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
MARYLAND JUDICIAL CENTER
580 TAYLOR AVENUE
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21401

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
IT TRAINING SERVICES
PROJECT NUMBER K13-0057-29

Questions/Responses #1
March 26, 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: Is it the AOC's intention to award the contract and then make ad hoc requests during the contract period for candidates to fill training functions of specific duration (e.g., a system deployment) or does the AOC intend to engage the trainers from day 1 through the end of contract year?

   Response: The AOC plans to immediately hire two resources. If necessary, additional resources may be hired in the future as stated in the RFP.

2. Question: The Statement of Work covers a broad range of training activities and technical depth. When we propose our Labor Categories, would the AOC allow the offeror to propose multiple experience levels of trainers, for example, Junior, Mid and Senior with a different rate for each?

   Response: Yes, rates will be clarified through a Best and Final Offer if necessary.

3. Question: RFP Section 2.3.6 specifies a major in Education/Training in the areas of computer Science, Information Systems, Engineering, Business or other related scientific or technical discipline. By defining the major so narrowly, the AOC may be limiting the field to its disadvantage and excluding highly qualified and talented trainers with relevant degrees. May the offeror propose qualified candidates with degrees that provide a sound foundation of writing and other communication skills as long as they possess the requisite experience?

   Response: Yes, please refer to Amendment #1 to the RFP.

4. Question: RFP Attachment E – Price Proposals, directs the offeror to "Insert Proposed Labor Category for Year One, and Option Years One and Two." Is the Proposed Labor Category to be determined by the Offeror or is it an AOC specified labor category?

   Response: The labor category is to be proposed by the Offeror.

5. Can you please elaborate on your meaning that Offeror shall **briefly** address each RFP requirement in the Technical Proposal and describe how its proposed services will meet those requirements. This is from RFP Section 3.4.5.1. Is it your expectation that we would need to go through the RFP and write to each section separately or an overarching solution that meets the requirements?

   Response: An overarching solution that meets the requirements.

Susan Howells, Procurement Officer