



**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

VACANT
Executive Director
Procurement & Contract
Administration
(410) 260-1594 Fax: (410) 260-1749

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

December 18, 2009

Re: Solicitation No. K10-0083-29, E-Payment Consulting Services;
Amendment No. 1

Dear Interested Party:

The following consists of questions received in reference to RFP No. K10-0083-29, E-Payment Consulting Services and the Maryland Judiciary's response.

Q: Will the list of attendees of the pre-proposal conference be made public?

A: Yes, see below.

Charles K. Leadbetter III, Berry, Dunn, McNeil, & Parker

Michael J. Park, Opus Group, michael.park@opusgrouppllc.com

Valerie McLaughlin, Qualitax, val@qualitax.net

David Smith, MVS

Bob Bucceri, Chaddsford Planning Associates, LLC, bob.bucceri@chaddsfordplanning.com

Dawne Cohoon, Informatix Inc.

Danielle Marchese, ATS, daniellem@appliedtechnologyservices.com

Valencia Borders, Borders Solutions Group, vborders@borderssg.com

Q: What are the NAICS codes an MBE must be certified in to be eligible for this opportunity?

A: This information can only be provided once the prime contractor has selected the scope of work for the sub-contractor.

Q: Page 5, Section T (Minority Business Enterprises): Are we required to subcontract with MBEs that are certified in the State of Maryland or can we propose subcontractors that are certified by other states' MBE programs?

A: Prime contractors are required to subcontract only with MDOT certified firms.

Q: Page 5, Section T (Minority Business Enterprises): Please clarify whether this subcontracting requirement is limited to minority business enterprises or if proposers can subcontract to women-owned business enterprises, small business enterprises, or other disadvantaged business categories to meet his requirement.

A: The Maryland Judiciary does not have a small business enterprise program. The subcontracting requirement is limited to MDOT certified firms: women-owned, African American, economically disadvantaged groups, Hispanics, American Indians, Asians, and the Physically or Mentally Disabled.

Q: Paragraph T states “an MBE subcontract participation goal of Twenty percent (20%) of the total current amount has been established for this procurement.” Please explain how the amount of MBE participation affects a proposer’s evaluation score. Also, is there any type of advantage for an MBE to act as the prime contractor on this project, assuming the MBE would have 100% participation in the project, less any work that is subcontracted to non-MBE companies?

A: The MBE participation goal has no effect on the evaluation score. There is no advantage for a MBE prime contractor on any Judiciary contracts.

Q: Page 15 (Price Proposal Work Sheet): This Work Sheet indicates we should multiply an hourly rate times 1,800 to come up with an overall price. Is this Work Sheet applicable to this project?

- a. If so, should expenses associated with travel be built into our hourly rate or provided separately?
- b. If not, how does the Judiciary prefer to see project costs presented (e.g., firm fixed-fee, broken out by deliverable, etc.)?

A: a. Provided separately. In the past some proposals have indicated a not to exceed % of the services cost for travel. Others have provided an estimate based on a given amount of travel. The former approach is easier to manage throughout the contract period. In any case, travel costs need to be included in the total amount of the proposal so that an accurate amount of a PO can be cut.

b. The preference is to see the estimated project costs broken out by labor category, hourly rate, and estimated hours per deliverable. Many things happen during the course of a project that change the number of hours needed for a given deliverable, but having estimates per deliverable give the project manager a means of managing things. Here's an outline of what the project manager is looking for:

| Deliverable | Labor Category | Hourly Rate | Estimated Hours | Estimated Travel | Total Estimated Cost |
|---------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Deliverable A | Labor Category A | \$\$\$.\$\$ | 999 | \$\$\$.\$\$ | \$\$\$.\$\$ |
| Deliverable B | Labor Category A | \$\$\$.\$\$ | 999 | \$\$\$.\$\$ | \$\$\$.\$\$ |
| | Labor Category B | \$\$\$.\$\$ | 999 | \$\$\$.\$\$ | \$\$\$.\$\$ |
| | | | | | \$\$\$\$.\$ |

Q: Page 5, Section 2 (Assessment and Analysis): Since many of the current ePayment processes are non-existent or redundant at many court locations (both Circuit and District), can the Judiciary provide an estimated number of locations and staff that will participate in fact finding meetings and requirements gathering sessions? For example, will only a core representative team be involved or will each location (along with staff) be part of the process?

A: A core representative team will be used. The District Court processes are centrally managed and interface will only be needed with District Court Headquarters. A sample of Circuit Courts that currently take credit card payments will be sufficient - no more than 6.

Q: Page 7, Section 2 (Assessment and Analysis): Does the Judiciary have an estimated number of workflow diagrams that need to be developed?

- a. Does the Judiciary have a preferred method for how the diagrams are to be developed (e.g., swim lane)?
- b. Does the Judiciary require that “to-be” workflow diagrams be developed in addition to “as-is”?

A: a. The format of the workflow diagrams vary depending on the purpose. In this instance, it is best left to the respondent to recommend the best format to satisfy the goals of the engagement.

b. Again, this is an item that should be included in the respondents recommended approach to the engagement. To the degree that the respondent believes 'to-be' workflows are needed or desired to facilitate establishing a strategy and RFPs for products or services, it should be included.

Q: Page 8, Section 2 (ePayment Implementation Standards): Can the Judiciary expand on what is expected for Task #2 (“Develop interoperability standards associated with ePayment services to be provided to AOC to supplement the standards associated with JIS enterprise architecture”)?

A: The judicial Information Systems Department is pursuing a Service Oriented technical architecture that will utilize an Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) component to facilitate interoperability between functional components. The chosen solution for enterprise electronic payment will be required to be compatible with this architecture. The standards attendant to this compatibility will need to be identified as part of this engagement.

Q: Page 9, Section 2 (Vendor Evaluation and Selection Assistance): Does the Judiciary want the selected firm to be involved in the contract negotiation process with the ePayment vendor or will the Judiciary’s procurement department be responsible for all aspects of contract negotiations?

A: The Judiciary's Procurement and Legal counsel will be responsible for contract negotiations. The selected vendor for this engagement will act in an advisory capacity to Procurement only.

Q: II.1, page 6. The second paragraph states that “[a]ll work shall be performed at the Maryland Judiciary’s Judicial Information System’s (“JIS”) located at 2661 Riva Road, Annapolis, MD...” Does this mean that the consultant must be located full-time at that facility (with occasional travel to courts around the state), like a contract employee, or does it mean that the principal onsite location will be the JIS, although the consultant will be expected to travel to other locations? The Scope of Work outlined in the RFP will require a significant onsite presence; however, much of the work is better performed in the consultant’s home office where access to information and other resources is easier.

A: The principle onsite location will be JIS with travel as needed to court locations. It is anticipated that a great deal of interface will be needed with Judiciary parties and related state entities (Comptrollers, Treasury, State Bank, etc.). In this regard coordination of meetings required to gather or present information will be the responsibility of the selected vendor. The most productive arrangement to facilitate these needs should be a component of the vendor's response. The vendor will also be expected to be responsive to changes in Judiciary personnel availability due to work demands. To the degree that this will necessitate an onsite presence needs to be determined by the respondent.

Q: II.4, PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE. The contract will be 12 months from the “date of award.” For planning purposes, on what date (approximately) do you envision starting this?

A: On or about March 1, 2010.

These are the only changes contemplated by Amendment No. 1. All other terms and conditions are in full force and effect.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the Maryland Judiciary.

Sincerely,

Anna Pfeifer
Procurement Specialist

cc Procurement File