



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
INTERNAL AFFAIRS
JUDICIAL COLLEGE OF MARYLAND
OPERATIONS
PROGRAMS

Questions/Responses No. 1 to the Request for Proposals (RFP) K18-0019-28 Web-Based Computer Assisted Legal Research

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The following questions for the above referenced RFP were received by the procurement officer 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 Maryland Judiciary unless the RFP is expressly amended. Nothing in the Maryland Judiciary's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the Maryland Judiciary of any statement or interpretation on the part of the Offeror asking the question.

1) Question: There are 1,000 total users for Functional Area I (see RFP Section 2.3.1, page 13). For pricing purposes we'd like additional clarification on these users. How many of them are "Professional Users"? Examples of these users are attorneys, judges, librarians, legislators, investigators or analysts who are employed by the agency. These are different from "Staff Support Users," such as paralegals, interns, law clerks, legal secretaries or other administrative staff, who receive complimentary access at no additional cost.

Response: The number of total users is approximate. Below is the breakdown of our current users: Judge: 39%, Attorney: 8%, Non-Attorney/Business Professional: 12%, Clerk: 31%, Librarian: 3%, Paralegal: 1%, Miscellaneous User Type: 6%

2) Question: Does the AOC/Judiciary expect Attachment F (Non-Disclosure Agreement) to cover search terms that users enter into the Computer Assisted Legal Research services?

Response: No. The Non-Disclosure Agreement does not cover search terms.

3) Question: Section 1. General Information, 1.17. Multiple or Alternate Proposals (page 9). The solicitation states that "Neither multiple nor alternate proposals will be accepted." May offerors offer price options that may be more effective in meeting the needs of the AOC's end users, and/or may result in overall cost savings to the AOC, provided that the price option(s) are contained in a single Proposal response?

Response: Multiple pricing options are not allowed under this RFP. Vendors should present the best solution to fit the requirements of this RFP. Vendors may include pricing for add-on (optional) services that are not required under the RFP, but may not propose two solutions.

4) Question: Section 1. General Information, 1.4 (page 6). Contract Duration. Please describe the notification process the AOC will utilize if it elects to extend the Contract for either or both of the optional renewal years?

Response: Contractor will receive written notification of the Judiciary's intent to renew within 30 days prior to contract expiration.

5) Question: Section 2. Statement of Work, 2.3.23, and 2.3.38 (pages 15 and 17). Section 2.3.38 appears to be a repetition of the search strategies and methods requested in section 2.3.23. If this section is duplicative, this Offeror respectfully requests the removal of section 2.3.38 in its entirety. If this section is not duplicative, can the AOC please clarify the reason for having these two very similar requirements?

Response: Section 2.3.23 refers to the full-text primary legal research listed in Sections 2.3.5 through 2.3.19, Section 2.3.38 refers to Section 2.3.36 - Public Access: “Contractor shall provide free, public access on the Contractor's webserver to searchable copies of:

- a. An up-to-date Maryland statutory code
- b. An up-to-date compilation of the Maryland Rules“

6) Question: Section 2. Statement of Work, 2.3.25, and 2.3.40 (pages 16 and 17). Section 2.3.40 appears to be a repetition of the search strategies and methods requested in section 2.3.25. If this section is duplicative, this Offeror respectfully requests the removal of section 2.3.40 in its entirety. If this section is not duplicative, can the AOC please clarify the reason for having these two very similar requirements?

Response: Section 2.3.25 refers to the full-text primary legal research listed in 2.3.5 through 2.3.19, Section 2.3.40 refers to Section 2.3.36 - Public Access: “Contractor shall provide free, public access on the Contractor's webserver to searchable copies of:

- a. An up-to-date Maryland statutory code
- b. An up-to-date compilation of the Maryland Rules“

7) Question: Section 3. Proposal Format, 3.2 Proposals, and 3.3 Submission (page 24). The solicitation provides instructions for submitting separately sealed packages for Volumes I and II of the proposal. It is this Offeror’s experience that shipping bid responses in multiple packages greatly increases the risk of lost, misplaced, or misdelivered packages. As such, would it be acceptable to the AOC if the Financial Proposal be packaged and sealed in a separate box that would then be inserted into a larger box that contained the Technical Proposal (e.g., sealed box inside a sealed box). This would then ensure that each Offeror’s response be contained in a single package for shipping efficiency, but would still maintain the integrity of the separate, sealed Financial Proposal. Please clarify.

Response: The Technical Proposal and Financial Proposal may be submitted in the same box provided that the Financial Proposal is separate, sealed and clearly marked.

8) Question: Section 3. Proposal Format, 3.4.5.4 Financial Capability and Insurance, and 3.4.5.6 Required Affidavits, Schedules and Documents to be submitted by Offerors in the Technical Proposal (page 26). Offerors are asked to include a copy of the current certificate of insurance in both sections 3.4.5.4 and 3.4.5.6. Can the AOC please clarify where Offerors are to include the certificate of insurance in the proposal?

Response: Certificate of Insurance is a separate document that can be sent with the proposal or separate envelope/ mailing.

Date Issued: January 12, 2018

Issued by: April Molley, Procurement Officer