

## 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

SHARON SAMPSON BALL, Director Human Resources (410) 260-1283 Fax: (410) 974-2849 sharon.ball@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.kratovillavelle@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 #1
Odyssey-Compatible Redaction Software
RFP Project #K14-0013-29
September 18, 2013

To our prospective Business Partners:

The following questions for the above referenced RFP were received by e-mail and are answered and posted for all prospective Offerors. 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 provide pricing can you provide volume of pages that are anticipated to be processed for redaction in a year?

Response: We really have no idea how many pages there are. We can provide the number of cases per year and the fact that the average number of filings in a case (see schedule below) but not how many pages per filing.

2) Question: Is there any projection on growth rate of images/pages to be processed for future years?

Response: This would be based on the rollout schedule.

3) Question: The RFP states that the software shall be able to create both a redacted and non-redacted version of the image (2.2 #7). The "non-redacted" image is essentially a conversion of whatever the input format is into a searchable PDF?

Response: All this refers to is that we don't want to lose the un-redacted version of the document, we want a second version of the original document that is redacted. The redacted version should be a searchable PDF.

4) What are the input formats expected to be processed? TIFF, PDF images, etc...?

Response: All documents being scanned by the clerks or coming in through efiling will be automatically converted to a searchable PDF by the MDEC system.

5) Question: For input of TIFF and PDF image files, is the image DPI 300 or something else?

Response: For F&S we can't control the resolution of what is being submitted. For images scanned in the court, the standard is 300 dpi. We will set the scanners to 300dpi but a user could change the setting.

The software should be able to redact scanned PDF as well as smart PDF's.

6) Section 1 – General Information, 1.1 states, "... Offerors to provide Odyssey compatible software to be used in the redaction of legal records...". In addition, Section 2 – Statement of Work, 2.2 (2) Mandatory Requirements states "Proven experience integrating with Tyler Technology's Odyssey case management suite of products". Please reconsider this as a non-mandatory preference rather than a requirement.

Response: See Amendment #1 - We are going to amend the RFP to make this a preference but not a mandatory requirement.

7) In section 1.4 the contract duration is six months with two optional one-month renewals. Typically a redaction integration is a long term relationship with a court, can you please explain the reason for the short contract duration?

Response: We made the assumption that the software would be configurable and that some of our IT staff could be trained to add redaction items as legislation changes. If our assumption is not correct then we need to know that. We thought it would take 6 months to install and configure the software initially. We may amend the RFP to reflect additional requirements.

8) What is the estimated annual volume of day-forward image pages that will be redacted by the Maryland Judiciary?

Response: All we would really be able to tell you is how many cases are filled in a year, case files vary by case type so we really couldn't predict the number or size of images that we would have.

9) Is the Maryland Judiciary able to estimate how many historical image pages may need to be redacted?

Response: Maryland's plan is to have all open cases filed into the system as each case file is touched. We would be putting this policy in place as each new county goes live on MDEC.

10) We understand the Anne Arundel is the first court scheduled to go live in March of 2014. Do you have a rollout schedule for the remaining counties? Will the Maryland Judiciary want counties to have access to the redaction solution prior to going live with MDEC or will they remain paper-based courts up to the time they implement MDEC?

Response: -Anne Arundel County is scheduled to go live in the spring of 2014, which would include the Court of Appeals and Court of Special Appeals.

- -6 months later we plan on moving to the 5 counties in the Upper Eastern Shore (Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne's, Caroline and Talbot).
- 6 months later we would be in the Lower Eastern Shore (Dorchester, Wicomico, Somerset, Worcester).
- By the fall of 2015 we would be in Baltimore County.
- -The schedule from that point isn't finalized but we would be doing groups of counties on a 3 month basis from that point on.

## **FY12 Case Filing Numbers**

	•		
Judiciary wide filings	2,056,603	Average # of filings per case 5 4 4	
Court of Appeals	767 1,916 283,869		
Court of Special Appeals			
Circuit Court			
District Court	1,770,051	4	
Anne Arundel County		Traffic*	L/T**
Circuit Court	23,159		
District Court	110,858	37,625	34,536
Upper Eastern Shore		Traffic	L/T
Circuit Court	15,635		
District Court	75,145	47,033	7,143
Lower Eastern Shore		Traffic	L/T
Circuit Court	15,672		
District Court	83,190	40,158	14,233
Baltimore County		Traffic	L/T
Circuit Court	32,466		

Issued By Gisela Blades, September 18,2013

**District Court** 



70,356

300,888

152,750

<sup>\*</sup>Most traffic cases are e-citations which consist of just 1 - 1 page document per case

<sup>\*\*</sup>L/T (Landlord Tenant) Cases generally consists of 1 - 1 page document per case.