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, 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

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) 974-2066
david.durfee@mdcourts.gov

SUSAN HOWELLS, Director
Procurement & Contract Admin.
(410) 260-1410 Fax: (410) 260-2520
susan.howells@mdcourts.gov

CONNIE KRATOVIL-LAVELLE, Director
Family Administration
(410) 260-1296 Fax: (410) 974-5577
connie.kratovil-lavelle@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

JESSICA PITTS, Director
Emergency Preparedness & Court Security
(410) 260-3515 Fax: (410) 260-2505
jessica.pitts@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
(410) 260-1291 Fax: (410) 260-3570
deborah.unitus@mdcourts.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACT ADM.
2003C COMMERCE PARK DRIVE
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT CONSULTING SERVICES
(MDEC)
PROJECT NUMBER K13-0063-29
Questions/Responses #1
May 14, 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: The Odyssey Assistant is a thick client application. The RFP does not talk about the technologies used for this client. For example, what protocols are used for communication between the client and server (we know we can encounter problems with WinSock services for example). Will we be able to properly interact with the client to both generate and execute load scripts through it?

    Response: TCP/IP is the communications protocol between the MDEC client and servers. The MDEC client is browser based with .NET extensions which will control/limit the degree of any interaction.

2. Question: RFP Section 2.1 states "The solution must also consider network workload from other Judiciary applications and systems, including existing legacy case management systems, enterprise videoconferencing, imaging, financial and human resource management (PeopleSoft) and electronic mail." While it is normal to factor current network load into a load testing scenario, is JIS expecting the Contractor to generate such loads in the test environment or will measured utilization levels be sufficient?

    Response: All testing will be performed in a controlled manner on the Judiciary's network.

3. Question: The same paragraph further states that "the MDEC performance testing capability should be usable by similar applications to the maximum possible extent." Once again, this statement can have a number of different meanings. For example, is JIS referring to the approach and tools being reusable or are they expecting the vendor to build a testing framework/harness that can be adapted to any application?

    Response: We are focused more on the potential reuse of the approach and associated tools.

4. Question: Is there a recommended or incumbent performance testing toolset to be used or can the bidder propose a tool as part of the solution? Should this be proposed as part of the proposal response or will this be a part of the deliverable for RFP Section 2.2.2 – Design, develop, document performance assessment.

    Response: There is no recommended/incumbent performance testing toolset.

5. Question: How many FTE's does JIS expect to be proposed?

    Response: It is the responsibility of the Offeror to determine how many resources should be proposed.

6. Question: Is Tyler Technologies eligible to bid on this RFP?

    Response: No.

7. Question: Will the source code be made available by Tyler Technologies?

    Response: No.

8. Question: At what stage is the roll-out in?

    Response: The roll-out has not started. The system is scheduled to be piloted in Anne Arundel County beginning in the second quarter of 2014.

9. Question: Will the system be developed and maintained at the Maryland facility or the Tyler Technologies facility?

    Response: The system is being developed primarily at the Tyler Technologies facility and will be maintained primarily at the same facility.

10. Question: MDEC Project Description RFP Section 2.1.2, where are the rest of the services hosted that are not located at the JIS Data Center?

    Response: All relevant services will be hosted in the JIS Data Center with the ability to failover to the UMBC Data Center in Catonsville.

11. Question: Is the secondary data center for failover capabilities operational?

    Response: Not at this time.

Susan Howells, Procurement Officer