



**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 #3
May 21, 2013**

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

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: Does the State anticipate the following activities a part of the performance testing activity?

Response:

- a. Fail-over testing by simulating components failure in the primary data center – yes, fail-over testing of MDEC components in the primary (JIS) data center.
- b. DR center testing – we will test the DR center to understand the performance of the scaled back Disaster Recovery Center – DR center (UMBC) testing for only the MDEC database server.

2. Question: Can you confirm that this is this out of scope - other Judiciary applications and systems, including existing legacy case management systems, enterprise videoconferencing, imaging, financial and human resource management (PeopleSoft) and electronic mail.

Response: The MDEC performance assessment will be conducted on the production network which also hosts these other applications. These systems must be factored into the assessment.

3. Question: Is there a phased rollout plan for the application? Is it based on locations or is it based on scope of functionality? Can it be shared with the offerors?

Response: Rollout is based on location. The MDEC system will be deployed statewide, which the assessment should consider.

4. Question: Can you provide the context for the 3 iterations of testing? Are the 3 iterations part of a phased roll-out or are they

specified to iron out potential performance bottlenecks found in the previous iterations?

Response: The context, which is to assess the performance of the version of the application that is being tested, is the same for all testing iterations. The 3 (optional) iterations will iron out potential performance bottlenecks. The context, which is to assess the performance of the version of the application that is being tested, is the same for all testing iterations.

5. Question: Will the state provide the testing hardware to generate load and monitoring/analyzing results? We understand that we will bring the software to test and profile the application.

Response: Include any performance assessment hardware requirements beyond what you can provide in your response to the RFP.

6. Question: How long does it typically take to provision a server or install a new server in the MDJIS data center?

Response: It varies depending on the size and complexity of the server priority of the need for the server.

7. Question: We will need to work with systems administrators to install software on servers (or VM's). What is the process to do this? Will there be dedicated resources from JIS that will work with us to accomplish these tasks?

Response: JIS resources will be made available to accomplish these tasks.

8. Question: The RFP requires the first assessment is to be run no later than September 30, 2013. Is this an actual production deployment? If so, what is the scope of deployment? If not, what is the expected scope of the initial assessment?

Response: The first assessment will be of the latest available version of the MDEC application software at that time.

9. Question: What environment will the testing be done in (Dedicated test environment or future production environment)?

Response: Future production environment.

10. Question: Detailed Scope – What are the modules/components of Odyssey that are being deployed and how do these align with the deployment phases/plan?

Response: The deployment is not phased. All modules listed will be deployed for a location.

Case Manager
File & Serve
Financial Manager
Public Access
SessionWorks for Judges
Payment Manager

11. Question: Does JIS expect offerors to propose and price all four iterations of Performance testing in this T&M proposal (first 90 days included).

Response: Yes.

12. Question: Since the first 90 days will reveal information that is relevant for the duration of the project, will JIS accept a revised proposal at the end of the 90 days to continue work with a proposed scope of effort, deliverables and appropriate staff?" Alternatively, does JIS want a T&M proposal that would cover all resources on an FTE basis for the two year period of time.

Response: Within 90 days the Contractor will be tasked with an assessment that will (likely) result in areas for improvement, pointed out in the Contractor's recommendations for improvement (Deliverable 2.2.5). Deliverable 2.6 (knowledge transfer) should be straightforward to resource. Optional deliverable 2.6 is a repeat of 2.3 and should be easy to identify needed resources up front. If what the Contractor is recommending in 2.2.5 is valid and requires support beyond the resources originally proposed (to perhaps implement the recommendations), a contract modification may be necessary and would be best method to handle this situation. This would also apply during the assessment, i.e., the scope of which exceeds what was anticipated. It is difficult to determine if resources will be required full-time for the entire two year period which is why the determination was made to make this a time and material contractual arrangement.

Susan Howells, Procurement Officer