



# ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

MARYLAND JUDICIAL CENTER  
580 TAYLOR AVENUE  
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

Pamela Harris, State Court Administrator  
410-260-1295

Questions/Responses No. 2 to the  
Request for Proposal (RFP) K15-0044-29  
ITSM Software as a Service

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 to 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 Offeror asking the question.

15. Question: What is the relative importance of Software License Management and Procurement functionality in the selected SaaS based IT Service Management solution? **Software License Management (not Procurement) is very important to us.**
16. Question: Would a vendor be disqualified from if they cannot meet all of the functional or demonstration requirements for Software Asset Management? **No, the evaluation team will decide which offering best meets the Judiciary's needs.**
17. The software we are positioning uses a concurrent license model, how many concurrent licenses would you suggest vendors that have this model propose? **100**
18. In the Responses to questions the first item asked about the due date and in your response you included the following "Response: June 8 – please see Addendum #1". We do not see Addendum #1 posted, can you please advise? **Posted**
19. On page 6 section 3.4.2 states an unbound original, to be labeled, and one electronic version shall be enclosed, however in section 3.4.1 the addenda states it does not need to be bound with the technical proposal. Please confirm do you want the original bound or unbound? **Bound**
20. On page 8 of the RFP you state Insurance should be included in section 3.4.5.4 but in section 3.4.5.6 you state to include a copy of Insurance which section would you prefer the Insurance to be inserted?
21. Could you clarify AOC'S answer for question #4. The initial verbal (and unbinding) response at the pre-conference was that the experience requirements could be met by the Offeror team and was not restricted to the prime. **We reverse the answer – we WILL allow team experience.**

Faye D. Matthews  
Deputy State Court Administrator  
410-260-1257

Mark Bittner  
Assistant Administrator  
Judicial Information Systems  
410-260-1001

Louis G. Gieszl  
Assistant Administrator  
Programs  
410-260-3547

Melinda K. Jensen, CPA  
Assistant Administrator  
Operations  
410-260-1240

Julie R. Linkins, Esq.  
Assistant Administrator  
Education  
410-260-3549

Kelley O'Connor  
Assistant Administrator  
Governmental Relations  
410-260-1560

Kathleen E. Wherthey, Esq.  
Assistant Administrator  
Internal Affairs  
410-260-3453

Issued by: Gisela Blades, Procurement Officer May 29, 2015