



LARRY HOGAN
Governor

BOYD K. RUTHERFORD
Lieutenant Governor

DAVID R. BRINKLEY
Secretary

MARC L. NICOLE
Deputy Secretary

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES # 1
PROJECT NO. 050B8400001
Statewide Foreign Language Interpretation and Translation Services
March 16th, 2017

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This List of Questions and Responses #1, questions #1 through #75, is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above named RFP. The statements and interpretations of contract requirements, which are stated in the following questions of potential Offerors, are not binding on the State, unless the State expressly amends the RFP. Nothing in the State's responses to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the vendor asking the question as to what the contract does or does not require. Any questions submitted in writing which are received after the issuance of this document, or which have already been submitted but do not appear on this list of questions and responses, will be answered in Questions and Responses #2.

1. May international companies propose? May contract services be performed outside the United States?

RESPONSE 1: International companies may propose and receive an award. However, several services requested by this RFP must be performed within the United States. (RFP Sections 2.3.1.1 and 2.5.1.2) In addition, certain data may not be transferred and/or stored outside the United States. (RFP Section 3.2.3.1(7)) All Offerors must also complete Attachment L: Location of the Performance of Services Disclosure, as part of submitting a complete Proposal. The State of Maryland considers the location from where an Offeror is to provide services as an Evaluation Factor. (RFP Section 5.4.5.6.3.)

2. Will the Contractors have to attend in-person meetings?

RESPONSE 2: Yes, the State may call in-person meetings with a Contractor during the course of this contract. Such meetings may be routine scheduled meetings or meetings called to address a specific issue or concern with Contractor performance. See also RFP Section 2.6.4.2.

3. Can a proposal be submitted via email?

RESPONSE 3: No. See RFP Sections 4.5 and 4.25.5 for detailed information on how to submit a proposal in response to this RFP.

4. Do you recognize Minority Business certification from other states? What if we aren't certified in Maryland?

RESPONSE 4: No. Only businesses certified as Minority Business Enterprises (MBE) by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) may be utilized to reach the Contract's minority subcontracting goals. Please see RFP Section 4.26.6 and <http://www.mdot.maryland.gov/newMDOT/MBE/CertificationForms/CertificationsForms.html> for more information.

5. *May a firm propose specifically for one of these services, or does the proposal have to be for all the services?*

RESPONSE 5: A vendor may propose to one, two, or all three service categories. A vendor does not have to propose to all three service categories. See RFP Sections 2.1.8, 2.1.9 and 4.9.

6. *Can MBE Prime contractors count themselves towards reaching the 10% MBE goal?*

RESPONSE 6: An MBE Prime contractor may use its own resources to fulfill up to 50% of the overall MBE participation goal so long as it is certified to provide the goods and services it proposes. This means that an MBE Prime could self-perform 5% of the overall 10% MBE participation goal and would be required to subcontract the remaining 5% to other MDOT certified MBEs or request a waiver if after making good faith outreach efforts it is unable to meet the balance of the goal. The MBE participation goal and self-performing percentage would apply to the total contract percentage commitment for each service category. See MBE Attachments D-1A, Part 1 Instructions and D-1B Waiver Guidance.

7. *Can an out of state vendor be certified as an MBE?*

RESPONSE 7: Yes, MDOT certifies in-State as well as out-of-State firms. The certification process is explained in detail on the MDOT website. <http://www.mdot.maryland.gov/newMDOT/MBE/Index.html> See also the response to Question #4.

8. *How did the State decide on a 10% goal?*

RESPONSE 8: The Procurement Review Group established the 10% MBE participation goal based upon guidelines from the Governor's Office of Small, Minority and Women Business Affairs (GOSBA) that included historical usage, a survey of available certified MBEs in the MDOT MBE directory, and the recognized subcontracting opportunities within the core services.

9. *Regarding the MBE and VSBE subcontracting participation goals, how will a responding firm not subcontracting any of the work under this contract be evaluated?*

RESPONSE 9: Responding firms are required to make a good faith effort to achieve the stated MBE and VSBE participation goals. If after making good faith efforts a responding firm is unable to meet the goal in full or in part, the offeror shall submit a request for a full or partial waiver with its proposal. If an Offeror fails to accurately complete and submit a MBE affidavit which includes the waiver request, and schedule for each Service Category with the Proposal as required, the Procurement Officer shall determine that the Proposal is not reasonably susceptible of being selected for award. If an Offeror fails to accurately complete and submit the VSBE affidavits and schedules for each Service Category with the Proposal as required, the Procurement Officer may determine that the Proposal is not reasonably susceptible of being selected for award. All good faith efforts must take place prior to proposal submission. Instructions for completing the waiver process for both MBE and VSBE participation goals can be found in the RFP, in sections 4.26 and Attachment D-1B, and section 4.27 and Attachment E-1, respectively.

10. *Since a source document page can vary widely in the amount of content, will you consider accepting written translation rates per word?*

RESPONSE 10: See Amendment #1, published March 7, 2018, that changed the written translation rates to per word instead of per page.

11. *What is the specific evaluation criteria and how are the factors weighted?*

RESPONSE 11: See section 6.2 of the RFP, titled "Evaluation and Selection Process, Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria". The criteria are listed in descending order of importance.

12. *Who are the incumbent vendors and what are their rates?*

RESPONSE 12: The current incumbent contractors are:
Telephonic Interpretation: Language Line Services
On Site Interpretation: Ad Astra, Inc.

Written Translation: Schreiber Translations, Inc.

Line item pricing is proprietary information and will not be released. Total proposed prices, as made public and published on Board of Public Works Agenda items during the approval of the current contract, are available on the DBM website at <http://dbm.maryland.gov/proc-contracts/Pages/contract-library/Services/Language2012.aspx>

13. Could you please clarify the definition of one page in Section 2.5.1.3 of this RFP (for example: what is a typical word count for a 8 ½ x 11” page; what is a typical word count for a 8 ½ x 14” page)?

RESPONSE 13: See Amendment #1, published March 7, 2018, that changed the written translation rates to per word instead of per page.

14. Some of the non-Latin-based or logossyllabic languages listed on page 9 of the RFP are not compatible with Times New Roman font. Please clarify if the use of other compatible fonts is allowed for these languages.

RESPONSE 14: If a language is incompatible with the Times New Roman font, other compatible fonts may be used.

15. Please define 1 (one) day turn around as within 24 hours from the request or within the same-day of the request. What is the time allowed for 1 (one) day turnaround?

RESPONSE 15: One day turnaround means within the 24 hour window from the time the request is made.

16. Please define 1 (one) week as business days or calendar days.

RESPONSE 16: As this is a 24/7 contract in which services must be Continuously Available (as defined in RFP Appendix I: Abbreviations and Definitions), all days are calendar days unless specifically labeled as Business Days.

17. Please clarify if the estimated quantities on the financial proposal forms are based on historical data.

RESPONSE 17: The estimated quantities and the financial model on the financial proposal forms are based broadly on historical data.

18. Section 2.1.9. states that a minimum of one (1) and maximum of three (3) awards may be made per service category. What is the likelihood that up to three (3) awards per service category will be made, and how would the actual work be distributed among multiple award recipients per service category?

RESPONSE 18: . Section 2.1.9 states “Offerors shall be able to provide all services and meet all of the requirements requested in this solicitation for a minimum of one (1) service category; telephonic interpretation, On-Site interpretation, and/or written document language translation. However, the same Offeror can be awarded a Contract for more than one service category. There will be a minimum of one (1) and a maximum of three (3) Contractors for all service categories.” emphasis added. There will be only one award per service category.

19. What is the estimated volume for expedited vs non-expedited in Service Category I and Service Category II?

RESPONSE 19: There is no expedited/non-expedited distinction in Service Category I. See Attachment B-3(B) for the relative frequency of routine expedited, and critical usage in Service Category II.

20. How can a bidder designate confidentiality of proprietary information within the proposal?

RESPONSE 20: See RFP section 5.4.2.2.

21. Do you have any historical data or volume based on languages and categorized by medical, legal, and general community requests? If so, will you be able to provide the data?

RESPONSE 21: The requested information is not available.

22. *Will you accept differential rates for Medical and Legal On-Site Interpreting Services?*

RESPONSE 22: No, the State will not accept differential rates for medical and legal onsite interpreting services.

23. *Will you accept after-hour rates for On-Site Interpreting Services?*

RESPONSE 23: No, the State will not accept after-hour rates for onsite interpreting services.

24. *Can the State provide some additional details on the expected training in sections 2.3.7, 2.4.8, and 2.5.5 ?*

RESPONSE 24: In its technical proposal response to RFP Sections 5.4.5.6.1 and 5.4.5.6.2, an Offeror should explain how its business trains and supervises its interpreters and translators and what certification it provides either nationally recognized or within its organization to ensure successful performance on the contract for each service category.

25. *Can you please elaborate on what you are looking for with the Interpreter/Translator Procedure Manual?*

RESPONSE 25: Per the RFP, the Procedure Manual is required only after an Offeror is notified that they have been selected for award and that award has been approved by the Board of Public Works. Please do not submit a Procedure Manual with your Technical Proposal.

26. *Please send a copy of the current contract.*

RESPONSE 26: Click the link in the Response to Question 12, above. A redacted copy of the contracts are viewable online.

27. *Will there be Desktop Publishing in the translation contract?*

RESPONSE 27: No, there will be no desktop publishing in the translation contract. Desktop publishing is outside the scope of this procurement.

28. *Will there be minimum charges in the translation contract?*

RESPONSE 28: No. Attachment B-3(C), Financial Proposal Form – Written Document Translation Services, as Amended in Amendment #1, published March 7, 2018, provides the allowable categories of rates for translation services.

29. *It is indicated that telephonic language interpretation will be billed in 1/10th of a minute after the first minute. Please clarify that telephonic language interpretation will be billed every 6 seconds after the first minute.*

RESPONSE 29: Yes, telephonic language interpretation will be billed every 6 seconds after the first minute.

30. *It is indicated that On-Site interpretation services after the first 2 (two) hours, will be billed in 1/10th of an hour increments. Please clarify that On-Site interpretation services will be billed every 6 minutes of an hour increments.*

RESPONSE 30: Yes, on-site interpretation services will be billed every 6 minutes after the first 2 hours.

31. *Are services under this RFP exclusive to one particular agency? If not, what are the agencies that can buy off the contract?*

RESPONSE 31: As a Statewide Contract, all State agencies can buy off the contract. , Maryland County, municipal, and other non-State of Maryland governments or government agencies and nonprofit entities within the State of Maryland may also purchase off the contract. See RFP section 2.1.3 for details.

32. *Will equipment for Simultaneous Interpretation Services be used at one designated location? Or will there be multiple sites?*

RESPONSE 32: Currently, only a single agency uses these services at its training facility. However, if

other agencies request this service, the equipment would have to go with the interpreters to the locations requested.

33. *Does a company need to be registered to do business in Maryland in order to respond to this RFP? If so, do they need to be registered at the time of submitting a proposal, or can they register at the time of award(s)?*

RESPONSE 33: It is strongly recommended that all Offerors be registered with the State Department of Assessments and Taxation at the time they submit a proposal, however a company is not required to be registered to do business in Maryland in order to submit a proposal to the RFP. See RFP section 4.21 for details.

34. *Does the simultaneous interpretation equipment need to be FM or infrared?*

RESPONSE 34: The State has no preference. In the technical proposal response to RFP Sections 5.4.5.6.1 and 5.4.5.6.2, the Offeror will advise and provide the State with a description of the type of portable interpretation system it proposes to utilize. The State does not have any equipment to be used as part of this service.

35. *Regarding Section 3.9.1, "a URL link to the Contractor's website where users are directly linked to the Contractor's services such as report generation, etc." what type of reports does the State of Maryland want available on-demand on-line versus monthly reports?*

RESPONSE 35: This optional item is in addition to and does not supersede or alter the reporting requirements of Section 2.7 of the RFP. The State would like to know what reporting an Offeror would have available on-line if using agencies/entities request reports. The State has no required reports available on-demand on-line at this time.

36. *Section 2.5.1.2.2 states: "Translators utilized from a foreign country are not acceptable unless the potential translator was raised within the U.S., or has spent significant recent time in this country and is directly knowledgeable regarding U.S.-domestic-culture." Please clarify this requirement.*

RESPONSE 36: The Contractor must be able to provide translators who understand American slang, colloquialisms, aphorisms, humor, idioms, metaphors, symbols, nuance, and concepts such as sarcasm that may be encountered in the course of their work so that the translation is culturally relevant, and conveys the writer's meaning and intention. A technically fluent translator with no first-hand exposure to American domestic culture may unknowingly mistranslate a document. This RFP requires cultural fluency in addition to technical competency.

37. *What have been the biggest challenges for fulfilling services under this contract, and what are the challenges that you anticipate?*

RESPONSE 37: The State declines to respond to this inquiry.

38. *As it is the case that there are providers based outside of the U.S. that have demonstrated experience translating documentation for U.S.-based LEP audiences and target markets, and these providers often offer a cost savings over those based in the U.S., will the State consider removing the requirement stipulated in 2.5.1.2?*

RESPONSE 38: No. The State declines to remove the requirement as stated in RFP Section 2.5.1.2.

39. *Regarding the Insurance Requirement listed in Section 3.1.4 for the Contractor to maintain Crime Insurance, will the State consider removing this requirement, since especially in the case of translation services, Contractor personnel will not be on-site at any State offices for the performance of services?*

RESPONSE 39: No. The State declines to remove the requirement as stated in RFP Section 3.1.4.

40. *Will the State allow for a minimum per project/per language charge for written translation requests?*

RESPONSE 40: No. The State will not allow for a minimum per project/per language charge for written translation requests. See Amendment #1, published March 7, 2018 that changed the written translation rates to per word instead of per page.

41. Cantonese and Mandarin languages listed on page 9 of the RFP are spoken forms of Chinese language. In regards to written translation services, which form of written Chinese language (Traditional or Simplified) will be required for this proposal?

RESPONSE 41: The Contractor is required to provide either form of written Chinese, depending upon the requesting agency/entity needs.

42. You provided historical telephonic usage in number of calls for the past five years. Can you provide the number of minutes (per month, per year, or total for five years) for each of your top five languages?

RESPONSE 42: The State's intent was to provide enough historical usage data to allow all Offerors to anticipate the amount of resources that it will need to allocate to fulfill the State's needs. This is offset by the State's desire not to put our incumbent Contractors at a competitive disadvantage by allowing other firms to "plug in" public information and discover proprietary information such as line item pricing. For that reason, the State declines to provide additional historical usage data.

43. Please clarify if the historical data for written translation is number of requests; if so, can you please provide number of documents and/or words (per year, for top five languages requested).

RESPONSE 43: Yes, the numbers displayed are the number of requests. Please see Response to Questions 42 for an explanation of why the State will not provide the number of documents or words.

44. The Historical Data Summary attachment is an excellent gauge of quantity of services, but could the State provide a breakdown of services by spending for past years in order for offerors estimate value of contract by service type?

RESPONSE 44: The State declines to provide this information. See Response to Questions 42.

45. Is it necessary to enter any bid values on eMaryland Marketplace, or only within the submitted bid response?

RESPONSE 45: Do not enter financial proposal values on eMaryland Marketplace (eMM). Offerors must submit a Financial Proposal form (RFP Attachment B, Amended) for each Service Category(ies) being proposed as directed in RFP Section 5.3.

46. May a Bidder submit for just one or two of the listed services, or must a Bidder bid on all three categories to be eligible?

RESPONSE 46: See RFP section 2.1.9 and the response to Question 5.

47. It looks like Appendix IV requires a Point of Contact Reference for every single language – core and non-core, for each type of service. Is listing a POC for every single language a requirement of the RFP? If so, how many different POCs are required? Could a company offer, for instance, three (3) POC references that cover all 25 core languages and all remaining non-core languages (up to 200 other languages)? Could the same references be used for different services if applicable?

RESPONSE 47: If a single previous customer or client can attest to your firm's experience in all Core Languages, then yes, that single customer's reference would be considered to encompass all Core Languages. References may overlap. For example, if you have 3 references that can verify your competency in all Core Languages those 3 references will suffice. Because each Offeror may provide a distinct list of Non-Core Languages and Additional Dialects, each of these should appear on Appendix IV, since the number of Non-Core Languages may differ between Offerors.

48. Per industry standards, translation pricing is most often provided in per-word units. Would the State be willing to revise the cost proposal to reflect per-word pricing rather than per-page pricing? If not, would the State please provide an anticipated average number of words per page?

RESPONSE 48: See Amendment #1, published March 7, 2018, that changed the written translation rates to per word instead of per page.

49. *Normally pricing is provided per word by language. Desktop Publishing (DTP/layout/formatting) is often an integral part of returning a perfect rendition and is normally priced by the hour. Pricing by the page is very difficult and may make pricing more expensive for the State as the vendor will have to consider worst case scenarios. Will you consider pricing by the word/language and by the hour for DTP per above?*

RESPONSE 49: See Amendment #1, published March 7, 2018, that changed the written translation rates to per word instead of per page. The State will not pay hourly pricing for desktop publishing services.

50. *Section 2.5.1.4 states that translation services will be reimbursed at the per page rates of the Source Language. However, sometimes it may be impractical to estimate the scope of translation in the source document where automated word counting functions are disabled, as may be the case with uneditable/scanned or hard copy documents. In these cases, would it be acceptable to use translated (target) document as the basis for reimbursement?*

RESPONSE 50: See Amendment #1, published March 7, 2018, that changed the written translation rates to per word instead of per page.

51. *For Service Category III (Written Translation), in Section 2.6.3.1 and the Financial Proposal Form, written translation pricing is stipulated “per page”; however, the industry standard for written translation pricing is typically charged “per word”. It is nearly impossible to price translation services by the page, as the amount of text can vary significantly with the type of document, e.g. a flyer vs. an instruction sheet. Therefore, will the State change the pricing to “per word” for written translations?*

RESPONSE 51: See Amendment #1, published March 7, 2018, that changed the written translation rates to per word instead of per page.

52. *We provide on-site interpretation services for all the core languages listed in the RFP, however, we haven’t gotten request for a couple of the languages from any of our customers in a long time. So I am afraid we may not be able to provide references for those in the technical part of our proposal. Is this something that will get our proposal automatically kicked out?*

RESPONSE 52: No, an Offeror will not be “kicked out” based solely on the absence of one or more references. Missing references will be evaluated as part of the Technical Evaluation, as references are considered part of an Offeror’s response to the work requirements of this contract. The proposal should explain why any references are missing from the response. Please see RFP section 6 for an explanation of how proposals will be evaluated.

53. *How many assignments were covered over the past 12 months under the current contract? What were the fill rates for these encounters?*

RESPONSE 53: The State declines to provide this information.

54. *What were the top five languages requested by the State in the past 12 months for onsite interpretation (OSI)?*

RESPONSE 54: The State declines to provide this information. Spanish is the single most commonly interpreted and translated language by a considerable margin. The Core Languages marked with an asterisk on pages 9 and 10 of the RFP are the most frequently requested languages, after Spanish.

55. *What are the rates for onsite interpreting that the State is currently paying?*

RESPONSE 55: Line item pricing for incumbent vendors will not be released. Detailed pricing information is confidential commercial information which, if disclosed, would damage the competitive position in the marketplace of the current contractor.

56. *Are there different rates based on language? If so, what are they?*

RESPONSE 56: Yes, see the Financial Proposal Form (Amended), Attachment B-3. Spanish is separately priced. Core and non-Core Languages are separately priced.

57. Does the State pay time differentials (short notice, weekends, emergency)? If so, what are those rates? What percentage of assignments are less than 24 hours' notice?

RESPONSE 57: See RFP sections 2.4, "On-Site Language Interpretation" and 2.5, "Written Document Language Translation" for a thorough and detailed explanation of how the State breaks down pricing into different categories based on certain timeframes.

58. Does the State pay mileage and travel time?

RESPONSE 58: See RFP sections 2.6.1.2, 2.6.2.4, 2.6.2.5, and 2.6.3.2.

59. By location, who were the top 10 departments & requestors of On-Site Interpretation Services? What are the annual volumes (hours) for onsite interpretation appointments by language and by location (or if not by location, by requesting department)?

RESPONSE 59: The State declines to provide this information. See response to Question 42, above.

60. Can you provide the names of the incumbent onsite interpretation providers and the rates you are paying and minimums (i.e. 2 hour minimum, etc.)?

RESPONSE 60: See the responses to Questions 12 and 55, above.

61. Please confirm if all incumbents are MBEs.

RESPONSE 61: None of the incumbent vendors are MBEs.

62. Translation is often performed 2-Step (translation and copy-edit) or 3-Step (includes a proofreading step.) Proofreading can be included in the price per word or as a separate, per hour service. Which do you prefer?

RESPONSE 62: No separate or additional services outside of those included on the Financial Proposal Form, Attachment B-3, as published in Amendment #1, will be paid for by the State. An Offeror may propose additional features or services beyond what the RFP requires as part of its Technical Proposal. In this instance, an Offeror may elect to include translation proofreading in the per word standard line item pricing. Whether to include additional services in its proposed pricing is a business decision that each individual Offeror must make, with the understanding that the State puts equal weight on the Technical Proposals and Financial Proposals, and then makes a "best value" decision that balances technical merit and price.

63. What kind of materials are normally translated? What kind of files? Is there a need for website translation/localization, multimedia, voiceovers, etc.? What kind of materials are included in the 2014-2016 list?

RESPONSE 63: The historical data summary for written document translation services includes all requests, Statewide. This means that different forms of media are all included in that data set. Requesting Agency/Entities may ask for different media sources to be translated into the written word.

64. Can we propose an electronic option for scheduling and confirming an interpreter's time for an on-site assignment vs. using a hard copy voucher?

RESPONSE 64: The State does not prohibit Offerors from proposing the use of any additional services beyond the RFP requirements. But the State expects all Contract Requirements to be met. This means that an Offeror may propose an electronic option in addition to using the State required hard copy, but not as a substitute for what the State requires in the RFP.

65. Would it be possible to get a breakdown of minutes used by language per month for 2017?

RESPONSE 65: See the response to Question 42, above.

66. *Are the subcontractors required to be MBE certified as well, or it can be subcontracted to any other type of certification holder company like a WOSB company.*

RESPONSE 66: Just to clarify, while MBEs are encouraged to submit proposals in response to the solicitation, there is no requirement that offerors be Maryland certified MBEs. Offerors may propose qualified Maryland certified MBE(s) from any of the designated categories to fulfill the MBE participation goal. Veteran-owned and Disabled Veteran-owned businesses will be considered to fulfill the VSBE participation goal. An offeror may propose other subcontractors that are not Maryland certified MBEs; however, those subcontractors may not be counted to fulfill the MBE participation goal for these contracts. Maryland does not recognize other states' or the Federal Government's MBE certification. In this example, a WOSB company that is not also a Maryland certified MBE could not be counted to fulfill the MBE participation goal. See also response to Question #4.

67. *Is there a simplified acquisition procedure applicable to this RFP?*

RESPONSE 67: The simplified acquisition process is specific to Federal Government contracting. The State of Maryland has no such program.

68. *Is there a page limit for proposals?*

RESPONSE 68: No, but the State requests that vendors meet the requirement of RFP Section 4.7, which asks for proposals to be prepared simply and economically, with a straightforward and concise approach including details where requested. That said, the State prefers an Offeror's response to work requirements in the RFP that illustrates a comprehensive understanding of work requirements and mastery of the subject matter, including an explanation of how the work will be done. Proposals which include limited responses to work requirements such as "concur" or "will comply" will receive a lower ranking than those Proposals that demonstrate an understanding of the work requirements and include plans to meet or exceed them. See RFP Section 6.2.1.

69. *May we summarize our financial statements?*

RESPONSE 69: An Offeror may submit summarized financial statements, so long as those statements provide enough information for State auditors to gauge the financial situation of the Offeror. Statements from entities that are not the Offeror itself, such as holding companies, parent companies, etc., do not provide the State with enough information to properly assess the financial situation of the Offeror. The State requests that only the financial statements of the entity that is seeking award be submitted with its Technical Proposal.

70. *Is there an incumbent vendor? If so, why is Maryland seeking new vendors?*

RESPONSE 70: The current FLITS contracts are for a five-year term. The State is conducting a new competitive procurement prior to the contracts' ending. See response to Question 12 for the list of incumbents.

71. *Will a list of all questions and answers from all bidding vendors pertaining to this RFP be provided?*

RESPONSE 71: Yes. Questions submitted from all interested parties that directly pertain to this RFP will be answered in writing, with those answers made public, provided those questions are received prior to March 27, 2018.

72. *Are you willing to consider an alternative to the Appendix-II On-site interpretation assignment sheet? Can we submit our own assignment voucher for the state of Maryland's approval?*

RESPONSE 72: See response to Question 64 above.

73. *Will Maryland provide parking reimbursement for OSI interpreters?*

RESPONSE 73: No. The State does not reimburse parking costs.

74. *If a vendor intends to bid on all three services, where should the extra information pertaining to each additional service be placed within the paper copy of the proposal?*

RESPONSE 74: The RFP describes which parts of the Technical Proposal require separate submissions for each Service Category, and which parts only need to be submitted once if an Offeror is proposing to two or three Service Categories. See RFP Sections 5.4.1 through 5.4.2.15, inclusive.

75. Regarding use of USA-based linguists (section 2.5.1.2), we are aware that this costs more than using vetted off-shore linguists. We understand the desired impact of doing this. However we have found that our process, of using a team of three linguists per project, as translator, copy editor, and proofreader, and keeping those linguistic teams consistent over long periods of time, enables us to provide a high degree of local usages and norms. Would this be acceptable to you?

RESPONSE 75: The Contract requirement in RFP Section 2.5.1.2 states that no documents may be sent outside the United States for translation. Any Proposal that proposes that documents will be sent outside the United States for translation will be viewed as an exception to the requirements of this Contract. Per RFP Section 5.4.2.4, exceptions to terms and conditions may result in having the Proposal deemed unacceptable or classified as not reasonably susceptible of being selected for award.

Remember proposals are due on April 6, 2018 no later than 2:00 p.m. If there are questions concerning this solicitation, please contact me via e-mail at christopher.hautala@maryland.gov or call me at (410) 260-4081.

Date Issued: 3/16/2018

By:
Chris Hautala
Procurement Officer