Addendum No. 3
Document Redaction Software
Project No. K22-0046-29

02/24/2022

The purpose of this addendum is to amend and clarify certain portions of the above-referenced solicitation with all prospective bidders/offerors.

Questions:

Q67. Based on responses to Q.56 and Q.57 the combined estimated annual volume is approximately 42M pages, but if you combine the pilot and all counties/cities from Attachment E it is less than 21M pages. That makes a difference when allocating resources for processing. Should we use 21M or 42M pages?

A67. Offerors shall use the page counts as listed on Attachment E – Bid/Price Proposal Form Revision 1.

Q68. The one-time crawl of 178M pages will require significant processing resources. Does the Judiciary have a timeframe for when you want that completed? Are you planning to have staff verify suspect images for a 178M page backfile?

A68. The Judiciary does not have a hard timeframe at this point. It is expected that this would be done in pieces by court, but this has not been defined at this time. Yes, Judiciary staff shall verify the redaction of the backfiles.

Q69. If I understand C.5 and C.8 you want a price for a complete rollout minus the pilot, but want to pay as you rollout. Does the judiciary have a desired or planned rollout timetable?

A69. The Judiciary will use internal resources to complete the rollout following the pilot. C.5 and C.8 are included to allow the AOC to understand how much the annual license fees will increase over time as additional counties are implemented.

Q70. Can you clarify what the Judiciary intended with C.7? Is it solely to be used for adding additional users?

A70. C.7 added the ability to provide pricing for available license types and per license/user pricing. Depending on the Offeror's pricing structure, lines 20-25 may not be applicable (e.g., your firm provides pricing by page count only, and does not charge user licensing fees).

Q71. Not providing more clarification on number of concurrent Odyssey users, or estimated redaction users makes it difficult to determine resources required for a Web Server. Should we make assumptions/estimates based on our experience implementing redaction with other courts, or should we price a web server to handle 4,500 users? Even though most will never use?

A71. Offerors shall use 1,500 concurrent Odyssey users as a basis for web server resources.

Q72. Does JIS have documentation on the Enterprise Service Bus they can provide to vendors?

A72. The Enterprise Service Bus will have API calls that would be made to send and retrieve data to Odyssey. The integration will still be with API calls. The Judiciary cannot release the specifics as part of the RFP process but will make the actual mechanics available to the Successful Offeror.

Q73. Regarding the OCR process, is it expected that we use Tyler's OCR result to work with our solution or can the solution run its own OCR process as it receives the documents?

A73. Prospective Offerors shall use the existing Tyler's OCR result.

Q74. We understand that the Judiciary highly desires a cloud-based solution. If the solution could yield better results being installed on-premises, would the Judiciary be open to an on-premise solution proposal just the same as a cloud based one?

A74.   A cloud-based solution is highly desirable, but not mandatory. Evaluation of Offeror proposed solutions will be based on the criteria outlined in RFP Section V.B.

All addenda will be incorporated into the final contract documents and will be binding on all bidders/offerors responding to this solicitation. Each bidder/offeror submitting a bid/proposal must acknowledge receipt of all addenda by completing and forwarding Attachment H (included in bid/proposal package) with the bid/proposal response; failure to acknowledge addenda may result in the bid/proposal rejection.

If you have any questions regarding this addendum, please contact me at (410) 260-1421 or email me at lauren.sands@mdcourts.gov

Procurement Officer