Which schedule should proposals be built against?	December 1, 2026 and runs through November 30, 2029. Work performed between October 1 and December 1 would be covered under the contract once executed. The January 1 pilot target is a goal, not a hard deadline. Post-go-live support and optional managed services would be available through the contract end date of November 30, 2029.
168	Attachment 3 requests a PWCR # (Public Works Contractor Registration). Is this applicable to an IT services solicitation, and if not, how should the field be completed?	No PWCR is required
169	Will the Court confirm that written answers to all Proposer questions will be issued on or before the posted date of 9/17/2026, and if the answers are delayed, will the proposal due date of 9/30/2026 be extended by a corresponding number of days?	If its delayed we will extend the proposal due date.
170	Is there a maximum email attachment size that the Court can receive, and are ZIP files acceptable if file sizes exceed email limits?	The standard Microsoft Outlook attachment size limit of 25 MB applies. ZIP files are not acceptable. If a proposal submission exceeds the 25 MB limit, vendors should contact Procurement for alternative submission instructions.
171	Is there a maximum page limit for the technical proposal, excluding resumes, certifications, and attachments?	No. There is no maximum page limit for the technical proposal.
172	Will the Court acknowledge receipt of proposal submissions via email	Yes
173	Is there a prescribed format/template for the cost proposal?	No. The Court does not have a prescribed cost proposal template. Vendors may submit their own cost schedule format, provided it presents the required fixed-price, turnkey not-to-exceed amount by phase and deliverable, and separately identifies optional AI readiness and post-go-live support line items.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

174	The RFP identifies a contract term of December 1, 2026 through November 30, 2029, but states that implementation should be delivered as soon as possible and that the implementation timeline is flexible. Please confirm whether the Court expects the core intranet	Yes. The Court expects the core intranet implementation — including pilot and enterprise-wide go-live — to be completed well before the contract end date of November 30, 2029. The target for Phase 1 pilot go-live is January 1, 2027. The remaining contract period through November 2029 is intended to cover optional post-go-live support, managed services, and any agreed-upon enhancements. Vendors should clearly distinguish implementation milestones from ongoing support in their work plans.
175	Does the Court have a target date or desired timeframe for the pilot launch and enterprise-wide production rollout?	The Court is targeting a pilot launch by January 1, 2027, following a project kickoff around October 1, 2026. Enterprise-wide rollout is expected to follow the successful pilot as quickly as possible. Both dates are targets and not hard deadlines. The implementation timeline is flexible and will be refined during Discovery.
176	The RFP estimates "a couple dozen" divisional/department sites. Can the Court provide the expected number of sites for the initial implementation and identify which sites are expected to be included in the first release	The Court has not finalized the exact number of sites for initial implementation. The estimate of a couple dozen reflects the anticipated total. The specific sites to be included in Phase 1 versus subsequent phases will be identified during the Discovery phase. Vendors should propose a flexible phased approach and not fix their scope to a specific number.
177	Are all anticipated department sites expected to have the same standard structure, or are significant department-specific customizations expected	All department sites are expected to follow the same standard structure, layout, and design framework. Significant department-specific customizations are not anticipated. Content, permissions, and metadata will vary by department, but the underlying site template, web parts, and navigation structure should be consistent across all sites.
178	Can the Court provide an estimate of the volume of content expected to be reviewed and/or migrated, such as number of documents, pages, files, and approximate storage size	The current IIS-hosted intranet contains approximately 17 GB of content. A formal count of documents, pages, or files is not available. The volume of content to be reviewed and selectively migrated will be determined during the Discovery phase, led by Court IT. Vendors should not assume full migration of the 17 GB.
179	What percentage or approximate number of existing intranet documents/pages does the Court anticipate migrating to SharePoint Online	The Court has not defined a target percentage or number of documents or pages to be migrated. Only approved, active content will be selectively migrated. The specific volume will be determined during Discovery. Vendors should account for a collaborative,

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

		selective migration process in their project plan without assuming a fixed migration volume.
180	Are there any existing document repositories or systems outside the current IIS intranet whose content should be considered for the new SharePoint intranet	No additional document repositories or systems outside the current IIS-hosted intranet are in scope for this engagement. The Court has a future roadmap to migrate on-premises network shares to SharePoint, but this is a separate initiative and not part of the current project scope.
181	Should the vendor assume that all custom SPFx components identified during discovery are included in the fixed-price implementation, or will functionality beyond the initial approved requirements be handled through change control?	Vendors should include a reasonable estimate of custom SPFx development in their fixed-price proposal based on the RFP scope and their discovery assumptions. Functionality identified during Discovery that falls within the reasonable interpretation of the RFP scope should be included. Requirements that represent a material expansion of scope beyond what was approved at the start of the project should be handled through the vendor-defined change control process.
182	How many search verticals or distinct search experiences does the Court anticipate, such as All, People, Documents, Policies, Forms, and Departments?	The specific number of search verticals has not been defined. At minimum, the Court expects verticals for People, Documents, and general intranet content. The full list of search verticals and distinct search experiences will be determined during Discovery. Vendors should propose a search architecture and include an estimated number of verticals based on their experience.
183	Does the Court have an existing metadata taxonomy or search schema that should be retained, or should the vendor develop the taxonomy and managed-property strategy from the ground up	No existing metadata taxonomy or search schema is in place. The vendor is expected to develop the complete taxonomy and managed-property strategy from the ground up during Discovery, in collaboration with Court IT and content owners.
184	Can the Court provide details of its current Microsoft Entra ID, Conditional Access, RBAC, sensitivity label, and Microsoft Purview configurations that the new intranet must integrate with	A detailed description of the Court's current Entra ID, Conditional Access, RBAC, sensitivity label, and Purview configurations is not available for distribution prior to award. The selected vendor will be provided appropriate administrative access post-award to conduct a full assessment during Discovery. Vendors should treat this assessment as a Discovery phase deliverable.
185	For Microsoft Purview, should the vendor implement existing Court policies only, or should	The scope should include the full development and recommendation of classification and retention policies. No existing Purview policies are currently in place. The

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	the scope include development/recommendation of classification and retention policies?	vendor is expected to design, recommend, and implement Purview configuration from the ground up in collaboration with Court IT.
186	How many administrator, site-owner, content-author, and governance roles are expected to be established initially?	The specific number of administrator, site-owner, content-author, and governance roles has not been formally defined. The Court anticipates approximately 12 administrators and site owners for initial training. The complete role structure will be defined during Discovery. Vendors should include role definition and RBAC design as part of their governance deliverables.
187	Are the Dev, QA, and Production environments already established, or is the vendor expected to configure the required SharePoint site collections and deployment structure	The Dev, QA, and Production environments have not yet been established. The vendor is expected to provision and configure all three site collections within the Court's existing M365 G5 tenant as part of the project scope.
188	For the optional AI readiness line item, does the Court expect an assessment/roadmap only, or actual implementation of Copilot, SharePoint Agents, Copilot Studio, or AI Builder capabilities	The optional AI readiness line item should include both an assessment and roadmap and, where feasible within the Court's existing M365 G5 licensing, initial implementation of Copilot-ready architecture — including permissions hygiene, metadata structure, and content governance. Full implementation of Copilot, SharePoint Agents, Copilot Studio, or AI Builder should be priced as additional optional line items. A roadmap-only deliverable without any architecture implementation is not preferred.
189	Can the Court confirm that the approximately 12 administrators/site owners represent the full initial training audience for administrator/site-owner training?	Yes. The approximately 12 administrators and site owners represent the full initial training audience for administrator and site-owner training. This number may be refined during Discovery. End-user training for the broader ~600-user population will be delivered through the train-the-trainer model, not through direct vendor-led sessions.
190	Is end-user training for approximately 600 users expected as part of the base scope, or is self-service documentation/train-the-trainer the expected approach	The train-the-trainer approach is the expected method for end-user training. The vendor is not expected to deliver direct training sessions to all 600 users. The vendor should train the approximately 12 administrators and site owners, who will then train end users within their respective departments. Self-service documentation and recorded training modules are also expected as deliverables to support end-user adoption.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

191	For optional managed services, what level of monthly support capacity does the Court anticipate, such as hours/month or number of enhancement requests?	The Court anticipates approximately 10–20 hours per month for optional ongoing managed services post-go-live, covering troubleshooting and minor enhancements. Vendors should propose tiered options with fixed monthly rates. The Court will select the appropriate tier post-award based on need.
192	Does the Court have preferred SLA response/resolution targets for P1, P2, P3, and P4 issues, or should the vendor recommend the SLA tiers	The Court does not have preferred SLA targets. Vendors should recommend SLA tiers for P1 through P4 issues based on their experience with similar government engagements. The Court will evaluate and select appropriate tiers post-award.
193	Please confirm whether offshore resources may directly perform project work using Court systems and data, subject to Court remote-access and security policies.	Yes. Offshore resources may directly perform project work using Court systems and data, provided they comply with the Court's remote access policies and security requirements. The awarded vendor is fully responsible for vetting all resources — including offshore personnel — and ensuring compliance with applicable Court policies.
194	Which departments will be included in Phase 1 versus future phases?	The specific departments to be included in Phase 1 versus future phases have not been determined. This will be established during the Discovery phase in collaboration with Court IT and stakeholders. Vendors should propose a phased approach and include department prioritization as a Discovery deliverable.
195	What are the top 10 business processes employees struggle to complete using the current intranet?	The Court has not formally documented the top business process pain points of the current intranet. The primary known challenges are outdated technology, limited searchability, and difficulty locating and accessing documents. A detailed understanding of employee pain points will be gathered during the Discovery phase through stakeholder sessions with the six key departments.
196	Which content categories are most frequently accessed by employees?	The Court does not have usage analytics or access data for the current IIS-hosted intranet. The most commonly accessed content categories are expected to include HR-related documents, operational and financial business process documents, employee resources, and Judicial Officer pages. Specific access patterns will be identified during Discovery.
197	Are there specific employee personas (judicial officers, HR, Finance, IT, Operations, etc.) that require personalized experiences?	Personalized experiences are not required. The intranet will use a consistent experience for all users. However, role-based access control will ensure that sensitive content — such as HR or payroll repositories — is restricted to authorized users. Specific user

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

		personas will be identified during Discovery to inform navigation and content structure.
198	What are the success criteria that will determine whether the project is considered successful 6 and 12 months after go-live?	Formal success criteria have not been defined at this time. The Court expects to measure user satisfaction through surveys and adoption metrics. Vendors should propose a success measurement framework — including suggested KPIs for adoption, search effectiveness, and user satisfaction — as part of their proposal.
199	What percentage improvement in user satisfaction does the Court expect?	The Court has not defined a specific user satisfaction improvement target. No baseline metrics currently exist for the legacy intranet. Vendors should propose a baseline measurement approach and recommended satisfaction targets as part of their adoption and success measurement framework.
200	Are there specific employee journeys that should be prioritized (finding policies, submitting forms, locating staff, accessing procedures, onboarding)?	The Court's primary priorities are document management, searchability, and a user-friendly interface. Key employee journeys expected to be prioritized include finding policies and procedures, locating staff via the employee directory, and accessing department-specific resources. Additional priority journeys will be identified during Discovery stakeholder sessions.
201	Can the Court provide an estimated list of the 12 departmental sites expected under the hub architecture?	A formal list of departmental sites is not available at this time. The Court anticipates a couple dozen divisional and department sites, not a fixed number of 12. The complete list of sites will be developed during the Discovery phase in collaboration with Court IT and stakeholders. Vendors should include site identification and inventory as a Discovery deliverable.
202	Will content ownership be assigned at the department level or centrally managed?	Content ownership will be assigned at the department level. Each department site will have designated site owners responsible for managing and maintaining their content. Central IT will oversee governance and platform administration.
203	Should navigation be audience-targeted based on department, role, or location?	Audience-targeted navigation based on department, role, or location is not required. The Court expects a consistent navigation experience for all users. Role-based access control will govern what content users can access, but navigation itself will not be personalized.
204	Are there business-critical documents that should always	Yes. The Court expects the ability to promote or pin business-critical content so it is consistently surfaced in search results regardless of standard ranking

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	be surfaced regardless of search ranking?	algorithms. This should be addressed as part of the enhanced search configuration, using promoted results and featured content capabilities within SharePoint Online.
205	Is there a requirement for policy acknowledgment and policy expiry tracking?	Policy acknowledgment and policy expiry tracking are not required as part of the base scope. Vendors may propose these as optional features if they believe they would add value to the solution.
206	What are the most common searches employees perform today?	The Court does not have search analytics or usage data from the current IIS-hosted intranet. Common search needs are expected to include HR policies and procedures, employee directory lookups, operational documents, and department-specific resources. Specific search patterns will be identified during Discovery stakeholder sessions.
207	Are there high-priority content types that require dedicated search verticals?	The specific content types requiring dedicated search verticals have not been defined. At minimum, the Court expects dedicated verticals for People and Documents. Additional verticals — such as Policies, Forms, or Departments — will be identified and defined during the Discovery phase. Vendors should propose a search vertical architecture as part of their solution.
208	Should search results prioritize authoritative content over popularity?	Yes. Search results should prioritize authoritative and official content over popularity-based ranking. The Court expects promoted results and featured content capabilities to be configured to ensure that official policies, procedures, and key documents are surfaced prominently.
209	Do users require faceted navigation and dynamic filtering?	Yes. Faceted navigation and dynamic filtering are expected as part of the enhanced search experience. Users should be able to filter search results by relevant metadata attributes such as content type, department, and date.
210	Are there requirements for synonym libraries, acronyms, or court-specific terminology?	Yes. The Court expects the search configuration to support synonym libraries and court-specific terminology to improve search relevance. The specific terms and synonyms will be identified during Discovery. Vendors should include synonym library design and configuration as part of their enhanced search scope.
211	Is Microsoft 365 Copilot currently licensed for any users?	Yes. The Court holds some Microsoft 365 Copilot licenses; however, they are not currently active or in use. The number of licensed users is limited. Copilot

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

		integration is optional and must be priced as a separate line item.
212	How many users are anticipated to leverage Copilot capabilities?	The number of users anticipated to leverage Copilot capabilities has not been defined. This will be determined post-award based on available licensing and stakeholder interest. Vendors should propose a recommended approach and pilot size as part of their optional AI readiness scope.
213	Should the intranet be designed as a Copilot-ready knowledge platform?	Yes. Even though full Copilot integration is optional, the intranet architecture should be designed as a Copilot-ready knowledge platform. This includes implementing proper permissions hygiene, metadata structures, content governance, and information architecture that positions the Court to enable Copilot in the future with minimal rework.
214	Does the Court want Copilot grounded only on intranet content or broader M365 content?	The Court's preference is for Copilot to be grounded on intranet content specifically, ensuring that AI-generated responses are scoped to relevant internal resources and respect each user's access level. Broader M365 content grounding may be considered in future phases.
215	Are there specific AI use cases desired such as: • Policy Q&A • Employee self-service • Document summarization • Knowledge discovery • HR FAQs	Yes. The Court is interested in the following AI use cases as optional capabilities: policy Q&A, document summarization, and knowledge discovery. Employee self-service and HR FAQs are also of interest. Vendors should propose their recommended approach for each use case as part of the optional AI readiness scope, with each use case priced as a separate optional line item where applicable.
216	Should AI-generated answers include source citations?	Yes. AI-generated answers should include source citations where feasible, so users can verify the source of the information and navigate directly to the authoritative document.
217	Does the Court require a formal governance charter as a deliverable?	Yes. A formal governance charter is expected as a project deliverable. The charter should document site ownership roles, content management responsibilities, provisioning processes, naming conventions, lifecycle management policies, and escalation paths. The vendor should develop the charter in collaboration with Court IT for review and approval.
218	Should governance committees meet monthly, quarterly, or annually?	The governance committee cadence has not been defined. Vendors should propose a recommended meeting frequency as part of the governance framework deliverable. The Court will review and approve the proposed cadence during Discovery.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

219	Are governance KPIs expected?	Yes. Governance KPIs are expected as part of the governance framework. Vendors should propose relevant KPIs — such as site provisioning compliance, content freshness, user adoption rates, and permission audit results — as part of their governance deliverables.
220	Should privileged access reviews be implemented?	Yes. Privileged access reviews are recommended and should be included as part of the governance and security framework. The vendor should propose an approach for periodic privileged access reviews consistent with Microsoft 365 best practices.
221	Is Entra PIM (Privileged Identity Management) in scope?	Entra Privileged Identity Management (PIM) is not required as part of the base scope. Vendors may propose it as an optional feature if they believe it would benefit the Court's security posture. If proposed, it should be priced as a separate optional line item.
222	Should site owner certifications be performed periodically?	Yes. Periodic site owner certifications are recommended as part of the governance framework. Vendors should propose a certification cadence and process as part of their governance deliverables.
223	Is there a requirement for annual governance audits?	Annual governance audits are recommended but not formally required at this time. Vendors should propose an audit approach as part of the governance framework. The Court will evaluate and confirm the audit cadence during Discovery.
224	Should the solution include lifecycle management for inactive sites?	Yes. Lifecycle management for inactive sites is required as part of the governance framework. The solution should include processes for identifying, archiving, and decommissioning inactive sites. The specific lifecycle workflow and thresholds will be defined during Discovery.
225	Should retention schedules be established as part of this engagement?	Yes. Developing retention schedules is expected as part of this engagement, as part of the Purview and governance workstream. The vendor is expected to work with Court IT to define and implement appropriate retention schedules for intranet content.
226	Are records management requirements anticipated in future phases?	Yes. The Court anticipates records management requirements in future phases, including a planned migration of on-premises network shares to SharePoint Online. The intranet framework and governance model developed in this engagement should be designed with future records management needs in mind.
227	Should content classification be automated where possible?	Yes. Where feasible within the Court's M365 G5 licensing, content classification should be automated

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

		using Microsoft Purview capabilities such as auto-labeling and trainable classifiers. The scope of automation will be determined during Discovery based on content types and classification requirements.
228	Should compliance align with: - WCAG 2.1 AA - WCAG 2.2 AA - Section 508	The solution must align with WCAG 2.1 Level AA as the primary accessibility standard. Given the government context, Section 508 compliance is also expected. WCAG 2.2 Level AA is not required but may be proposed as a value-add.
229	Is independent accessibility testing expected?	Yes. Independent accessibility testing by the vendor is expected as part of the quality assurance process prior to go-live. Vendors should include an accessibility testing plan and remediation process in their proposal.
230	Are accessibility remediation reports required?	Yes. Accessibility remediation reports are required as a deliverable. The vendor should document identified accessibility issues and their resolution as part of the QA and testing process.
231	Is accessibility validation required before UAT sign-off?	Yes. Accessibility validation must be completed and documented before UAT sign-off. The Court will not approve UAT completion until accessibility compliance has been confirmed.
232	Is a formal change management plan expected?	A formal change management plan is recommended. Vendors should include a change management approach in their proposal covering communications, stakeholder engagement, and user adoption strategies. The level of formality will be confirmed during Discovery.
233	Is executive communications support required?	Executive communications support is not required as part of the base scope. The Court's executive sponsor and project manager will handle internal communications. Vendors may propose communications support as an optional service if they believe it would benefit adoption.
234	Should departmental champions be identified and trained?	Yes. Departmental champions — in the form of trained site owners — should be identified and trained as part of the train-the-trainer approach. Each department is expected to have a designated site owner who serves as the champion for their area.
235	Are adoption targets expected?	Adoption targets have not been formally defined. Vendors should propose recommended adoption targets and a measurement framework as part of their adoption approach. The Court will review and confirm targets during Discovery.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

236	Should user adoption dashboards be included?	User adoption dashboards are recommended and should be proposed by the vendor. Native Microsoft 365 analytics capabilities should be leveraged where possible. The specific dashboard requirements will be defined during Discovery.
237	Are launch campaigns expected?	A formal launch campaign is not required. The Court will manage internal communications around the go-live. Vendors may propose launch communication support as an optional service.
238	Should feedback mechanisms be embedded within the intranet?	Yes. Embedded feedback mechanisms — such as feedback forms, ratings, or survey integrations — are encouraged as part of the intranet design. Vendors should propose an approach for collecting and acting on user feedback as part of their adoption strategy.
239	What are the expected service hours for post-go-live support?	Business-hours support aligned with Pacific Time is the expected baseline for post-go-live support. The Court does not require 24/7 coverage. Vendors may propose extended coverage tiers as optional items.
240	Are there severity classifications for incidents?	Yes. The Court expects a tiered severity classification system for incidents (e.g., P1 through P4). Vendors should define severity classifications and corresponding response and resolution SLA targets as part of their optional post-go-live support proposal.
241	What are the expected response and resolution SLAs?	The Court does not have prescribed response and resolution SLA targets. Vendors should propose SLA tiers for P1 through P4 incidents based on their experience with similar government engagements. The Court will review and select appropriate tiers post-award.
242	Who will approve production deployments?	Court IT will approve production deployments. The CIO serves as the escalation point for any deployment disputes or exceptions.
243	Does the Court require a CAB (Change Advisory Board) process?	A formal Change Advisory Board process is not required. However, the vendor is expected to define a structured change control process as part of their project management approach. Production deployments must be reviewed and approved by Court IT prior to execution.
244	What budget range has been allocated for the implementation?	The Court has an established budget but will not be disclosing it publicly. Vendors should submit their best and final offer based on the scope described in the RFP. Budget will be discussed during contract negotiation with the selected vendor.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

245	Can the Court provide an approximate budget range or funding level for the project, including implementation and optional support services?	The Court has an established budget but will not be disclosing it publicly. This applies to both the base implementation and optional support services. Vendors are expected to submit their best and final offer based on the full scope described in the RFP and the pre-proposal conference.
246	Approximately how many divisional and departmental sites need to be configured initially, and which sites will participate in the pilot?	The Court anticipates a couple dozen divisional and departmental sites in total. The specific sites to be included in Phase 1 and those designated for the pilot will be determined during the Discovery phase. The pilot is expected to include one representative from each division or business owner group. Vendors should propose a flexible phased approach and not assume a fixed site count.
247	Which Microsoft AI licenses are already owned by the Court, including Microsoft 365 Copilot, SharePoint Agents, Copilot Studio, and AI Builder? Please confirm that no additional AI licensing costs should be included.	The Court holds some Microsoft 365 Copilot licenses, which are not currently active. Copilot Studio and AI Builder are not currently licensed. SharePoint Agents availability is subject to the Court's existing M365 G5 entitlement. Confirmed — no additional Microsoft AI licensing costs should be included in the vendor's cost proposal. Optional AI line items should include professional services and configuration costs only.
248	What are the target dates for the pilot and enterprise rollout, and are there specific SLA requirements for hypercare, incident resolution, and enhancement requests?	The Court is targeting a pilot go-live by January 1, 2027, following a project kickoff around October 1, 2026. Enterprise-wide rollout is expected to follow the successful pilot as quickly as possible. SLA requirements for hypercare, incident resolution, and enhancement requests are not prescribed — vendors should propose tiered SLA structures as part of their optional post-go-live support line items.
249	Are offshore resources permitted for this engagement? If so, will prior written approval from the Court be required?	Yes. Offshore resources are permitted for this engagement. Prior written approval will not be required provided the vendor discloses their use of offshore resources in their proposal. Submission of a proposal including offshore resources will be treated as the Court's advance approval for that delivery model, subject to compliance with all Court remote access policies and security requirements.
250	Section 4.7 states that all work will be remote and that offshore resources are acceptable. However, the standard agreement later states that,	Section 4.7 of the RFP governs for purposes of this solicitation and supersedes the general language in the standard agreement on this point. Offshore resources are acceptable. Vendors who intend to use offshore resources must disclose this clearly in their proposal. Such disclosure in the proposal will constitute the

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	unless written approval is provided in advance, work may not be performed outside the United States. This needs to be clarified before any offshore delivery model is committed.	required advance approval. All offshore resources must comply with the Court's remote access policies and security requirements, and the awarded vendor remains fully responsible for vetting all personnel.
251	Could the Court provide an overview of the current IIS-hosted intranet architecture, including the technologies/frameworks used, major functional modules, and any existing custom functionality that must be replicated or replaced?	The current intranet is a custom web application hosted on an internal IIS server. It is not SharePoint-based. The system contains primarily static content: operational and financial business process documents, HR-related documents, employee resources, Judicial Officer pages, and reports. There are no custom .NET applications, InfoPath forms, workflows, or interactive tools currently in use. No existing functionality requires direct replication — the new intranet will be built as a modern SharePoint Online solution from the ground up.
252	Who is the incumbent vendor currently providing similar services?	There is no incumbent vendor. The Court's existing intranet and M365 environment are maintained entirely by internal Court IT personnel.
253	Is the incumbent vendor allowed to participate in this RFP?	There is no incumbent vendor. All qualified vendors are welcome to participate in this solicitation on equal terms.
254	What are the current limitations and challenges that you are facing?	The primary challenges with the current intranet are outdated technology, limited searchability, and a static design that is difficult to update and maintain. The system does not integrate with the Court's modern M365 environment and lacks the collaboration, document management, and communication features required to support the Court's current operational needs.
255	What platform or technology is the current intranet site built on?	The current intranet is a custom web application hosted on an internal IIS server. It is not built on SharePoint or any other modern content management platform.
256	Could the Court provide the current Microsoft 365 tenant configuration relevant to the project, including SharePoint Online, Teams, Entra ID, Purview, and Conditional Access configurations?	A detailed description of the current M365 tenant configuration is not available for distribution prior to award. The Court's M365 G5 tenant is configured with identity, licensing, and security policies. The selected vendor will be provided appropriate administrative access post-award to conduct a full tenant assessment during the Discovery phase.
257	Does the Court already have a preferred SharePoint information architecture,	The Court does not have a preferred SharePoint information architecture, hub/site structure, navigation model, or taxonomy. The vendor is expected to

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	hub/site structure, navigation model, and taxonomy, or is the vendor expected to develop these entirely during discovery?	develop all of these from the ground up during the Discovery phase, in collaboration with Court IT and key stakeholders.
258	Could the Court identify the specific functionality for which custom SPFx web parts are expected, versus functionality that can be delivered using native SharePoint/Microsoft 365 capabilities?	The specific functionality requiring custom SPFx web parts has not been predefined. This will be identified during Discovery based on stakeholder requirements and design decisions. The Court's expectation is a modern, dynamic intranet — not a basic out-of-the-box SharePoint site — and vendors should anticipate custom SPFx development where native capabilities are insufficient.
259	Could the Court confirm that integration requirements are limited to Microsoft technologies such as Entra ID, Teams, SharePoint, Microsoft 365, Power Platform and Purview?	Confirmed. Integration requirements for this engagement are limited to the Microsoft 365 stack, including SharePoint Online, Entra ID, Active Directory, Teams (optional), Power Platform (optional), and Purview. No third-party integrations are required.
260	Is the Court expecting a single enterprise intranet site with department/section pages, or a broader hub-and-spoke intranet architecture with multiple sites and delegated content ownership across business units?	The Court expects a hub-and-spoke intranet architecture, with a single enterprise hub site and associated divisional and department sites (estimated at a couple dozen), with delegated content ownership assigned at the department level.
261	Does the Court expect the employee directory and organizational chart to be delivered using native Microsoft 365 / Entra ID capabilities?	Yes. The employee directory and organizational chart should be delivered using native Microsoft 365 and Entra ID capabilities. Active Directory is the system of record for employee profile data.
262	Can the Court clarify whether the proposed intranet is expected to function as a standalone SharePoint Online-based internal portal, or whether it should also integrate with and/or connect to the Court's public-facing website or other external web properties?	The intranet is a standalone internal portal. No integration with the Court's public-facing website or any other external web properties is required or expected.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

263	Can the Court clarify whether the listed features (news, document management, employee directory, org chart, calendar, search, permissions) represent the full required scope, or should vendors anticipate additional modules to be identified during discovery?	Vendors should anticipate that additional modules and requirements may be identified during Discovery, beyond those listed in the RFP. The listed features represent the known base scope, not the complete final scope. Vendors should propose a Discovery process that includes thorough stakeholder engagement to surface and document all requirements.
264	Beyond Teams and potential Copilot integration, are there any other required integrations with Court systems (e.g., HR systems, document repositories, case-related resources, forms, calendars, or identity systems) that vendors should account for?	No. Beyond the Microsoft 365 stack, no additional integrations with Court systems are required. The intranet will not integrate with HR systems, case management systems, or any other external platforms as part of this engagement.
265	Should the solution include approval workflows, publishing workflows, or content lifecycle automation, and if so, are Microsoft Power Automate / Power Platform components acceptable?	Approval workflows and publishing workflows are not required as part of the base scope. They may be proposed as optional features using Power Automate or Power Platform components. Power Platform-based workflow solutions are acceptable where proposed.
266	Can the Court confirm the expected homepage widgets, personalization requirements, and whether audience targeting by role and or department is desired?	Required homepage widgets include at minimum news and announcements, quick links, calendar/events, and employee resources. The full widget list will be refined during Discovery. Audience targeting by role or department is not required. All users will see a consistent global homepage experience.
267	Should the optional AI roadmap include implementation of AI capabilities during Phase 1, or primarily architecture, governance and readiness for future implementation?	The optional AI roadmap should include both architecture and readiness as the foundation, with initial implementation of Copilot-ready structures — such as permissions hygiene, metadata design, and content governance — during Phase 1. Full AI feature implementation such as Copilot, SharePoint Agents, or Copilot Studio should be presented as additional optional line items beyond the AI readiness scope.
268	Could the Court clarify which AI readiness capabilities it considers highest priority for evaluation-Microsoft 365	The Court's highest priority AI readiness capabilities are Microsoft 365 Copilot integration for search and content discovery, and Copilot Search and Summarization. SharePoint Agents and an embedded

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	Copilot, Copilot Search/Summarization, SharePoint Agents, embedded chatbot, or Power Platform AI capabilities?	chatbot are of secondary interest. Power Platform AI capabilities are the lowest priority of those listed. All are optional and must be priced as separate line items.
269	For Microsoft Purview, should vendors assume implementation of classification, sensitivity labeling, and retention controls as part of the base Phase 1 scope, or should portions of Purview configuration be presented as a near-term roadmap item based on discovery findings?	Vendors should include foundational Purview implementation — covering initial classification and sensitivity labeling — as part of the base Phase 1 scope. More advanced retention controls and policy configurations may be presented as a phased near-term deliverable within the contract period, based on Discovery findings. A roadmap-only approach with no Phase 1 implementation is not acceptable.
270	Does the Court have existing governance committees, site-owner roles, content-owner responsibilities, records-retention policies, or site lifecycle processes that should be incorporated into the proposed governance model?	No. The Court does not have existing governance committees, formally defined site-owner roles, content-owner responsibilities, records-retention policies, or site lifecycle processes. All governance structures will be designed from the ground up by the vendor in collaboration with Court IT during the Discovery phase.
271	What departments, user groups, or approximate number of users should vendors assume will participate in the pilot, and what acceptance criteria will determine readiness for enterprise-wide rollout?	The pilot is expected to include one representative from each division or business owner group. The core stakeholder group of approximately 10 people will participate in UAT. Acceptance criteria for enterprise-wide rollout should include: successful user access with no permission issues, UAT sign-off from the business stakeholder group, accessibility validation, and IT approval of the production environment. Vendors should propose detailed acceptance criteria in their work plan.
272	Can the Court please confirm the Microsoft 365 and related licenses currently available for this project (e.g., SharePoint Online, Power Platform, Microsoft Purview, Teams, Copilot, etc.), and whether proposers should rely solely on Court-owned licenses or include any required additional	The Court operates on a full M365 G5 subscription, which includes SharePoint Online, Teams, Power Apps, Power BI, and some Copilot licenses (not currently active). Copilot Studio and AI Builder are not currently licensed. Confirmed — vendors must rely solely on Court-owned M365 G5 licensing. No additional Microsoft licensing costs should be included in any proposal. Optional features requiring licensing not included in M365 G5 should be identified as Court-owned dependencies.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	licensing costs in their pricing proposal?	
273	What is the approved budget or range allocated for this project?	The Court has an established budget but will not be disclosing it publicly. Vendors should submit their best and final offer based on the scope described in the RFP. Budget will be discussed during contract negotiation with the selected vendor.
274	Could the Court clarify the reason for reissuing this solicitation?	We needed to make some modifications to the scope of work.
275	Our company is already registered to do business in California; however, we have not yet completed the Public Works Contractor Registration (PWCR). Can the PWCR registration be completed after contract award? If so, may we enter "N/A" for the PWCR number in our proposal at this time?	No PWCR is required
276	Please confirm whether optional post-go-live support and optional AI/Copilot line items will be included in the 35-point cost evaluation and, if so, identify the assumed term, service tier, or quantities the Court will use to compare proposals.	Optional line items must be clearly marked as such in the cost proposal and will be evaluated separately from the base implementation cost. This ensures that proposals including optional items can be fairly compared against those that do not. The base fixed-price implementation cost will form the primary basis of the cost evaluation. Optional line items should be itemized and labeled distinctly so the Court can assess them independently.
277	For fixed-price planning, approximately how many documents, total data volume, departments, and legacy pages does the Court expect the selected vendor to inventory, validate, classify, or help migrate, and which migration activities will be performed directly by Court staff?	The current IIS-hosted intranet contains approximately 17 GB of content. Formal document, page, and file counts are not available. The Court does not require full migration — only approved, active content will be selectively migrated. Court IT and content owners will lead content identification, validation, and final placement decisions. The vendor is expected to provide the framework, guidance, and support for the migration process. Vendors should scope their fixed-price proposal accordingly and include reasonable assumptions in their proposal narrative.
278	Please describe the current maturity of the M365 G5 tenant—including the	A detailed description of the current tenant maturity is not available for distribution prior to award. The Court's M365 G5 tenant is configured with identity, licensing,

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	SharePoint app catalog, Purview, sensitivity labels, retention policies, Entra ID groups, conditional access, and search schema—and confirm the administrative roles and environment access that will be made available to the selected vendor.	and security policies, but specific configurations for the SharePoint app catalog, Purview, sensitivity labels, retention policies, and search schema are not formally documented at this time. The selected vendor will be provided appropriate administrative access post-award to conduct a full assessment during Discovery. The scope of access will be confirmed at project kickoff.
279	Please describe the current maturity of the M365 G5 tenant—including the SharePoint app catalog, Purview, sensitivity labels, retention policies, Entra ID groups, conditional access, and search schema—and confirm the administrative roles and environment access that will be made available to the selected vendor.	A detailed description of the current tenant maturity is not available for distribution prior to award. The Court's M365 G5 tenant is configured with identity, licensing, and security policies, but specific configurations for the SharePoint app catalog, Purview, sensitivity labels, retention policies, and search schema are not formally documented at this time. The selected vendor will be provided appropriate administrative access post-award to conduct a full assessment during Discovery. The scope of access will be confirmed at project kickoff.
280	Because implementation timing represents 20 evaluation points, what target dates should proposers assume for discovery completion, pilot launch, UAT, and enterprise rollout, and what objective acceptance criteria and Court review periods will apply to each major phase?	Vendors should build their work plans against a project kickoff of approximately October 1, 2026, with a pilot go-live target of January 1, 2027. Discovery completion, UAT, and enterprise rollout milestones should be proposed by the vendor based on their methodology and experience. The Court will review and confirm milestone dates and acceptance criteria during project kickoff. Vendors should clearly define proposed acceptance criteria and Court review periods for each major phase in their work plan as part of their proposal.
281	Please confirm whether a vendor may retain ownership of its pre-existing frameworks, templates, provisioning tools, and reusable SPFx components while granting the Court a perpetual license to use and maintain those materials within its tenant.	Confirmed. Vendors may retain ownership of their pre-existing intellectual property, including frameworks, templates, provisioning tools, and reusable SPFx components. The Court requires a perpetual, royalty-free license to use, maintain, and modify those materials within its tenant for the duration of its operations. Any custom work developed specifically for the Court as part of this engagement will be owned by the Court.
282	RFP requires a fixed-price, turnkey, not-to-exceed proposal with costs itemized	The Court has an established budget but will not be disclosing it publicly for either the base implementation or optional capabilities. Vendors are expected to

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	by phase/deliverable. To help Proposers appropriately size the proposed solution, resources, implementation approach, and optional capabilities, can the Court provide an anticipated budget range or funding range for the base implementation? If available, please also indicate whether the anticipated budget includes or excludes optional AI readiness capabilities and post-go-live support.	submit their best and final offer based on the full scope described in the RFP and the pre-proposal conference. Budget will be discussed during contract negotiation with the selected vendor.
283	While the RFP references training and support (Page 2), it does not distinguish between one-time post-go-live support and ongoing support . Please clarify whether ongoing intranet support and administration are expected to be included in the proposal pricing, or if one-time post-go-live support and ongoing support is optional and may be proposed separately.	Both one-time post-go-live support (hypercare) and ongoing managed services are optional and must be proposed separately from the base implementation cost as distinct line items. Neither is included in or required as part of the fixed-price base proposal. Vendors should provide tiered options for each.
284	Please confirm how many hours of support the Court is looking at for the Vendor to provide for the post-go-live support , and for how many days.	The Court has not defined a specific number of hours or days for post-go-live hypercare support. Vendors should propose their recommended hypercare tiers, including estimated hours and duration, as part of their optional post-go-live support line items. The Court estimates approximately 10–20 hours per month as a general reference for ongoing managed services.
285	Similarly, after post-go-live support is over, is the Court also looking for additional ongoing support till June 30, 2029. If yes, how many hours of support the Court is looking at each month.	Optional ongoing managed services are available through the contract end date of November 30, 2029. The Court anticipates approximately 10–20 hours per month for ongoing support covering troubleshooting and minor enhancements. Vendors should propose tiered monthly support packages with fixed rates for evaluation. The Court will select the appropriate tier post-award.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

286	The RFP states that “Any exception to a Minimum Term will render a proposal non-responsive.” Please identify the specific provisions within the Court’s Standard Terms and Conditions, Administrative Rules, and/or other solicitation documents that constitute “Minimum Terms” for purposes of this RFP.	As stated in RFP 81326C – Intranet Modernization Using M365 G5/SharePoint Online, any exception to a Minimum Term will render a proposal non-responsive. Therefore, while you may submit a proposal, any proposal that includes an exception to the Minimum Term (refer to Attachment 2 of the RFP) will be deemed nonresponsive.
287	Please also confirm whether exceptions to provisions that are not designated as Minimum Terms may be submitted for the Court’s consideration in accordance with Attachment 3.	As stated in RFP 81326C – Intranet Modernization Using M365 G5/SharePoint Online, any exception to a Minimum Term will render a proposal non-responsive. Therefore, while you may submit a proposal, any proposal that includes an exception to the Minimum Term (refer to Attachment 2 of the RFP) will be deemed nonresponsive.
288	Please clarify whether any proposed exception could result in a proposal being deemed non-responsive, or whether such exceptions may be evaluated and negotiated following selection.	As stated in RFP 81326C – Intranet Modernization Using M365 G5/SharePoint Online, any exception to a Minimum Term will render a proposal non-responsive. Therefore, while you may submit a proposal, any proposal that includes an exception to the Minimum Term (refer to Attachment 2 of the RFP) will be deemed nonresponsive.
289	Given the breadth and complexity of the requested solution, including the development of technical architecture, work plan, design concepts/wireframes, AI readiness plan, staffing approach, and detailed fixed-price cost proposal, can the Court extend the proposal submission deadline to provide Proposers with a minimum of two weeks following the issuance of the final Questions and Answers and/or any related addenda?	If the final Q&A and addenda are delayed beyond the current schedule, the proposal submission deadline will be extended by a corresponding number of days to ensure vendors have a minimum of two weeks following issuance. Vendors will be notified of any deadline changes via official addendum.
290	Current SharePoint footprint- Please provide an overview of the Court’s existing Microsoft	A detailed overview of the Court’s existing M365 environment is not available for distribution prior to award. The Court’s M365 G5 tenant is configured, but

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	365/SharePoint Online environment, including the current number and type of SharePoint sites, hub sites, Teams-connected sites, security groups, and any existing SharePoint customizations that may need to be considered during discovery and design.	a formal inventory of existing SharePoint sites, hub sites, Teams-connected sites, security groups, and customizations has not been compiled. The selected vendor will conduct a full tenant assessment during Discovery. Vendors should treat this assessment as a Discovery phase deliverable and scope accordingly.
291	Number of sites - The RFP references a hub site with associated divisional/department sites estimated at "a couple dozen." Can the Court provide an approximate target number of sites to be implemented under the base scope and identify whether the number is expected to increase during the project?	The Court anticipates a couple dozen divisional and department sites under the base scope. The exact number will be refined during Discovery. Additional sites may be identified during Discovery, which would be addressed through the vendor-defined change control process if they represent a material scope expansion. Vendors should propose a flexible approach that accommodates a reasonable range of sites without requiring a fixed count commitment.
292	Department/site sizing - Can the Court provide an approximate number of departments/divisions, site owners, content authors, and other administrative users expected to be supported by the new intranet	The Court anticipates a couple dozen departments and divisions. Approximately 12 administrators and site owners will be trained initially. The specific number of content authors and other administrative users will be defined during the Discovery phase. All sites together will serve approximately 600 internal users.
293	Existing intranet assessment - Will the Court provide access to the existing IIS-hosted intranet, its site structure, content inventory, usage analytics, and/or existing documentation during discovery?	Yes. During the Discovery phase, the Court will grant the selected vendor access to the current IIS-hosted intranet and its content to support the assessment and inventory process. Note that formal usage analytics, content inventory documentation, and site structure documentation are not currently available. The vendor's access to the intranet itself during Discovery will serve as the primary means of conducting content discovery and assessment.
294	The RFP states that there is no lift-and-shift migration and that identified/relevant files will be manually migrated collaboratively by Court staff	The current IIS-hosted intranet contains approximately 17 GB of content across a single internally hosted web application. A formal document count or repository breakdown is not available. The volume of content to be selectively migrated will be determined during

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	and the selected vendor. Can the Court provide an estimated volume of content/documents, number of repositories/sites, and approximate number of documents expected to be migrated under the base scope?	Discovery, led by Court IT. Vendors should not assume full migration of the 17 GB and should scope their migration support accordingly.
295	Please clarify the division of responsibilities between the vendor and Court staff for content inventory, content classification, metadata assignment, content remediation, migration, validation, and final approval.	The vendor is responsible for: developing the content inventory framework, designing the metadata and classification taxonomy, providing migration guidance and tooling recommendations, and supporting the collaborative migration process. Court IT and content owners are responsible for: identifying which content will be migrated, performing content cleanup and remediation, assigning ownership, and providing final approval on all migrated content. Content placement into the new SharePoint environment is a shared effort.
296	Should the vendor include migration tooling/automation where appropriate, or is the Court expecting manual migration exclusively?	Manual migration using native SharePoint upload methods is acceptable and expected for the base scope. The Court does not require automated migration tooling. Vendors may propose value-added migration tooling as an optional line item if they believe it would benefit the process and reduce risk.
297	Does the Court have an existing preferred SharePoint information architecture or governance model, or should the selected vendor be responsible for defining the complete target-state architecture during discovery?	The Court does not have an existing preferred SharePoint information architecture or governance model. The selected vendor is responsible for defining the complete target-state architecture and governance framework during Discovery, in collaboration with Court IT and key stakeholders.
298	Are there existing SharePoint Framework (SPFx) components, custom web parts, Power Platform solutions, or PnP solutions in the Court's tenant that should be reused or integrated into the new intranet?	No. There are no existing SPFx components, custom web parts, Power Platform solutions, or PnP solutions currently deployed in the Court's tenant that need to be reused or integrated. This is a clean build starting from scratch.
299	Does the Court have existing brand guidelines, design systems, accessibility	No. The Court does not have existing brand guidelines, design systems, or approved UI patterns for the intranet. Vendors are expected to propose a design

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	standards, or approved UI patterns that the vendor must follow when developing the intranet?	approach. The Court's only firm design requirement is WCAG 2.1 Level AA accessibility compliance.
300	How many unique page templates, layouts, or major user experiences does the Court anticipate for the initial implementation?	The number of unique page templates and layouts has not been defined. This will be determined during the Discovery phase based on stakeholder requirements and the information architecture design. Vendors should include page template definition as a Discovery deliverable and propose an estimated number based on their experience with similar engagements.
301	Is the Court expecting high-fidelity wireframes/mockups for the complete intranet or representative pages/templates as part of the proposal and subsequent design phase?	The Court is not requiring high-fidelity wireframes for the complete intranet as part of the proposal. However, vendors are strongly encouraged to include representative wireframes, mockups, or design concepts for key pages — such as the global homepage, a department site landing page, and the employee directory — as part of their proposal. The more design detail provided, the better the Court will be able to evaluate and differentiate proposals. Full wireframes for all pages and templates will be developed during the design phase post-award.
302	Can the Court provide the expected number and types of search verticals, refiners, managed properties, promoted results, and metadata-driven search experiences required for the initial implementation?	The specific number and types of search verticals, refiners, managed properties, and promoted results have not been predefined. At minimum, the Court expects verticals for People and Documents, with metadata-driven filtering and promoted results for authoritative content. The complete search configuration will be designed during the Discovery phase. Vendors should propose a search architecture and include an estimated scope based on their experience with similar government engagements.
303	Are there existing search requirements, search analytics, or user pain points from the current intranet that the vendor should address?	No search analytics or formal search requirements exist for the current intranet. The primary known pain point is that the current system lacks meaningful search functionality. Vendors should expect to design the enhanced search experience from the ground up. User pain points and search use cases will be gathered during Discovery stakeholder sessions.
304	The RFP states that IT will maintain the search schema and refiners post-go-live. Will the vendor be responsible for initial configuration only,	The vendor is responsible for the initial search configuration, ongoing optimization during the project engagement, full documentation, and knowledge transfer to Court IT before project close. Post-go-live, Court IT will be responsible for maintaining the search

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	including documentation and knowledge transfer, or is ongoing optimization expected during the project?	schema and refiners independently. Vendors should ensure that knowledge transfer deliverables are sufficient for Court IT to manage search configuration without vendor support after the project ends.
305	Can the Court provide details regarding its existing Microsoft Entra ID configuration, including security groups, role structures, Conditional Access policies, and identity synchronization between Active Directory and Entra ID that the solution must integrate with?	Detailed information regarding the Court's existing Entra ID configuration, security groups, role structures, and Conditional Access policies is not available for distribution prior to award. The Court operates in a hybrid identity environment with both on-premises Active Directory and Microsoft Entra ID in use. The selected vendor will conduct a full assessment of the identity configuration during Discovery and will have appropriate administrative access to do so post-award.
306	Will the Court provide the required security, Conditional Access, sensitivity labeling, retention, and audit policies, or is the vendor expected to design these policies from the ground up?	The vendor is expected to design these policies from the ground up in collaboration with Court IT. No existing formal security policies, Conditional Access configurations, sensitivity labeling standards, retention schedules, or audit policies are currently documented for intranet use. The vendor should assess the current tenant state during Discovery and recommend and implement approved policies as part of the base scope.
307	Please clarify whether implementation of Microsoft Purview data classification and retention is expected as part of the base implementation or may be proposed as a near-term roadmap/optional item.	Foundational Microsoft Purview implementation — including initial data classification and sensitivity labeling — is expected as part of the base Phase 1 scope. More advanced retention controls and policy configurations may be phased as a near-term deliverable within the contract period based on Discovery findings. A roadmap-only approach with no Phase 1 Purview implementation is not acceptable.
308	For the optional AI readiness scope, should Proposers assume that the Court currently has Microsoft 365 Copilot licenses available, or should the proposal address architecture and readiness only without assuming Copilot licensing?	Proposers should not assume broad Copilot license availability across all users. The Court holds a limited number of Microsoft 365 Copilot licenses that are not currently active. The optional AI readiness scope should focus primarily on architecture and readiness — including permissions hygiene, metadata structure, and content governance — that positions the Court to enable Copilot in the future. Any proposed Copilot features that require active licensing should be clearly identified as Court-owned licensing dependencies and priced accordingly as separate optional line items.
309	Please clarify whether the Court expects the optional AI readiness line item to include	The optional AI readiness line item should include both architecture and governance recommendations and initial implementation of Copilot-ready structures such

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	actual implementation/configuration of Copilot, SharePoint Agents, Copilot Studio, or AI Builder, or primarily architecture, governance, and roadmap recommendations.	as permissions hygiene, metadata design, and content governance. Full implementation of Copilot, SharePoint Agents, Copilot Studio, or AI Builder should be proposed as additional, separately priced optional line items beyond the AI readiness scope.
310	If AI capabilities are proposed, will the Court provide approved AI governance, data classification, security, and responsible AI policies, or should these be developed by the vendor?	No formal AI governance, data classification, or responsible AI policies are currently in place. The vendor is expected to develop and recommend these policies in collaboration with Court IT as part of the optional AI readiness scope. The Court will review and approve all proposed policies before implementation.
311	Should the optional AI scope include a working prototype/demo of a SharePoint Agent or Copilot-based experience?	A working prototype or demonstration of a SharePoint Agent or Copilot-based experience is not required but is of interest to the Court. Vendors who wish to include a prototype as part of their optional AI scope are encouraged to do so and should price it as a separate optional line item.
312	Support- For optional post-go-live support, can the Court clarify the expected duration, approximate support volume, hours of coverage, and whether support is expected to be remote and business-hours only?	Post-go-live support is optional and must be priced as separate tiered line items. The Court anticipates approximately 10–20 hours per month for ongoing managed services. Support is expected to be remote and business-hours only, aligned with Pacific Time. The Court does not require 24/7 coverage. Vendors should propose tiered hypercare and ongoing managed services options with clearly defined durations, hour volumes, and coverage windows.
313	Is there a defined escalation path from the Court, if business and IT stakeholders disagree during implementation?	Yes. The defined escalation path is: IT Applications Manager → CIO. The CIO serves as the executive sponsor and final decision-maker for escalated disputes between business and IT stakeholders.
314	Are there any fixed dates, events, or public deadlines that could constrain delivery?	No fixed dates, events, or public deadlines currently constrain delivery. The January 1, 2027 pilot target is a goal, not a hard deadline. The Court will communicate any scheduling constraints that arise during the engagement.
315	Are there any known lessons learned or considerations from prior similar initiatives that the Court would like vendors to account for in their approach?	No prior similar initiatives have been conducted at the Court. This is the first intranet modernization effort of this kind. Vendors should draw on their own experience with similar government and court engagements to anticipate risks and inform their approach.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

316	How tolerant is the Court to formal change orders if new requirements emerge post-kickoff?	The Court will evaluate change orders on a case-by-case basis. The vendor should define a formal change control process as part of their project management approach. Minor adjustments within the reasonable scope of the RFP should be absorbed where possible. Requirements that represent a material expansion of scope will be subject to formal change control and additional cost discussion.
317	Should enhancements discovered during implementation be deferred, change-controlled, or absorbed?	Enhancements discovered during implementation will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Minor enhancements within the spirit of the approved scope should be absorbed where feasible. Enhancements that represent new functionality or material scope expansion should be change-controlled. The vendor should define clear criteria for this distinction in their proposed change control process.
318	Is creating any workflows or process automation part of the scope? If yes, please provide the required details.	Workflow creation and process automation are not required as part of the base scope. Vendors are welcome to propose value-added workflows or automation as optional line items. Power Automate-based solutions are acceptable if proposed.
319	Who is the executive sponsor vs. day-to-day product owner for the intranet?	The executive sponsor is the CIO. The day-to-day project manager and product owner is the IT Applications Manager.
320	Will the Court assign a dedicated business stakeholder group for requirements validation and UAT?	Yes. The Court will assign a dedicated core stakeholder group of approximately 10 people for requirements validation and UAT. This group will include representation from key departments and will be available to participate in Discovery sessions, design reviews, and UAT activities.
321	What is the expected turnaround time for approvals (design, content, UAT)?	The Court will work to turn around approvals as quickly as possible to support the project timeline. Vendors should propose reasonable review and approval cycles in their project plan — typically 5–10 business days for design approvals and UAT sign-off — and the Court will work to meet those timelines. Specific approval turnaround commitments will be confirmed at project kickoff.
322	Is there a formal change control process , or should the vendor define one?	The vendor is expected to define a formal change control process as part of their project management approach. The proposed process should be reviewed and approved by Court IT at project kickoff.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

323	Are there blackout periods (e.g., court operations, fiscal year-end) that could impact delivery?	No known blackout or change-free periods currently exist that would constrain delivery. The Court will communicate any scheduling constraints that arise during the engagement.
324	How will user satisfaction be measured (survey, adoption metrics, analytics)?	User satisfaction will be measured through surveys administered post-go-live. Vendors should propose an adoption metrics framework as part of their solution, leveraging native Microsoft 365 analytics capabilities where available. The Court does not have baseline metrics from the current intranet to compare against.
325	Are there baseline metrics today (usage, search success rate, page visits)?	No. The current IIS-hosted intranet does not have usage analytics, search success rates, or page visit data available. Vendors should propose a baseline measurement approach as part of their adoption strategy so that post-go-live performance can be tracked from day one.
326	Is there an existing content inventory or taxonomy ?	No. There is no existing content inventory or taxonomy for the current intranet. Developing both will be part of the vendor-led Discovery phase in collaboration with Court IT and content owners.
327	Who will be responsible for content cleanup, validation, and ownership assignment ?	Content cleanup, validation, and ownership assignment is a shared responsibility. Court IT and content owners will lead content identification, cleanup decisions, and final validation. The vendor is expected to provide the governance framework, metadata standards, and guidance to support this process. The vendor will assist with placement of content into the new SharePoint environment collaboratively.
328	Are there content retention or archival rules that should be applied during migration?	No existing content retention or archival rules are in place. Retention and archival policies will be developed during the Discovery phase as part of the Purview and governance workstream. These policies will then be applied to content as part of the migration and classification process.
329	Will departments be required to standardize naming conventions and metadata ?	Yes. All departments and division sites will be required to adopt standardized naming conventions and metadata as defined in the governance framework developed during Discovery. Compliance with these standards will be a condition of site provisioning and ongoing governance.
330	Are there file types or content that should NOT be migrated ?	No specific file types have been excluded at this time. Content selection will be determined collaboratively during Discovery. Any content deemed outdated,

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

		redundant, or irrelevant during the Court-led content analysis will not be migrated, regardless of file type.
331	Should migration include: ○ Version history? ○ Permissions? ○ Metadata recreation?	No. Migration will not include version history, permissions, or metadata recreation from the legacy system. Only approved, active content files will be selectively migrated. Metadata will be applied to migrated content according to the new taxonomy developed during Discovery, not carried over from the legacy system.
332	Who is responsible for content validation post-migration ?	Content owners and Court IT are responsible for content validation post-migration. The vendor should provide a validation checklist and framework to support this process, but the final validation and sign-off rests with Court IT and the designated content owners for each department site.
333	Is a pilot migration expected before full rollout?	Yes. A pilot launch to a representative group — including one representative per division or business owner — is expected before enterprise-wide rollout. The pilot will validate the solution, confirm permissions and access, and allow for any final adjustments before the full launch.
334	Are there branding guidelines, color palettes, or accessibility standards (WCAG) to follow?	No existing branding guidelines or color palettes are in place. Vendors are expected to propose a design. The Court's firm accessibility requirement is WCAG 2.1 Level AA compliance. Section 508 compliance is also expected given the government context.
335	Are there examples of intranets the Court likes/dislikes ?	The Court does not have specific examples of intranets it considers successful or unsuccessful to share. Vendors are encouraged to showcase their own portfolio of prior work and present representative design concepts as part of their proposal.
336	What level of customization vs. out-of-the-box SharePoint is preferred?	The Court expects a modern, dynamic, and customizable intranet — not a basic out-of-the-box SharePoint site. Custom SPFx web parts and enhanced configurations are expected where native SharePoint capabilities are insufficient to meet design and functional requirements. Custom code is acceptable as long as the Court retains ownership of all work product developed specifically for this engagement.
337	Should governance include: ○ Site provisioning process?	Yes. The governance framework must include all three: a defined site provisioning process, standardized naming conventions, and lifecycle management covering active, inactive, archived, and deleted site

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	○ Naming conventions? ○ Lifecycle management (archive/delete)?	states. These are required components of the governance deliverable.
338	What level of restriction is desired for Teams/Site creation (currently open)?	Site and Teams creation should be restricted to specific designated roles within Court IT. The current open creation model will be locked down as part of the governance implementation. The vendor should design the provisioning and governance framework to enforce this restriction.
339	Who will act as: ○ Site Owners ○ Content Authors ○ Governance Committee	These roles are to be defined during the Discovery phase in collaboration with the vendor and Court IT. Role definitions, responsibilities, and assignments will be documented in the governance charter. The Court currently has a core stakeholder group of approximately 10 people who will be involved in this process.
340	Are there expectations for automated governance (policies, provisioning workflows) ?	Automated governance is recommended where feasible. The vendor should propose automation for site provisioning workflows, naming validation, and lifecycle management using Power Platform or PnP-based approaches. Full automation without an IT approval step is not desired — semi-automated workflows with IT oversight are preferred.
341	Are there data classification requirements (public, internal, confidential)?	Yes. Data classification is expected as part of the Purview implementation. Specific classification levels — such as public, internal, and confidential — will be defined during Discovery in collaboration with Court IT. The vendor is expected to design and implement the classification taxonomy as part of the governance and Purview workstream.
342	Should Microsoft Purview be implemented in Phase 1 or roadmap only?	Foundational Microsoft Purview implementation is expected in Phase 1. This includes initial data classification and sensitivity labeling. More advanced retention policies and controls may be phased as a near-term deliverable within the contract period. A roadmap-only approach with no Phase 1 implementation is not acceptable.
343	Are there requirements for: ○ Conditional access policies?	Yes. All three are required as part of the base scope. The vendor is expected to assess the current state, recommend configurations, and implement approved conditional access policies, sensitivity labels, and audit

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	○ Sensitivity labels? ○ Audit logging/reporting ?	logging and reporting as part of the security and governance workstream.
344	Should search include: ○ People directory integration? ○ Metadata-driven filtering?	Yes. Both people directory integration and metadata-driven filtering are required components of the enhanced search experience. These should be included in the base scope search configuration.
345	Are there expectations for custom search experiences (PnP, verticals, etc.) ?	Yes. Custom search experiences including custom verticals, refiners, managed properties, and promoted results are expected. PnP Search or equivalent custom search implementations are acceptable approaches. Out-of-the-box Microsoft Search alone is not sufficient
346	Who will maintain search schema and refiners post-go-live?	Court IT will be responsible for maintaining the search schema and refiners post-go-live. The vendor must provide full documentation and knowledge transfer to Court IT before project close to ensure IT can manage the search configuration independently.
347	Of the following, which should be included vs. optional : ○ Employee directory (with org chart) ○ Event/calendar system ○ Forms digitization (Power Apps) ○ Workflow automation (Power Automate) ○ Teams integration	The following breakdown applies: • Employee directory with org chart — Included in base scope. • Event/calendar system — Optional. • Forms digitization via Power Apps — Optional. • Workflow automation via Power Automate — Optional. • Teams integration — Optional, nice-to-have. All optional items must be priced as separate line items in the cost proposal.
348	Is there interest in Copilot integration for search/content?	Yes. The Court is interested in Copilot integration for search and content discovery as an optional capability. Vendors should propose a Copilot integration approach as part of the optional AI readiness scope, priced as a separate line item.
349	What is the expected support model post go-live ?	Both hypercare and ongoing managed services are optional and must be priced as separate line items — neither is included in the base scope. Hypercare

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

	○ Hypercare (30–60 days)? ○ Ongoing managed services?	should cover the period immediately following go-live (30–90 days recommended). Ongoing managed services of approximately 10–20 hours per month are anticipated for years two and three of the contract. Vendors should provide tiered options for both.
350	Are SLAs required for: ○ Issue resolution ○ Enhancements	Yes. SLAs for both issue resolution and enhancement requests are expected as part of the optional post-go-live support tiers. Vendors should propose SLA tiers for P1 through P4 issues and for enhancement request turnaround times. The Court will review and select appropriate tiers post-award.
352	Will the Court require a knowledge transfer plan to internal IT ?	Yes. A formal knowledge transfer plan to Court IT is required as a project deliverable before project close. The plan should cover search schema maintenance, site provisioning, governance administration, SPFx component management, and any other areas where Court IT will assume responsibility post-go-live.
353	Is the 3–6 month timeline fixed or flexible based on scope refinement ?	The timeline is flexible and will be refined during the Discovery phase based on scope confirmation. The Court's target is a pilot go-live by January 1, 2027, following an October 1, 2026 kickoff. This represents approximately a 3-month implementation window, though the Court recognizes this may be adjusted based on the complexity identified during Discovery.
354	What is the target go-live date ?	The Court is targeting a pilot go-live by January 1, 2027, following a project kickoff around October 1, 2026. Enterprise-wide rollout is expected to follow the successful pilot as quickly as possible. These dates are targets, not hard deadlines. The timeline is flexible and will be refined during Discovery.
355	On section 8.2 - c . For the "not to exceed" is this per itemized cost explanation or a limit for the entire contract?	The "not to exceed" amount applies to the entire contract, not per individual line item or deliverable. It represents the maximum total amount payable under the contract for all base scope work and expenses. Optional line items, if selected post-award, would be additive and should be clearly identified as such in the cost proposal so the Court can evaluate total potential contract value.

Please note the bid due date remains the same.

We appreciate your participation in the solicitation process and thank you for your interest in doing business with the Court.

Superior Court of California County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street
San José, California 95113
(408) 882-2700



FINANCE / GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION

Sincerely,

Collin Conroy
Procurement

cc: Sabrina Hsu
Scott Lindsay
Ev Plascencia