

**Pre-Proposal Conference Meeting Notes from November 13, 2012 for  
RFP No. K13-0038-28 – Web-Based Computer Assisted Legal Research**

Meeting began at 9:30 A.M. and concluded at approximately 11:00 A.M.

Attendance: Kelly Moore, Procurement Officer, Administrative Office of the Courts  
James G. Durham, Deputy Director, Maryland State Law Library  
Mary Jo Lazun, Head of Electronic Services, Maryland State Law Library  
Sara Marks, Fiscal Services Coordinator, Maryland State Law Library  
Peter Sherman, Account Manager, LexisNexis  
Scott Smothers, Regional Field Manger, Thomson Reuters (West)  
Dave Whitaker, Sales Consultant, Thomson Reuters (West)

Location: Administrative Office of the Courts  
Procurement and Contract Administration Conference Room  
2003 C Commerce Park Drive  
Annapolis, MD 21404

After initial introductions, Kelly Moore stated that any questions for the RFP should be addressed solely to her. Offerors are specifically directed NOT to contact any Judiciary personnel or its contracted consultants for meetings, conferences, or discussions that are specifically related to this RFP at any time prior to any award and execution of a contract. Unauthorized contact with any Judiciary personnel or the Judiciary's contracted consultants may be cause for rejection of the Offeror's proposal.

Prospective Offerors should be mindful of the due date of Tuesday December 4<sup>th</sup> 12:00 noon – and that questions submitted the week of the due date will not allow for adequate response time. Prospective Offerors were also reminded that contacting any other involved party could result in their proposal being rejected.

As the RFP was reviewed, Prospective Offerors were invited to ask questions and/or make comments.

*Particular areas of note:*

1.28 – It is the intention of the AOC that the award(s) resulting from this RFP will extend to other Non-State Governments or Agencies, in particular the county funded Circuit Courts in Maryland.

Prospective Offerors must submit: a transmittal letter, 1 (one) original bound proposal plus 9 (nine) copies plus an electronic version in MS Word (omit Excel from 3.2.2 & 3.5.1), a Proposal Affidavit – Attachment B, as provided, Attachments D; and/or E; and/or F.

Question: Is Functional Area III (section 2.7) solely dependent on Functional area II (section 2.5)?

Response: Not necessarily, though the Administrative Office of the Courts will definitely procure for the 8 patron stations.

Note: The Confidentiality Agreement (provided) supersedes the Non-Disclosure Agreement -Attachment G.

Note: During the evaluation process - the Technical Proposal will be completed first and holds greater weight than the Financial Proposal.

Question: How many WiFi log-ins should be quoted?

Response: Prospective Offerors should quote for a range of 5-10 wireless users.

Note: Thomson Reuters now has the capability of “log-in sharing” between static IP Patron stations and wireless users. Thomson Reuters is seeing a pattern on more WiFi than static, and some discussion ensued regarding the ability to modify the contract in regard to Functional Area II – 8 patron stations. Kelly Moore responded the AOC does not foresee this being an issue during the initial 3 three-year base period of the contract, but a modification could be made at the optional renewal year(s) if necessary.

Question: Provide further clarification on section 1.28.

Response: It is the intention of the AOC that the award(s) resulting from this RFP will extend to other Non-State Governments or Agencies, in particular the county funded Circuit Courts in Maryland.

Question: Can vendors propose on one or all of the Functional Areas?

Response: Yes.

Question: How does the agency determine if optional years are exercised?

Response: Any variety of factors: service quality, change in RFP content, budgetary restraints.

Question: Would offering a trial to the evaluation committee members be beneficial to the procurement process?

Response: This isn't possible because there is no guarantee that fair and equitable testing of the product can be completed by each of the 9 committee members.

Mary Jo Lazun requested that particular attention be paid to the back-end user component during oral presentations. Kelly Moore instructed that an Addendum might be posted with these requests if it is deemed so appropriate.