



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 #4
Maryland Electronic Court Core Acquisition
RFP Project #K11-0030-29
October 8, 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 price the eight data conversions called out in the RFP we will require the following:

- Their data dictionaries
- COBOL copy books and dump formats (if COBOL)
- Entity Relationship Diagrams/Data Definition Language ERDs/DDL (if Relational)

Will this data be made available in a timely manner so that a thorough conversion pricing analysis can be completed?

Response: As stated in RFP Section 2.5.4.3, JIS will provide the contractor with the data structures and dictionaries upon issuance of a Notice to Proceed. Offerors should estimate the conversion effort from past experience, the information provided on the number of data sources to be converted (See RFP Section 1.33.2.3) and knowledge of the target data structures.

In addition, District Court Criminal is missing from the list of applications provided in RFP Section 1.33.2.3 and is added through Amendment #3 to the RFP as follows:

- District Court Criminal – This database maintains data for all criminal cases heard in the District Court.
2. Question: It is understood from the RFP that JIS will be responsible for the implementation of web services between the SOA/ESB and end users. This leaves Offerors with the MDEC interface to the SOA/ESB. There is no place specifically identified in RFP Section 2.5 Required Services and Deliverables nor in the Deliverables Schedule (RFP Attachment L) that identifies the 18 automated interfaces between the MDEC and the JIS enterprise SOA as

discussed elsewhere in the RFP. The RFP declares that approximately half of the 18 listed interfaces exist in some form and are deployed on some of the legacy implementations. Also the RFP (for example in RFP Attachment H-6 page 8) states that “These (18) interfaces have been described in the Interoperability Plan”.

- Will the Interoperability Plan be provided?
- Will the interface specifications and WSDLs (if web services) be provided for the legacy inbound, outbound and bi-directional interfaces?
- Are the legacy data exchange interfaces NIEM2.1/ECF4.0 conforming?
- Which of the legacy interfaces is to be supported by MDEC for the interoperability demonstration? Will sample instances of these exchanges (cleansed of PII) be provided?
- Will specific interface deliverable artifacts be defined for the 18 standard interfaces such as operations schemas and WSDLs or FTP file transfer formats?
- Where in the price proposal will these deliverables be priced?
- In the absence of the above would it be acceptable for the MDEC Offeror to provide a native WSI conforming WSDL for each of the 18 data exchange interfaces called out in the RFP and a SOAPUI script that exercises each of these interfaces? From this exposed interface basis, JIS could then transform these exchange messages into/out of NIEM2.1/ECF4.0 for further SOA BPEL orchestration and/or Notification Service implementation across the judicial enterprise.

Response: The interfaces listed in the RFP were provided for the purpose of illustrating the data and events that will need to be exposed to the SOA/ESB. The creation of the interfaces / web services exchanges with systems or entities outside of the MDEC core will be the responsibility of JIS.

Any effort required to modify proposed software to expose transactions / events to the SOA/ESB should be included in the appropriate project deliverables. These deliverables may include, but are limited to the following section of the RFP:

- **RFP Section 2.5.2.2b – Requirements Gap Analysis**
- **RFP Section 2.5.2.3b – Requirements Traceability Matrix**
- **RFP Section 2.5.2.4 – MDEC Core System Design**
- **RFP Section 2.5.2.7 – MDEC Core Test Plan and Environment**
- **RFP Section 2.5.3.1 – Pilot MDEC Core System**

3. Question: RFP Attachment C ACC-104, several requirement descriptions say “see also Multifunction Capabilities...” However, a tab by that name does not exist. Please clarify where Multifunction Capabilities requirements are located within the RFP.

Response: References to Multifunction Capabilities should be ignored, the requirements were integrated into the full list, but some references were not removed.

4. Question: RFP Sections 2.5.3.1, 2.5.3.3 and 2.5.3.5, the Judiciary has indicated a copy of source code for contractor provided software licensed to the Judiciary shall be loaded on Judiciary servers. Custom developed software expressly for the Judiciary shall be delivered in source form as noted. Third party software that is licensed to the Judiciary is excluded from this obligation. If an Offeror is providing a COTS products as part of the solution and their policy is not to provide source code for those products, is this acceptable to the Judiciary? If so, can the source code requirement be clarified to reflect this?

Response: Yes. If the Offeror is providing a COTS product and their policy is not to offer the source code for purchase, it is not required that the source code be loaded on Judiciary servers.

5. Question: RFP Attachment I – Technical Requirements - SEC-002, please define host down mode?

Response: Ability to continue operations in the event of Server unavailability.

6. Question: RFP Attachment I – Technical Requirements – SEC-006, please clarify the nature of the roles referenced and provide an example.

Response: It is anticipated that access to application functions will be based on the nature of the roles performed by different users. For example, local configuration options may require a level of security provided for an administrative user as opposed to a clerk user. Similarly, some functions may be limited to management level users. These roles will be defined and managed through Oracle OID facilities.

7. Question: RFP Attachment I – Technical Requirements – CL-005, please clarify what is meant by “standalone” in this case.

Response: Capable of functioning in the event of Server or network unavailability.

8. Question: The RFP requirement to conform to ECF 4.0 at its core is an integration method that is standardized and repeatable allowing courts and contractors alike to develop applications capable of interacting with multiple external applications in a singular way for the purpose of e-filing. Considering this, would the AOC accept proposals for a portion of the scope of the RFP such as electronic filing?

Response: No, partial solutions will not be considered, Offerors must propose to meet all requirements of the RFP.

9. Question: Release 1 is supposed to include the results of lessons learned from the pilot implementation. For the results of this analysis to be properly designed, developed, and tested, the contractor will

have to determine a date certain that there is a complete list of items which will be added to Release 1. Does the Judiciary have a specific length of time in mind for the pilot to run before the Judiciary and contractor define those items?

Response: A period of 90 days is anticipated for the Pilot.

10. Question: RFP Attachment L defines the Counties that are included in the 11 prescribed rollouts. Can the Judiciary please explain the reasons, if there is a specific method, for defining the groupings of counties included in each of the 11 rollouts?

Response: A general analysis of court size, workload, and resource needs was used to combine jurisdictions in such a way as to balance the implementation workload across the rollout schedule.

11. Question: If possible, would the Judiciary be in favor of reducing the overall length of the project to less than six years?

Response: Yes, provided the approach is reasonable and consistent with the resources available from the Judiciary as presented in RFP Section 1.31.3.

12. Question: RFP Section 1.32.3 describes a list of 18 web services that will be drawn from or update the MDEC application. However, it is unclear in RFP Section 2, Statement of Work or in RFP Attachment L which deliverable should include those interfaces. Can you please clarify what specifically is required of the contractor for the development of these interfaces, and when they will be required, so that we can provide appropriate pricing.

Response: See response to Question #2 above.

13. Question: The RFP requires us to provide 10 years of support cost, a service which will have to be provided by the software provider. Can you confirm that the 35% MBE requirement is specific to the total amount of the software and services only?

Response: Confirmed, 35% MBE requirement is specific to the total amount of the software and services only.