



# Administrative Office of the Courts

---

## Operations Division

### Questions/Responses No. 1 to the Request for Proposals (RFP) K21-0030-25U Problem Solving Court Technical Consultant

Ladies and Gentlemen:

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 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: What is the time duration for the actual project implementation?

Response: Refer to section 2.3.2 of the RFP.

2. Question: What technologies and/or other vendor system integrations platforms are currently in use that need to be analyzed?

Response: Maryland Electronic Courts (MDEC) is a single Judiciary-wide integrated case management system that will be used by all the courts in the state court system. Courts will be able to collect, store, and process records electronically, and will be able to access complete records instantly. For more information: <https://mdcourts.gov/mdec/about>.

The Statewide Maryland Automated Record Tracking (SMART) system is the current problem-solving court case management system. It is a web-based tool that provides a consent-driven client tracking system for state agencies and private treatment providers. Used by treatment providers and problem-solving courts as a management information system, SMART enables a comprehensive approach for collecting substance abuse treatment data, tracking drug court client services, and analyzing program data thereby monitoring and reporting on the performance and progress of treatment providers and problem-solving courts throughout the state. For more information: <https://www.igsr.umd.edu/SMART/>.

3. Question: Are the other supporting team members committed to the initial RFP work full time or on an as needed basis?

Response: As-needed basis.

4. Question: Who are the other project team members that will be supporting to put together the RFP for the actual implementation?

Response: Internal Maryland Administrative Office of the Courts staff members.

5. Question: What technical team and business SMEs from the state that will be involved to provide supporting details?  
Response: Refer to Question 4.
6. Question: Is the SME role of the Technical Consultant a remote position or on-site?  
Response: Both.
7. Question: What would the initial time period the Problem-Solving Court Technical Consultant will be engaged?  
Response: Refer to section 2.3.2 of the RFP.
8. Question: Is the AOC expecting a single award or a team of consultants for this engagement?  
Response: Yes
9. Question: Which agencies are included in the problem-solving court stakeholders?  
Response: Judges and other court staff, behavioral health treatment providers, State's Attorneys, Public Defenders/private attorneys, probation officers, and local law enforcement officers.
10. Question: How many individuals from the Judiciary's project team and the problem-solving court stakeholders?  
Response: Approximately 12-15 individuals.
11. Question: Is there an incumbent firm/Consultant for this project?  
Response: No.
12. Question: Does the AOC have a preferred consultant that they have consulted with during the buildout of this RFP?  
Response: No.
13. Does the AOC have any Rough Order Magnitude assessment of the effort estimate of each of these 5 deliverables?  
Response: The Judiciary has no information to share at this time.
14. Question: Since onsite presence will have a substantial impact on cost and at this point, it is hard to draw travel cost estimates. Is the agency willing to accept a price quote that included labor cost only? Travel cost to be billed as incurred. Due to the COVID impact, it is very hard to judge how often would the consultant need to be onsite in Annapolis.  
Response: No. Rates provided in the financial proposal must be all inclusive.
15. Question: As this is a relatively straight forward fixed price contract, is it still necessary to submit two (2) separate proposals (financial and technical)?  
Response: Yes.

16. Question: Regarding submission of electronic copies, it has been mentioned that thumb drives are acceptable but are SD cards acceptable as well?  
Response: Yes.
17. Question: Will documentation on the current system be provided upon contract award?  
Response: Yes.
18. Question: When awarded, will all meetings regarding the contract be scheduled, ad-hoc or a combination of both?  
Response: A combination of both.
19. Question: Will expenses (mileage, parking, metro) to attend in-person meetings be invoiceable?  
Response: No.
20. Question: I understand the contract is fixed fee, however as the number of hours are unknown would it suffice to submit within the proposal hourly rates?  
Response: Yes.
21. Question: As this contract is state-wide, will we be required to travel to courts throughout the state or will everything be facilitated at one location? And if required to visit courts, will invoicing for travel expenses be allowed?  
Response: One location.
22. Question: Can proposals be submitted via email?  
Response: No.
23. Question: Can companies outside of the USA apply?  
Response: Yes.
24. Question: Can tasks be performed outside of the USA?  
Response: For some tasks, yes.
25. Question: Is travel required for meetings?  
Response: For Phase 1, there will be travel requirements.
26. Question: Can vendors team with other cloud solution vendors?  
Response: Yes. Please refer to section 2.3.4 of the RFP
27. Question: Is this engagement advising or building out integrations?  
Response: Advising.
28. Question: Are there set hours?  
Response: No, Vendor can propose number of hours per week.

29. Question: Is ERP/CRm needed?

Response: No.

30. Question: What are the forms of submission?

Response: Refer to section 1.9 of the RFP

31. Question: What is the start date?

Response: The Judiciary desires to make an expeditious award, while allowing adequate time for a thorough evaluation process.

32. Question: Is it possible for the Liability Clause, (addressed in the Contract) amount to be decreased?

Response: Please refer to Section 1.20 and 3.4.4 of the RFP.

33. Question: Is this an on-site engagement?

Response: Not 100%, but for phase 1, on-site will be required. Refer to section 2.3.2 of the RFP.

34. Question: Who is currently maintaining the Problem-Solving Court case management system?

Response: University of Maryland, Institute for Governmental Studies and Research (IGSR)

35. Question: The current management information system (SMART/MIS) appears to have been initially created for substance abuse cases in Maryland problem solving courts (HATTS) and appears to still be focused on clinical health pertaining to substance abuse. Will the new MIS be used for similar purposes, or will its scope be broadened to encompass nonsubstance abuse cases?

Response: It is anticipated the new system will do both. It should be able to manage cases with substance use disorder but also manage cases with behavior health as well as other needs and issues.

36. Question: During the pre-bid conference, one of the reasons as to why a new MIS was needed was to integrate with other tools. Are there specific tools, that can be named to the public, that need to integrate with the new MIS?

Response: The new MIS may need to be integrated with risk and needs tools as well as other screening tools.

Issued by: Valerie L. Mitchell  
Procurement Officer  
6/4/2021