

## Questions and Responses

Question	Response
<p><b>Licensing Program &amp; Eligibility</b></p> <p>1. Is the Court open to receiving proposals under the Microsoft Cloud Solution Provider (CSP) program, or is a specific Microsoft licensing program required?</p>	<p>The Court is open to proposals under any Microsoft licensing program for which the Court is eligible, including CSP, EA, MCA, LPA/RFO, or other applicable Microsoft purchasing options. Proposers must clearly identify the proposed Microsoft agreement structure and purchasing channel, including any assumptions, requirements, limitations, or transition considerations.</p>
<p>2. What is the Court's current Microsoft licensing agreement type (e.g., Enterprise Agreement (EA), CSP, MPESA, or other)?</p>	<p>The Court currently uses Microsoft 365 Government G3 licensing under an existing Microsoft licensing agreement.</p>
<p>3. Does the Court anticipate maintaining its current licensing program structure, or is it open to transitioning to an alternative licensing model if cost savings and operational benefits can be demonstrated?</p>	<p>The Court is open to evaluating alternative licensing models if the proposer demonstrates that the proposed model meets the Court's operational, procurement, support, compliance, and cost requirements. Proposers should identify any recommended changes to the baseline quantities, license types, or agreement structure in their technical proposal.</p>
<p>4. Are there any contractual, procurement, or policy restrictions that would prevent a transition from the current licensing agreement to a CSP model?</p>	<p>The Court is not identifying any specific restriction in this response that would prevent consideration of CSP. However, any proposed model must comply with Court procurement requirements, Microsoft eligibility requirements, applicable public-sector purchasing requirements, and the terms of the RFP.</p>
<p>5. Is the Court seeking licensing procurement services only, or does the scope also include strategic licensing advisory, optimization, and roadmap planning services?</p>	<p>The scope includes Microsoft licensing procurement, renewal support, fulfillment, and ongoing licensing advisory services. The advisory component is intended to support accurate licensing, cost optimization, renewal planning, and alignment with the Court's Microsoft environment. It is not intended to be a separate standalone IT consulting engagement.</p>
<p><b>Current Microsoft Environment</b></p> <p>6. Can the Court provide a high-level breakdown of current Microsoft licensing quantities by SKU?</p>	<p>The Scope of Work and Cost Proposal Form identify the baseline quantities to be used for proposal pricing. Baseline quantities include 85 Microsoft 365 Government G5 users, 265 Microsoft 365 Government G3 users, as-needed Microsoft Entra ID P1/P2 add-on pricing, as-needed Intune/endpoint management licensing, as-needed Defender/security add-ons, as-needed Purview/information protection/compliance add-ons, 6 Visio Plan 2 users, 3 Power BI Pro users, 5 Visual Studio Professional users, 357 Windows Server User CALs, Windows Server licensing based on Court-provided server/core inventory, 44 SQL Server Standard cores, and 8 SQL Server Enterprise cores. Final quantities are subject to validation.</p>
<p>7. What Microsoft 365 licensing tiers are currently deployed (e.g., Microsoft 365 E3, E5, Business Premium, etc.)?</p>	<p>The Court currently uses Microsoft 365 Government G3 as its primary Microsoft 365 licensing tier. The Court is evaluating a mixed Microsoft 365 Government G3/G5 licensing model for the renewal.</p>
<p>8. Does the Court currently utilize Microsoft Azure services? If so, can estimated annual Azure consumption or spend be provided?</p>	<p>Azure consumption is not identified as a primary baseline pricing component of this RFP. If a proposer recommends Azure-related licensing or services, those items should be clearly identified separately, including assumptions, pricing, and whether they are required or optional.</p>
<p>9. Are there any anticipated licensing expansions, reductions, or significant changes during the proposed contract term?</p>	<p>Yes. The Court anticipates a potential transition to a role-based Microsoft 365 Government G3/G5 licensing model and may increase adoption of Microsoft identity, security, compliance, endpoint management, Power Platform, Power BI, information protection, auditing, and reporting capabilities during the contract term.</p>
<p>10. Does the Court currently maintain any on-premises Microsoft workloads that may be impacted by the renewal, including but not limited to: Windows Server, SQL Server, SharePoint Server, Exchange Server, Remote Desktop Services?</p>	<p>Yes. The Court maintains on-premises Microsoft workloads, including Windows Server file/print services, SQL Server workloads, and virtualized Windows Server environments. Exchange email services are currently provided through Exchange Online. The Court is also transitioning file-sharing services toward SharePoint Online and OneDrive.</p>
<p><b>Support Expectations</b></p> <p>11. Beyond licensing procurement and renewal management, what support services are expected from the selected vendor?</p>	<p>Expected support services are described in the RFP and Scope of Work and include licensing guidance, quote support, renewal planning, true-up support, license reconciliation, optimization assistance, identification of licensing risks, notification of material Microsoft licensing changes, and support for licensing decisions related to the Court's Microsoft environment.</p>
<p>12. What service level expectations (SLAs) does the Court have for support requests and issue resolution?</p>	<p>Proposers should describe their proposed support model, escalation process, and response expectations. At minimum, the Court expects prompt turnaround for quotes, licensing questions, and renewal support requests.</p>
<p>13. Is the Court expecting a dedicated account manager and/or licensing specialist to be assigned to the engagement?</p>	<p>Yes. The Scope of Work requires the vendor to provide a designated account representative and Microsoft licensing specialist.</p>
<p>14. Are periodic business reviews, licensing optimization reviews, or strategic planning sessions expected as part of the contract?</p>	<p>Yes. The Scope of Work requires ongoing licensing review and optimization at least annually, or more frequently if proposed by the vendor.</p>

**RFP Title: Microsoft Licensing**

**RFP #: 2526-309**

Question	Response
<b>Security &amp; Compliance</b> 15. Is the Court currently evaluating or planning initiatives involving Microsoft Defender, Microsoft Purview, Microsoft Entra ID, Compliance and Records Management solutions?	Yes. The Court is currently using Microsoft Entra ID P1 for Conditional Access and MFA implementation and is evaluating or planning expanded Microsoft identity, security, compliance, governance, information protection, auditing, reporting, and related capabilities. Endpoint detection and response is currently provided through CrowdStrike, funded externally through the Judicial Council.
16. Does the Court anticipate increasing adoption of Microsoft security, compliance, or governance solutions during the contract term?	Yes. The Court anticipates increased adoption of Microsoft security, compliance, identity, governance, endpoint management, and related capabilities during the contract term. Proposers should identify recommended licensing and any overlap with existing Court capabilities.
<b>Modern Workplace &amp; Cloud Roadmap</b> 17. Is the Court currently evaluating or planning initiatives related to SharePoint Online, Microsoft Teams, Power Platform, Microsoft 365 Copilot, Azure modernization?	The Court currently uses Microsoft 365 services, Exchange Online, and is transitioning file-sharing services to SharePoint Online and OneDrive. The Court also anticipates potential future expansion of Microsoft Intune, Power Platform, Power BI, and information protection capabilities. Microsoft 365 Copilot and Azure modernization are not identified as baseline pricing components of this RFP unless proposed separately as optional or recommended items.
18. Is the selected vendor expected to provide strategic recommendations and guidance regarding the Court's Microsoft roadmap and technology planning?	Yes, within the context of Microsoft licensing, renewal planning, cost optimization, and alignment of licensing with the Court's Microsoft roadmap. The RFP does not seek broad IT consulting services unrelated to Microsoft licensing procurement, renewal, fulfillment, and advisory support.
19. Does the Court anticipate future projects that may be procured separately but require alignment with Microsoft licensing strategy and planning?	Yes. Future Microsoft-related initiatives may require alignment with the Court's licensing strategy and planning. Any future projects outside the scope of this RFP may be procured separately in accordance with Court procurement requirements.
<b>Evaluation &amp; Commercial</b> 20. Can the Court provide additional information regarding the proposal evaluation methodology, including the relative weighting of pricing, qualifications, experience, and support capabilities?	The evaluation methodology is stated in the RFP. The maximum point allocation is: Quality of work plan submitted - 13 points; Ability to meet timing requirements for license renewal - 12 points; Experience of proposer on similar assignments - 12 points; Credentials of key staff to be assigned - 5 points; Cost - 50 points; Acceptance of terms and conditions - 5 points; DVBE incentive - 3 points.
21. Will additional consideration be given to vendors that demonstrate licensing optimization expertise, strategic advisory services, and Microsoft cloud transformation experience?	Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria stated in the RFP. The Court may consider demonstrated Microsoft licensing expertise, optimization capability, relevant public-sector and hybrid-environment experience, quality of service model, responsiveness, escalation process, and ability to support the Court throughout the three-year term.