ADDENDUM #1

RFP No. 252

TELEPHONIC INTERPRETATION SERVICES FOR OHIO COURTS

Date of Issuance: December 2, 2024

Response Due Date and Time:

January 13, 2025, at 12:00 p.m. (EST)

Addendum 1 - Vendor Questions and Clarifications Related to RFP #252:

QUESTION #1:

What has the expenditure on telephonic interpretation services been within the last 12 months or the calendar year?

ANSWER:

From January 1, 2024, through December 2, 2024 (date of RFP issuance), the total expenditure has been \$193,617.48.

OUESTION #2:

How much notice do you give your provider for telephonic interpretation requests?

ANSWER:

As per section 4.2 of the RFP, the Court expects an on-demand service available 24-hours a day, seven days a week. The vendor will be contacted when a Court has an immediate need.

QUESTION #3:

Do you have an incumbent vendor? If so, would you share their rates with us?

ANSWER:

The current vendor is LanguageLine Solutions. Rates are \$1.01 per minute for all languages.

QUESTION #4:

Please confirm only a single vendor will be awarded the contract.

ANSWER:

Confirmed.

QUESTION #5:

Have you exercised all renewal options with your existing provider(s)?

ANSWER:

The Court's agreement with the current vendor expires on June 30, 2025, with options to extend the contract for two additional one-year terms. The Court will relinquish the extension options and is seeking competitive bids for a new agreement.

QUESTION #6:

Why is the Court going out to RFP at this particular time?

ANSWER:

The Court's agreement with the current vendor expires on June 30, 2025, and we are seeking competitive bids for a new agreement.

QUESTION #7:

Can you please share your anticipated annual budget or historic spend under this contract?

ANSWER:

The Court does not wish to share the projected budget and would rather respondents provide their most competitive proposal. Please refer to the answer to Question #1 regarding historic spend.

QUESTION #8:

Per page 4, Section 4.2(b), we understand from the RFP that connect times are monitored by the Court. Can the Court please share the average connect times either by language (preferred) or in aggregate?

ANSWER:

The average connect time for all languages is 26.6 seconds.

QUESTION #9:

If there is a delay in posting answers to questions, will the Court consider extending the submission deadline by that same length of time?

ANSWER:

N/A. Response deadline remains January 13, 2025, by 12:00 p.m. (EST).

OUESTION #10:

Did the incumbent(s) cover every single assignment successfully?

ANSWER:

The current vendor was able to provide interpreters in every language that they listed.

OUESTION #11:

What challenges have you faced with a similar scope of work from vendors you worked with?

ANSWER:

In the past, main challenges have consisted of poor interpreting skills and occasional connectivity issues.

QUESTION #12:

Can we ask for a debriefing in case we are not awarded?

ANSWER:

The Court can accommodate a debriefing if requested.

QUESTION #13:

What is the average length of calls?

ANSWER:

In 2022, the average length of calls was 16 minutes and 46 seconds. In 2023, the average length of calls was 16 minutes and 36 seconds. Year to date in 2024, the average length of calls has been 16 minutes and 5 seconds.

QUESTION #14:

Which phone line will be served by the OPI interpreters? If there are multiple lines, please indicate just one for reference.

ANSWER:

Whichever line the vendor provides. The current vendor offers a toll-free number that taps into the general pool of interpreters, and an exclusive toll-free number that offers experience court interpreters.

QUESTION #15:

What will the delivery time be for language ID cards?

ANSWER:

On or before May 2, 2025.

QUESTION #16:

Do language ID cards need to comply with any specifications?

ANSWER:

The vendor may provide desk-reference cards, trifolds and/or posters. Specifications can be coordinated with the Court's Language Services office after award determination.

OUESTION #17:

Will the Court staff need to call other parties during a call?

ANSWER:

Not typically, but it may happen on rare occasions.

OUESTION #18:

Are minimums allowed? As in, charging a fixed minimum amount per call when the duration is below a certain threshold?

ANSWER:

The Court is seeking rates to be invoiced in one-minute increments for all services regardless of the length of the call.

QUESTION #19:

The RFP mentions the Court reaching out to references, but I could not find out how many/what type of references to submit? Also, would using the Court as a reference, if required, be an option?

ANSWER:

As per Section 5(a) of the RFP, the Court is seeking vendors with at least five years of experience in providing services similar to those being requested, preferably in a state or federal court system. While not a requirement, respondents can choose to list as many references as they wish that are within those guidelines as part of the response requirement outlined in Section 6.3(a). The Court may not serve as a reference.

[Remainder of this page intentionally left blank.]