



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

Questions/Responses #3
Enterprise Resource Planning Implementation
RFP Project #K10-0073-29
March 4, 2011

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

FAYE D. MATTHEWS
DEPUTY STATE COURT
ADMINISTRATOR
(410) 260-1257 Fax: (410) 974-2066
faye.matthews@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
(410) 260-3617 Fax: (410) 841-9850
gray.barton@mdcourts.gov

ROBERT BRUCHALSKI
Acting Executive Director
Judicial Information Systems
2661 Riva Road, Suite 900
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 260-1007 Fax: (410) 974-7170
robert.bruchalski@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

JESSICA PITTS
Executive Director
Emergency Mgmt. & Court Security
(410)260-3515 Fax: (410)260-3524

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

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. 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.

52. Question: The AOC's Standard Terms and Conditions contained in Attachment A contain some terms and conditions that bidders may not be able to agree to as written. Does the AOC's prohibition on bidders taking exception to these Standard Terms and Conditions disqualify bidders who offer alternative language to be used as the basis for good faith negotiation of a mutually acceptable contract?

Response: See RFP Section 1.23. The AOC will only consider exceptions raised prior to submission of proposals.

53. Question: Will the Grant Audit Process flow (GM_10) be provided?

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

54. Question: Will we be getting the process flows for Manual Invoice Submission (no #) and Electronic Invoice Submission (no #)?

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

55. Question: Is AP_2 missing from the process flows or was this intentionally dropped?

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

56. Question: Will we be getting a process flow diagram for Interface to State (GAD)?

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

57. Question: Will we be getting the process flows for HR Transactions/Transfers within AOC and HR Transactions/Transfers outside of the AOC?

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

58. Question: Was the elimination of process flow numbers ES_5e and ES_5f intentional or are some process flows missing?

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

59. Question: Should there be a process flow for "Performance Evaluation" as specified within the Appendix 16 narrative?

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

60. Question: Should there be a TR_3 process flow? TR3 is for cancelled/rescheduled.

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

61. Question: The process defined in the narrative called "Course Catalogue (schedule and description) does not appear to have a correlating business process flow, should there be one or does this equate to a different title process flow?

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

62. Question: Can the AOC validate that "Certificate Programs (application process through stipend awarded)" equates to "Training Session Maintenance/Completion Tracking/Certifications"?

Response: Yes

63. Question: Should there be a process flow for "Personalized Training Profile" as specified within the Appendix 17 narrative?

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

64. Question: Should there be a process flow for "Lending Library/Training Resources" as specified within the Appendix 17 narrative?

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

65. Question: Should there be a process flow for "Tuition Assistance" as specified within the Appendix 17 narrative?

Response: All available process flows have been included in the RFP material

66. Question: Where did the AOC intend for implementation of the PeopleSoft Human Resource modules to be included in the pricing tables?

Response: See Amended Price Sheet

67. Question: Table B through F appear to be similar except that Table B lacks the category "Developed Custom Functionality"; is this intentional?

Response: See Amended Price Sheet

68. Question: Requirements for Appendix 19 section ES-5h appear to be missing, are there any defined requirements for this process as depicted in Appendix 13, page 13.12.

Response: ES-5h is for termination and no specific requirements were done

69. Question: Can the State identify which process flows correspond to the list of requirement section headings?

Response: The process flows directly correlate to the process flows, with the exception of ES5e and ES5f, which relate to transfers in and out, as specified in Q#45-46.

70. Question: Should there be any requirements that correlate to the process flow titled "Payroll Distribution (Manual)", ID number FS_9?

Response: No. This process is no longer required.

71. Question: Requirement number GTI8.13 specifies "the vendor must provide software application help desk support 24 x7" which conflicts with the RFP section 2.6; can the State please identify which requirement should be complied with?

Response: Please comply with RFP Section 2.6

72. Question: Section 2.4.2 Systems Interfaces within the RFP mentions Oracle's Enterprise Service Bus stack and references Appendix 24, however, Oracle's Enterprise Service Bus is not documented in Appendix 24; can the State confirm that Oracle's Enterprise Service Bus is part of the JIS Enterprise Architecture?

Response: Oracle's Enterprise Service Bus is part of the JIS architecture and should be used in accordance with RFP section 2.4.3

73. Question: In table G, there appears to be an error in cell C16. Should there be parenthesis around the addition of the three composite rates?

Response: Corrected in amended price sheet

74. Question: In tables I through M, is it intended that bidders populate Column A and, if so, with what?

Response: See corrected price sheet

75. Question: What is the difference between “RFP Reference Section Number” and “Deliverable Reference ID Number”? Where should we indicate which deliverables table we are submitting the receipt form for?

Response: The AOC will revise the Acceptance Form as needed during contract performance

Additional Note to Response to Questions 38 and 39 (Q&A #2): Potential customization of software components should be identified in response to this RFP. Offerors are expected to form alliances with authorized eGrants and JobAps vendors to successfully achieve RFP deliverables as described and proposed. Access to software APIs or source code for the purposes of extending functionality to address custom needs of the Judiciary will be determined at a later date.

Additional Note to Response to Question 44: *grant-related data to be migrated* will need at least one audit cycle, so the estimate is 5-7 year of data.

Issued By: Gisela Blades, Procurement Officer