



# 16th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT of MISSOURI

## Q&A Response for Vendors

Website Implementation | RFP Number: 10014746

Topic	Q#	Question	Answer
Budget	1	Does the Court have an established budget range, ceiling, or not-to-exceed figure for this engagement?	The Court has an internal budget but is not disclosing it. This allows vendors to propose their most competitive pricing and unique solutions.
	2	What is the current annual spend on hosting, support, and maintenance for the existing website?	The site is hosted on-premise. Costs are distributed across the Court IT budget and staff rather than a single line-item annual spend.
	3	If the selected CMS has commercial licensing costs, is the Court or the vendor responsible for ongoing license fees?	Our preference is to have the CMS costs incorporated into the yearly maintenance costs
	4	Should hosting costs be included in the project budget, or are they procured separately?	Our preference is to have the hosting costs incorporated into the yearly maintenance costs
	5	Is the project budget already approved, or will an award require additional governing body approval?	The money is earmarked for this project. However, a standard approval process is still required.
Timeline	6	Is the March 31, 2027 desired completion date a firm contractual deadline, or is there flexibility?	The date is a goal and is flexible if scope or discovery phases require additional time.
	7	Can the Court grant a one to two week extension to the proposal submission deadline?	No
	8	Is the period of performance from selection (July 30, 2026) to completion (March 31, 2027) the planning window vendors should use?	Yes

<b>Scope: Content and Migration</b>	9	How many pages, documents, and media assets exist on the current site, and what portion is expected to be migrated?	The current site has approximately 355 pages and less than 2 GB of media, including PDF forms. The site runs on mojoPortal, and export artifacts can be provided to the awarded vendor. External sites and content will remain external. The Court anticipates that approximately 90% of the current content will be migrated.
	10	What CMS currently powers 16thcircuit.org, and what version is it on?	The current site is powered by mojoPortal, running on Windows Server with an MSSQL database.
	11	Will the Court conduct a content audit prior to migration, or is the vendor expected to lead the audit?	The Court will complete the internal content audit. Court staff will assist with auditing and refining text content during the migration.
	12	Will the Court require copywriting, editing, or new content development from the vendor?	No. Copywriting and content development will be handled by Court staff.
	13	Will original or stock photography or videography services be required?	Not initially. These would be considered as a separate line item.
	14	Are there pages, sections, or document types that should NOT be migrated to the new site?	Yes. The internal content audit will identify content to be retired or excluded.
	15	Are 301 redirects from the current URL structure required to preserve SEO rankings?	No
	16	Are there statutory archiving or record-retention mandates that affect how legacy content is handled?	Yes. However, the exact retention period is still being determined
<b>Scope: Site Boundaries</b>	17	Is the scope of this engagement limited to 16thcircuit.org, or does it include consolidating other Court systems or microsites?	The scope is limited to the existing 16thcircuit.org content.
	18	Will the Juror Login feature be integrated into the new site, or remain an external link?	Juror Login will remain an external link.
	19	Is the Delinquent Land Tax application in scope for this project?	No, this is an external application. We should be able to use IFrames
	20	Does the Court operate other web properties, subdomains, or microsites that need to align with the new site in brand or navigation?	These are outside the scope of this project.

<b>Scope: Integrations</b>	21	Are there CRM, marketing automation, or third-party platforms currently in use that the new site needs to integrate with?	The Court does not currently have any specific integrations to third-party services. The Court would like to see the CMS capabilities for connecting to other services. The Court may require the ability to render content based on internal database connections.
	22	Is the marketing automation requirement a confirmed need or aspirational?	It is aspirational and intended for potential future development.
	23	Does the Court currently use a CRM platform?	No. CRM integration is for potential future development if needed.
	24	Should the new site provide deeper integration with Case.net, eFiling, or Workday beyond hyperlinks?	No, not required. However, we would consider utilizing APIs to access external data for future development
	25	Will the new site include site search functionality, and what level of capability is expected?	Yes. The site requires a search feature that returns text matches from pages. The Court is open to additional search features, but they are not a priority.
	26	Should the site search index the contents of PDF and Office documents?	It is not required, but full text indexing of documents is preferable.
	27	Are interactive online forms, e-signature workflows, or form-fill capabilities required at launch?	No. The Court is not planning to launch with an interactive forms feature. These capabilities may be considered for future development.
	28	Is integration with a public notification system (emergency closings, weather alerts) required?	No, this is an external application. We should be able to use IFrames
	29	Beyond Google Analytics 4 and Google Search Console, does the Court use or plan to use any other analytics or reporting tools?	We will use Lighthouse and axe DevTools and may use additional tools.
<b>Technical Requirements: CMS Functionality</b>	30	Does the Court have a preferred or required CMS platform?	The Court is open to different CMS solutions but prefers to avoid WordPress.
	31	Will the Court consider a fully custom-built CMS, or is a recognized platform required?	The preference is for a recognized platform, but not a requirement.
	32	What are the primary shortcomings of the current CMS that this project should remedy?	mojoPortal is open source but is no longer actively developed. A platform that supports modern standards is the goal.
	33	Will the Court consider Microsoft SharePoint, Salesforce Experience Cloud, or other enterprise platforms as the CMS?	No, regarding SharePoint and Salesforce Experience Cloud. Our preference is a CMS platform, not another category platform with a CMS extension

<b>Technical Requirements: Hosting</b>	34	Does the Court prefer cloud-hosted or on-premise deployment, will it accept managed third-party hosting, and does vendor-proposed hosting require a separate procurement?	The Court currently uses on-premise hosting but is open to either solution. For cloud-hosted proposals, vendors should include technical and pricing details. If a cloud solution is selected, the Court would not store PII or transfer that information through the platform. The Court must be able to make modifications without vendor intervention. The Court will accept a hosting arrangement through a third-party platform, with no preference for a specific hosting environment or provider. If hosting is part of the vendor's proposal, it will not require a separate procurement process.
	35	Where is the site currently hosted?	The site is hosted on-premise, on VMs at the LightEdge data center.
	36	Are SOC 2, CJIS, FedRAMP, StateRAMP, or NIST compliance certifications required for hosting?	Those certifications are not currently required.
	37	Are there data residency, jurisdictional, or judicial-system hosting restrictions vendors should account for?	There are no current restrictions, since only public data is stored on the site.
	38	Does the Court manage its own SSL certificates and DNS, or should the vendor manage those?	The Court manages its own domain name and SSL certificate.
	39	Does the Court require a formal SLA with financial remedies for downtime, or is the 99.9% uptime a target metric?	Yes, a formal SLA would be required for a hosted solution.
	40	Who is responsible for the uptime guarantee if the solution is cloud hosted versus on-premise?	The uptime guarantee burden falls on the vendor if the solution is cloud hosted. Server uptime issues are only the burden of the vendor if the solution is not hosted on-premise.
	41	Is a separate staging or UAT environment required in addition to production?	Yes
	42	Should the staging environment mirror production capacity, or is a lower-spec environment acceptable?	The staging environment does not need to have the same capacity as the production environment
<b>Technical Requirements: Security and Access</b>	43	Does the MFA requirement need to integrate with an existing identity provider?	No. The MFA solution is not required to connect to an identity provider.
	44	What identity provider does the Court currently use?	The Court currently uses independent CMS accounts. The Court has an Active Directory environment with an ADFS server, and is in the process of moving to the Microsoft Exchange environment, which may enable other identity methods.

	45	Are there specific security compliance frameworks beyond standard best practices that the website must adhere to?	No
	46	Are regular third-party security audits or penetration testing required as part of ongoing maintenance?	No
	47	Is encryption at rest required for content stored in the CMS database, or is HTTPS in transit sufficient?	HTTPS is sufficient
	48	What is the expected frequency for security updates and patching?	As soon as possible for security. For patching, quarterly would be sufficient
Technical Requirements: Performance	49	Are the PageSpeed Insights and Core Web Vitals requirements measured only at launch, or are they ongoing contractual obligations?	These metrics are required at launch. Beyond launch, the Court expects that any metric issues can be addressed through a support ticket.
	50	Does the PageSpeed requirement apply to all pages, key landing pages only, or a representative sample?	All pages
	51	From which location or monitoring tool will TTFB be measured?	Kansas City metropolitan area. PageSpeed Insights for TTFB
Technical Requirements: CMS Functionality	52	Is a chatbot feature required?	No. The Court has a preference for no chatbot capabilities.
	53	Are additional permission levels required beyond the minimum 3 (Admin, Editor, Author), such as department-specific roles?	No, not required
	54	How many tiers of approval are required in the content publishing workflow?	At least 1. But, multiple with granularity is preferred.
	55	Does the versioning retention and rollback requirement extend to media files and documents, or only page content?	Only pages is required.
	56	Is scheduled publishing (future publish or unpublish dates) required?	No, not required. However, it would be a nice feature to have available.
	57	What is the expected format and scope of the full export requirement?	The preference is to export as a standard structured data format, i.e., JSON or XML
	58	Does the Court expect ownership of custom code, themes, and templates in addition to content, design assets, and database?	Yes
	59	Should MFA extend to Editor and Author roles in addition to Admin?	Required for Admin, but optional for other roles
Accessibility	60	The RFP references both WCAG 2.1 and WCAG 2.2 in different sections. Which standard is the binding requirement?	WCAG version 2.1 or later at Level AA is the binding requirement.
	61	Is a third-party accessibility audit required as a project deliverable, or is vendor self-certification acceptable?	Third-party audit not required

	62	Is VPAT or ACR documentation required as part of project deliverables?	No
	63	Has the Court conducted any accessibility audits of the current site that should inform the new build?	No
	64	What third-party tools does the Court currently use to monitor and manage accessibility?	Lighthouse and axe DevTools.
	65	Are multilingual or translation requirements in scope?	Translated content is not required. A solution that works well with Google Translate or a similar machine translation tool is sufficient and considered a plus.
Design	66	Does the Court have existing brand guidelines that the website must adhere to?	Yes. Court branding (including brand colors, fonts, logos, and guidelines) has been developed by a design firm. No website-specific assets were provided as part of those guidelines.
	67	Will sub-sites or departments (such as Family Court or the Independence courthouse) require distinct branding?	The Court has overarching court branding. Family Court will have different seals and logos, but the goal is to present as one court across the site.
	68	How many rounds of design revision are anticipated for homepage and interior page templates before approval?	1 to 5 rounds
	69	Does the Court want to preserve its existing information architecture, or is it open to a restructured or task-based approach?	We are open to a restructured approach
	70	Are there other court websites that the Court considers a good model for the redesign?	<a href="https://www.stlcitycircuitcourt.com/">https://www.stlcitycircuitcourt.com/</a> <a href="https://www.wicourts.gov/">https://www.wicourts.gov/</a> <a href="https://stlcountycourts.com/">https://stlcountycourts.com/</a>
	71	Who are the primary audience segments the new website should serve?	The general public
	Qualifications	72	How many case studies or references are required, and is government or court experience required?
73		Are there restrictions on who may bid? Is there a local vendor preference?	There is no restriction on who may submit proposals. The Court may consider benefits such as proximity and operating hours, but proximity is not a high priority compared to other factors.
74		Are there citizenship restrictions, or can portions of the work be executed by offshore teams?	There are no citizenship restrictions for project personnel. The Court requires a US-based office location. The development

		location is not required to be in the US. However, the Court may consider the proximity of development and support hours when evaluating proposals.	
	75	What is expected for the 'Certifications or technical partnerships' submission requirement?	If you have a certification with technology partners, let us know.
	76	Are MBE, WBE, DBE, or other diversity certification preferences applied in evaluation?	No
	77	What are the Court's expectations for the vendor's risk management process, and does it cover staffing, website maintenance, or both?	The Court expects for SLAs to be met with regard to issues, critical issues, and if used, hosting. Pricing for maintenance and support should be reflected in proposal.
<b>Training</b>	78	How many staff will require training, and across what roles?	Under 25 staff total. Train-the-Trainer sessions are required at a minimum for admin and content manager roles.
	79	Does the Court prefer in-person or virtual training delivery?	Training may be provided in person or via web-based delivery.
	80	Is role-specific training required (for example, separate sessions for administrators versus content editors)?	Critical for authors and editors. Should be a distinction between admin users and regular users
<b>Maintenance and Support</b>	81	How does the Court define a 'critical issue' for the 4-hour response SLA, and does that SLA apply 24/7/365 or during business hours only?	A security event or full site outage is considered a critical issue. For critical issues, the SLA is 24/7/365. Non-critical issues may be addressed during standard business hours.
	82	Should post-launch maintenance and support pricing be included in the proposal?	Yes. Post-launch support offerings should be included in the proposal. Vendors should provide upfront and annual pricing for their support offerings, whether break-fix or fully managed.
	83	What is the expected contract term for post-launch support?	When hosting is provided by or through the vendor, the Court anticipates annual renewal due to Court budgeting cycles.
	84	Is there a current vendor supporting the existing website, and are they eligible to bid?	There is no current vendor contract. Internal IT supports the existing site. There is no incumbent to consider.
	85	Is a mandatory warranty period required post-launch, separate from optional ongoing maintenance?	Yes
<b>Submission Requirements</b>	86	How should proposals be submitted (number of copies, format, and file naming), and does the Court accept vendor portal uploads?	Digital PDFs are preferred. The file naming convention is flexible but should include the RFP number and company name, and there is no specific file size limit. The Court does

		not accept vendor portal uploads such as BidNet.
87	Will the Court issue a confirmation of receipt for submitted proposals?	Yes. The Court will send an email receipt upon receiving a proposal.
88	How should vendor questions be submitted during the Q&A period?	Vendor questions should be sent by email to selvaraj.thangaveloo@courts.mo.gov.
89	Will Q&A responses be shared with all vendors, or only with the firm that submitted each question?	Q&A will be shared with all vendors.
90	What is the expected format and length for the Candidate Discussions on July 10, 2026?	The Court is targeting remote sessions only.
91	Should itemized pricing be submitted as a separate document or integrated into the main proposal PDF?	Itemized pricing can be included in the main proposal.
92	Is the award a single-vendor or multi-vendor selection?	A single vendor will be selected.
93	Is there a preferred or required length for the proposal?	There is no specific expectation for proposal length. The proposal should adequately address the requirements and convey the value the vendor brings.
94	Are there font, margin, or page-count limitations for the proposal?	No
95	How will the cost proposal be scored within the evaluation matrix?	The most cost effective solution may receive the full 15 points available for cost. However, cost is not the only deciding factor in the overall evaluation.
96	Are wet-ink original signatures required, or are digital signatures acceptable?	Digital signatures are acceptable
97	Does the Court anticipate a fixed-price contract, or is it open to a time-and-materials or milestone-based payment model for phases where scope may evolve?	Pricing should fall into two buckets - the implementation and the ongoing costs for maintenance and/or hosting, IT and PIO.
98	Will the winning vendor's proposal be attached to the Court's contract, or will the selected vendor have an opportunity to negotiate the scope of work?	There will be negotiations and discussions before the contract is finalized.
99	Who serves on the evaluation committee, and what areas of expertise do the evaluators represent?	The evaluation committee will consist of representatives from key stakeholder groups involved in the project. The committee is expected to include individuals with expertise in project management, website/content management, information technology, user experience (UX), communications and marketing, accessibility compliance, and business operations.

	100	What feedback can bidders expect on their proposal submissions after the award decision?	We will disclose the factors that lead to our decision. However, we will not be providing each vendor with an individualized report.
	101	Can a vendor submit an Open Records Request following the award decision?	Yes. Furthermore, we will be as transparent as possible with our decision making.
<b>Court Context</b>	102	What is the current monthly traffic to the website?	Over the last 12 months, the site averaged approximately 162,259 page views per month with a peak of 180,276.
	103	What are the current storage requirements for the site?	Total storage is less than 4 GB combined between database and files. Files take less than 2 GB, and the database is less than 1 GB.
	104	What is the current bandwidth usage?	Current bandwidth usage is undetermined.
	105	How many staff members administer or will administer content on the site?	Likely under 25 users total, with approximately one content manager per department plus some IT admin staff. Outside of IT, content managers will have basic technical proficiency.
	106	Who has final approval authority for design and the go-live decision?	The Court Administrator holds final approval authority.
	107	Are AI-assisted tools and methodologies acceptable during project delivery (for example, content mapping, accessibility testing, or QA)?	We do not want AI integrated into the site. However, we do not have any requirements regarding the use of AI-assisted tools during project delivery.
	108	Does the Court have a preferred project management methodology, such as Agile or Waterfall?	No
	109	Are key vendor personnel permitted to work remotely?	The Court requires a US-based office location. The development location is not required to be in the US. However, the Court may consider the proximity of development and support hours when evaluating proposals.
	110	Will the Court provide technical contacts for vendor coordination with third-party systems where integrations or authentication setup are required?	We do not currently utilize 3rd party integrations that require this.
111	How many discovery or stakeholder sessions are anticipated, who are the key internal participants (for example IT, Court Administration, judicial officers, and public-facing staff), and will sessions be held on-site in Kansas City or remotely?	We are expecting minimum 2-3 stakeholder sessions that will involve IT, Court Administration, Public Relations, as well as department representatives. These sessions can be completed in-person or remote.	