**PAMELA HARRIS**
STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR
(410) 260-1295  Fax: (410) 974-2066
pamela.harris@mdcourts.gov

**FAYE D. MATTHEWS**
DEPUTY STATE COURT
ADMINISTRATOR
(410) 260-1257  Fax: (410) 974-2066
faye.matthews@mdcourts.gov

**DENNIS D. SCOTT, Director**
Human Resources
(410) 260-1283  Fax: (410) 974-2849
dennis.scott@mdcourts.gov

**GRAY BARTON, Director**
Office of Problem-Solving Courts
(410) 260-3617  Fax: (410) 260-3620
gray.barton@mdcourts.gov

**MARK BITTNER, Director**
Judicial Information Systems
(410) 260-1001  Fax: (410) 974-7170
mark.bittner@mdcourts.gov

**GISELA BLADES, Director**
Procurement & Contract Admin.
(410) 260-1594  Fax: (410) 260-2520
gisela.blades@mdcourts.gov

**ALLEN C. CLARK, III, Director**
Budget & Finance
(410) 260-1579  Fax: (410) 260-1290
allen.clark@mdcourts.gov

**DAVID R. DURFEE  JR., Director**
Legal Affairs
(410) 260-1405  Fax: (410) 260-3505
david.durfee@mdcourts.gov

**CONNIE KRATOVIL-LAVELLE, Director**
Family Administration
(410) 260-1296  Fax: (410) 974-5577
connie.kratovil-lavelle@mdcourts.gov

**ROXANNE P. McKAGAN, Director**
Facilities Administration
(410) 260-1407  Fax: (410) 974-2066
rocky.mckagan@mdcourts.gov

**PAMELA C. ORTIZ, Director**
Access to Justice Commission
(410) 260-1258  Fax: (410) 260-2504
pamela.ortiz@mdcourts.gov

**DIANE S. PAWLOWICZ, Director**
Court Operations Department
(410) 260-1725  Fax: (410) 260-2503
diane.pawlowicz@mdcourts.gov

**DEBORAH A. UNITUS**
Director, Program Services
(410) 260-1256  Fax: (410) 260-3570
deborah.unitus@mdcourts.gov

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
MARYLAND JUDICIAL CENTER
580 TAYLOR AVENUE
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401**

**Questions/Responses No. 1 to the Request for Proposal (RFP)
Webcast Upgrade
Maryland Court of Appeals
May 7, 2014**

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The following questions for the above referenced RFP were received and are answered and posted for all prospective Contractors who received the RFP. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions are not binding on the Maryland Judiciary unless the RFP is expressly amended. Nothing in the Maryland Judiciary's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the Maryland Judiciary of any statement or interpretation on the part of the Contractor asking the question.

**Question:** 2.1 - Please provide details on the courtroom audio recording system?

**Response:** The courtroom audio recording system will be installed by no later than July 13th, 2014. These are the requirements for the audio recording system as it relates to this webcast solution:

1. The current system has 8 mics/10 inputs, 7 bench mics and 1 podium mic. The new system will require the addition of two PZMs, and two open XLR inputs in the courtroom. This will be a total of 10 mic inputs and 12 inputs total.

    a. One of the additional PZMs should be located on the top platform of the Reporters desk in the courtroom.

    b. The other PZM should be located on the opposing side of the courtroom, where a temporary podium is placed. This PZM needs to be able to disconnect at the floor so that the microphone can be removed when it is not needed.

2. It is a requirement that the new audio recording system provide an output from each microphone input at a central location. The required audio signal will be provided via balanced XLR in order to achieve a clean signal.

    a. The CourtSmart audio outputs, for each microphone, will be located together outside of the Court of Appeals Clerks office at the desk of the Assistant to the State Reporter.

**Question:** 2.1 – Please provide detailed information about the current JIS streaming infrastructure. None was provided at the Pre-Bid Conference as indicated in the RFP.

**Response:** We are using Microsoft's Windows Media Services 2008 (Streaming Media Services). The service is running on a Windows 2008R2 server, which is virtualized on a VMware ESXi 5.5 virtual machine. The server shares a 500mbps link to the internet with

the rest of our hosted internet applications.

**Question:** 2.1 – Please describe the requirement – "Contractor to provide secure remote access to the streaming encoder".

**Response:** Secure remote access could be accomplished via a tool similar to RDP (Remote Desktop Protocol) or SSH.

**Question:** 2.2 Please elaborate on the Future Capabilities requirements, specifically the Closed Captioning requirement. Does any 'captioning capability currently exist – please describe?

**Response:** There are three future capabilities that the court would like for the vendors to take into consideration when creating their webcast solution. The following are required future capabilities: Character Generation, Name Keys/Graphics, and Closed Captioning. Based on each vendor's solution, we would like the pricing, hardware and software needs, as well as personnel needs/recommendations as it relates to configuring those future capabilities into the system that each vendor is proposing. Closed Captioning is not a current capability/function of the Court of Appeals, and this could potentially be potentially added as a new service for the Court in the future.

**Question:** 2.3.7 – Please provide details on the current reverse proxy server?

**Response:** We have a hardware load balancer (model and type will not be provided for security). The reverse proxy is located within our perimeter network, and the streaming server will be placed inside our internal network. All access must filter through the reverse proxies to the streaming server via defined ports.

**Question:** 2.3.7 – What reverse proxy solutions do you have in place?

**Response:** See above.

**Question:** 2.3.11 – Please clarify the paragraph – it appears to indicate no vendor stream testing can occur between – June 23 and September 3?

**Response:** The winning vendor will be able to do any testing/streaming, that statement is just noting that the Court will not officially stream the emergency sessions if they were to occur between those dates.

**Question:** 2.4.3 - Please elaborate on the requirement. How is the start/stop sequence intended to be accomplished? Physically at the encoder or via a web GUI ?

**Response:** Currently the webcast user starts and stops the encoding via a local proprietary GUI. We require the ability for the webcast user to be able to start and stop encoding via a computer based interface. If there is an option to add a physical/tactile button, in conjunction with the web interface option, we would like to see that capability demonstrated on May 29th, 2014.

**Question:** 2.6.1 (d.) – Access to audio volume control for webcast – please clarify?

**Response:** There will be 10 Balanced audio cables (XLR) coming out of the audio recording system. These connections will reside outside of the Court of Appeals Clerk's office. This is the location of the user for the webcast. These 10 XLR connections are outputs for each PZM in the courtroom. We require the ability for the webcast user to be able to raise and lower the volume of any individual PZM for the purposes of the webcast and archive.

**Question:** 2.6.5 Please describe the Closed Captioning – previous 2.2 indicated a Future Requirement?

**Response:** There are three future capabilities that the court would like vendors to consider

when creating their webcast solution. The following are required future capabilities: Character Generation, Name Keys/Graphics, and Closed Captioning. Based on each vendor's solution, we would like the pricing, hardware and software needs, as well as personnel needs/recommendations, as it relates to configuring those future capabilities into the system that each vendor is proposing. Closed Captioning is not a current capability/function of the Court of Appeals, and this could potentially be a new function for the Court in the future.

**Question:** 2.6.7 (b.) – Bitrate adjustment remotely – what is the method to determine the need for the bit rate adjustment?

**Response:** We would like to define connected user thresholds per bitrate that will automatically downgrade the stream to the next lowest level. Manual adjustment of the bitrate should be an options as well.

**Question:** 2.6.7 (c.) – Please explain the need for Frame Rate adjustments and what frame rates are required?

**Response:** We are requiring a minimum frame rate of 23.976 frame per second. We will accept 29.97 frames per second, as well. As it states in 2.5.3 "Frame Rate Required: 23.976 fps or 29.97 fps (23.976 preferred)"

**Question:** 3.2.2 and 3.4.2 Please clarify - the number of submission documents are in conflict.

**Response:** There are two volumes identified in Section 3.2.2. Section 3.4 lists the Technical Proposal requirements, and Section 3.5 lists the Financial Proposal requirements. If there is a conflict beyond that, please submit it as a question.

**Question:** Do you know specifically what "configurable thresholds" the scope of work is referring to? Is this like total bandwidth on the server, CPU usage, number of active connections, etc. or are we talking about more uncommon thresholds?

**Response:** Bandwidth usage and active connections would be the primary thresholds we would be interested in.

**Question:** Attachment E Please clarify the Sections: Solution Document, Design To Test As Accepted, MD Court of Appeals and List of Hardware

**Response:** The solutions document pertains to the costs associated with all documentation, including as-built drawings and design of the system. The design to test as accepted portion pertains to the installation costs, training, testing/configuration, hardware costs and associated costs outside of the design and documentation costs. The "Maryland Court of Appeals" line was supposed to be in the box above identified as "Location", please ignore that line item. The list of hardware and software should be identified for each vendor's proposed solution in order to allow the judiciary an opportunity to review the proposed solution(s) in detail and see a breakdown of the cost for the proposed solution.


Issued by


Lisa Peters, Procurement Officer
Procurement and Contract Administration