



**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 #5
Maryland Electronic Court Core Acquisition
RFP Project #K11-0030-29
October 22, 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: What is the total number of end-users to be trained?

Response: The number of internal Judiciary users to be trained is approximately 3,800.

2. Question: How many users will be trained at each location?

Response: The numbers below are approximate:

**Judges and Masters – 220
Allegany County – 50
Anne Arundel County – 300
Baltimore City – 750
Baltimore County – 350
Calvert County – 50
Caroline County – 25
Carroll County – 75
Cecil County – 75
Charles County – 75
Dorchester County – 40
Frederick County – 75
Garrett County – 25
Harford County – 100
Howard County – 100
Kent County – 20
Montgomery County – 400
Prince George's County – 425
Queen Anne's County – 35
Somerset County – 30
St. Mary's County – 50**

Talbot County – 30
Washington County – 75
Wicomico County – 75
Worcester County – 65

Court-Related Agencies / AOC / DCHQ – 115

Appellate Courts – 170

3. Question: The rollout activities (config, data conversion, training) in RFP Attachment L for Q8 include Howard, St. Mary's, and the Court of Appeals. However, the Pilot Deliverable described in RFP Section 2.5.3.1 states that the Court of Special Appeals and Court of Appeals should be included in the Pilot. Can you please clarify which deliverable should include Appeals Court operations?

Response: The Court of Special Appeals and the court of Appeals should be included in the Pilot phase.

4. Question: RFP Attachment I – Technical Requirements – AV-005, AV-007, AV-012, and AV-013; when referencing court MdEC Core Applications, does this refer to the courtroom specific applications or does it include the Case Management and other supporting applications as well?

Response: These requirements refer to the courtroom and clerk applications.

5. Question: Is the order of the 11 rollouts significant, or can the contractor suggest an alternative sequence, or overlapping rollouts?

Response: Yes, the order of the 11 rollouts is significant, and yes, Offerors can suggest changes. In addition, please see the response to Question #10 of Question/Response #4 dated October 8, 2010.

6. Question: For each of the Courts included in the 11 rollouts and the Pilot County, can Offerors get a count of users that will require training on the application?

Response: Please refer to response to Question 2 above.

7. Question: The price sheet tabs 2.5.4.2b, 2.5.4.3b, 2.5.4.4b, 2.5.4.5b, and 2.5.5.3b, which are for pricing the services in the quarterly

rollouts, only have one column for the price of this service. That amount is said to be evenly distributed and paid for across each quarter in the plan. However, the work for each rollout is not evenly distributed. The rollouts are structured with great variation in the number of users for each, the number of locations involved, and the number of systems that will be converted – therefore, the resources required and resulting price will be quite different for each rollout. Can the AOC provide a different pricing structure that is similar to how it is laid out in tab 2.5.5.3a, allowing the vendor to provide a more accurate distribution of the price for each quarter?

Response: A different pricing structure will not be provided. Offerors should enter an average price for each quarterly rollout. The purpose of the average is to provide an equal basis for comparison of the price proposals for evaluation and set the not-to-exceed amount for the award and resulting contract. Offerors may provide a separate schedule if they wish to receive progress payments for each rollout.

8. Question: Price Sheet tab 2.7 provides a list of labor categories. Can offerors add additional labor categories if necessary?

Response: No.

9. Question: Item 2.5.6.3 in the RFP describes the requirement for “On-Site Support (Post Pilot)”, which states that on-site support will be required for a period of one year after formal acceptance of each implementation. Item 2.5.4.5 also describes a requirement for two weeks of on-site support for each court location. Can you please confirm our interpretation that each local deployment should include 2 weeks of post go-live support (2.5.4.5), and there should be an additional support team (2.5.6.3) available in Annapolis during the implementations and for a period of one year after all courts have gone live.

Response: The interpretation is confirmed.

10. Question: In Attachment I, the definition for the affirmative response of “A-Currently Deployed” states that conformance must be proven through reference checks. There are some items in the matrix which our existing application can conform to, but is not necessarily deployed in that fashion at a customer site. There is no other response key which provides us with the ability to affirm a function exists. For those items that exist today, should we use the “A” response key, but provide a comment that clarifies this distinction.

Response: Yes.

TTY Users: 1-800-735-2258
www.mdcourts.gov