



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

FRANK BROCCOLINA
STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR
(410) 260-1295 Fax: (410) 974-2066
frank.broccolina@mdcourts.gov

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

SHARON SAMPSON BALL
Executive Director
Human Resources
(410) 260-1283 Fax: (410) 974-2849
sharon.ball@mdcourts.gov

GRAY BARTON
Executive Director
Office of Problem-Solving Courts
2011-D Commerce Park Drive
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 260-3617 Fax: (410) 841-9850
gray.barton@mdcourts.gov

PHILIP S. BRAXTON
Executive Director
Judicial Information Systems
2661 Riva Road, Suite 900
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 260-1000 Fax: (410) 974-7170
philip.braxton@mdcourts.gov

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

DAVID R. DURFEE JR.
Executive Director
Legal Affairs
(410) 260-1405 Fax: (410) 974-2066
david.durfee@mdcourts.gov

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

SUSAN HOWELLS
Executive Director
Procurement & Contract
Administration
(410) 260-1410 Fax: (410) 260-1749
susan.howells@mdcourts.gov

DIANE S. PAWLOWICZ
Executive Director
Court Research & Development
(410) 260-1725 Fax: (410) 974-2066
diane.pawlowicz@mdcourts.gov

ROXANNE P. MCKAGAN
Director, Administrative Services
(410) 260-1407 Fax: (410) 974-2066
rocky.mckagan@mdcourts.gov

DEBORAH A. UNITUS
Director, Program Services
2001D Commerce Park Drive
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 260-1291 Fax: (410) 260-3570
deborah.unitus@mdcourts.gov

Questions/Responses #2
Maryland Electronic Court Core Acquisition
RFP Project #K11-0030-29
September 30, 2010

Ladies and Gentlemen:

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

1. Question: In order to meet the requirements as an MBE, please clarify if a CA certified WBE satisfies the MBE requirements in the RFP?

Response: No, firms proposed to satisfy the MBE requirements in the RFP must be certified by the Maryland Department of Transportation in the services or commodities proposed to provide.

2. Question: Is there a proposal scoring advantage associated to an Oracle/AIX based solution? If yes, please describe and quantify the advantage assigned to an Oracle/AIX solution in the proposal scoring methodology.

Response: There is no scoring advantage associated to an Oracle/AIX based solution.

3. Question: Attachment D was released with the RFP. The RFP references Attachments D-1 and D-2. Please confirm that the two forms contained in "Attachment D" are the forms that are to be submitted. If not, please provide Attachments D-1 and D-2.

Response: The two Attachment D forms have been revised to read D-1 and D-2 and are incorporated into the RFP through Amendment #1.

4. Question: RFP Section 3.2, Page 62, if each section is clearly marked with the section number and page number, and is consecutively numbered within that section, will the Judiciary allow this to fulfill the requirement for consecutive numbering?

Response: Yes.

5. Question: RFP Section 3.1, page 62, the requirement does not specify what file format the technical proposal and the MSWord portions of the financial volume should be used for the CD. Are pdf versions acceptable?

Response: Yes.

6. Question: RFP Section 2 and Section 3, Section 3 outlines the format of the proposal but does not provide any guidance on whether offerors are to respond to RFP Section 2 Statement of Work within the response. Are offerors responses required to address each section of the Statement of Work? If so, would the Judiciary provide some guidance as to where responses to Section 2 should be incorporated?

Response: Please respond according to RFP Section 3.2 E – Technical Response to RFP Requirements. In addition, please see additional response requirement added to RFP Section 3.2 F – Offeror Experience and Capabilities through Amendment #1.

7. Question: RFP Section 2.5.4.3, page 43, do Offerors need to respond to the Local Data Conversion section and the requirements listed?

Response: Yes.

8. Question: If so, where?

Response: In Attachments L and M.

9. Question: Should this be included in the pricing?

Response: Yes, in Attachment M.

10. Question: Is it an optional to allow Offerors to leave it out or allow Offerors to put it in?

Response: Not optional.

11. Question: RFP Section 3.2.E.5, to assist in developing a solution architecture that aligns with existing infrastructure and platform preferences, please describe the existing Oracle database and Oracle Web Logic application server architecture/configuration including the following specifics:

- Server hardware
- Storage hardware
- Operating system(s) utilized
- Clustering /load balancing configuration

Response:

- **Server hardware – IBM POWER5 and POWER6 p570 servers**
- **Storage hardware – IBM N-Series (NetApp) storage units**
- **Operating system(s) utilized – AIX 6, 1 ML 6**
- **Clustering /load balancing configuration - The p570s are not clustered. Server redundancy is achieved using the Cisco 11503 content management switches / load balancers.**

The N-Series storage units are clustered using the clustering facilities that come with NetApp's Data ONTAP operating system, utilizing the fiber channel protocol (FCP).

12. Question: RFP Appendix I - Technical Requirements Matrix – Operating System Tab, the requirements indicate that the MDEC Core Application should support AIX 6.0 deployed in a virtual environment and also Windows 2008 R2 managed under VMware ESX v4 or later. Are either of these operating systems and virtualization technologies acceptable?

Response: Yes.

13. Question: RFP Appendix I – Technical Requirements Matrix – Performance Tab, please provide the following details regarding the use and volume of transactions and existing data as it relates to the Enterprise Content Management (ECM) system requirements:

The concurrent usage of the system is indicated as approximately 2,000 users initially. Can it be assumed that each of these 2,000 users may be performing functions requiring content storage and/or retrieval? If not, what percentage of concurrent users is anticipated to require this functionality?

Response: It can be assumed that 2,000 internal users will require document storage or retrieval functionality. Additionally, external users may retrieve documents as well. Regarding concurrent users, assume that up to 1,500 users can be actively storing or retrieving documents at the same time.

How many distinct geographic sites will require the ability to perform scanned document capture?

Response: All court locations.

What is the range of scan input volume for each site?

Response: Estimated volumes in number of pages per year:

Circuit Court

Dorchester	40,000	50,000
Somerset	30,000	40,000
Wicomico	90,000	110,000
Worcester	60,000	75,000
Caroline	30,000	40,000
Cecil	110,000	130,000
Kent	20,000	25,000
Queen Anne's	30,000	40,000
Talbot	30,000	40,000
Baltimore	450,000	500,000
Harford	200,000	230,000
Allegany	60,000	75,000
Garrett	20,000	25,000
Washington	140,000	160,000
Anne Arundel	340,000	375,000
Carroll	110,000	130,000
Howard	125,000	150,000
Frederick	150,000	175,000
Montgomery	600,000	675,000
Calvert	75,000	90,000
Charles	130,000	150,000
Prince George's	650,000	725,000
St. Mary's	75,000	90,000
Baltimore City	850,000	1,000,000

District Court

Dorchester	35,000	50,000
Somerset	35,000	50,000
Wicomico	100,000	125,000
Worcester	60,000	75,000
Caroline	25,000	35,000
Cecil	100,000	125,000
Kent	15,000	20,000
Queen Anne's	40,000	50,000
Talbot	40,000	50,000
Baltimore	800,000	950,000
Harford	125,000	150,000
Allegany	50,000	65,000
Garrett	35,000	50,000
Washington	100,000	125,000
Anne Arundel	340,000	375,000
Carroll	85,000	100,000
Howard	175,000	200,000
Frederick	140,000	160,000
Montgomery	600,000	675,000
Calvert	60,000	75,000
Charles	110,000	130,000
Prince George's	925,000	1,100,000
St. Mary's	60,000	75,000
Baltimore City	900,000	1,100,000

What is the estimated average number of documents that will be added to the system per month?

Response: Estimated 650,000 to 750,000.

Is there an existing scanning/imaging solution in place today? If so, how many search/retrieval operations are performed per month?

Response: Not for active cases; some scanning of District Court closed cases is performed.

Are there existing retention policies for electronic documents?

Response: Electronic document retention currently follows the same policies and schedules as paper documents

Are there existing scanned documents to be converted into the new ECM system? If so, please indicate how many and where they are stored.

Response: Conversion of existing scanned documents into the ECM system will be considered outside of the base scope of this initiative. Should assistance be required, it will be handled through the Optional Services component of this RFP.

14. Question: RFP Attachment C – Functional Requirements, instructions state that each requirement includes a list of sub-requirements that provide supporting detail. For each functional requirement highlighted in yellow, the Offeror must indicate one of the 6 responses in the column labeled “Response Code” for ALL worksheets in this workbook. The worksheet will automatically fill the response column for the detailed sub-requirements with the response provided in the main requirement highlighted in yellow. This seems to imply that Offerors have to respond the same way to each sub-requirement, which is problematic since Offerors will have to respond with “E” for alternative proposed to an inordinate number of the items with an explanation about the fact that the first one is really an “A”, the second is a “B”, the third is a “D” and the fourth is a “C”. That’s going to require a much larger amount of work and result in a response that is harder to evaluate. Is it possible to provide a revised spreadsheet that unlocks this capability so that Offerors can respond to each sub-requirement?

Response: RFP Attachment C – Functional Requirements has been modified to allow individual responses to each sub-requirement. It is modified through Amendment #1 to the RFP.