

**Office of Finance
Department of Procurement
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
45 W. Gude Drive, Suite 3100
Rockville, Maryland 20850**

September 14, 2026

NOTICE TO OFFERORS

The following are questions and responses regarding

RFP No. 9451.1, Interpretation System

No.	Question	Answer
1.	Could you provide information regarding your incumbent vendor and their current rates?	We do not have an incumbent vendor to supply the interpretation services the RFP seeks. We utilize TPTs (temporary part-time staff) to provide human interpretation, we also use Language Line. We are seeking an APP and device solution through the RFP
2.	Applicability of curriculum/assessment requirements (Sections 3.3.4.5–3.3.4.7, 3.3.8.2–3.3.8.5): Several specifications reference student performance dashboards against MCCRS learning objectives, formative/summative assessment reporting, Clever rostering, LTI 1.3 LMS gradebook synchronization, score export to Performance Matters Unify, and QTI 2.1 test items. These appear oriented to instructional-content and assessment products. Please confirm whether these requirements apply to an interpretation system, or whether they apply only to the extent a proposed solution includes student-facing instructional content.	Any responses that are not applicable to the responding system should be listed as Not Applicable.
3.	NIMAC coordination (Section 3.7): Section 3.7 requires NIMAS file set submission to the NIMAC. Because an interpretation system does not include published instructional materials, please confirm this section is not applicable to this procurement.	Likely not applicable, however see the answer 2.
4.	Reference to “private duty nurses” (Section 21.0): Section 21.0 states “the Contractor will ensure that all private duty nurses abide by the provisions of the	See Erratum/Addendum No.1 with the correction.

	MCPS General Contract Articles.” Please confirm whether this reference is applicable to this RFP.	“The Contractor will ensure that all staff abide by the provisions of the MCPS General Contract Articles”
5.	Interpreter certification standard for spoken languages (Section 3.2.2.1) Section 3.2.2.1 references a minimum score of 3.5 or higher on the Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment (EIPA). The EIPA evaluates educational sign language interpreters. For spoken-language interpreters, will MCPS accept equivalent spoken-language qualifications, such as state or federal court certification, medical interpreter certification (CCHI/NBCMI), documented language proficiency ratings, and documented K-12 educational interpreting experience?	Not applicable.
6.	Award structure by use case (Sections 1.0, 3.12): The RFP describes two primary use cases (large-scale events and one-on-one interpretation) and notes it may result in multiple awards. May offerors propose on one or both use cases, and will MCPS evaluate and award the use cases separately or as a single integrated award?	We are seeking solutions that support both use cases. i.e. an app may support a large event, a parent-teacher conference may be supported by a hand-held device.
7.0	Estimated volumes: To support usage-based pricing, can MCPS provide estimated annual volumes: (a) the number and typical size of large-scale events requiring interpretation; (b) estimated annual one-on-one interpretation sessions or minutes by modality (OPI/VRI); and (c) the district’s highest-demand languages?	Offerors should consider that we conduct 26 large High School graduations and numbers of community engagement events that may require an app or online solution that supports multiple languages to scores of people. Offerors should consider that one-on-one sessions may be unscheduled (example: a parent visit to a school front office) or a scheduled visit such as a parent teacher conference and offerors should reflect on the number of schools and size the student body enrollment of approximately 150,000.
8.0	Pricing Proposal format (Sections 3.1.5.3, 8.4): Does MCPS prefer a specific pricing format or template, e.g., per-minute usage pricing with not-to-exceed caps for AI-supported event services and per-minute rates for OPI/VRI one-on-one services? Is there a preferred structure for itemizing optional equipment, training, and professional development?	Offerors should reflect on their solutions but consider that caps to minutes, device capabilities cannot be a limitation to providing services. Essentially a device or an app that can be used on demand for the period of time necessary.

9.	Minority Business Enterprise form (Attachment C): Attachment C defines a minority business enterprise by minority-group ownership and separately provides a “Female” checkbox. Please confirm whether a certified woman-owned small business should mark “is” a minority business enterprise and check “Female” for purposes of this form.	Correct, mark you are a minority business enterprise and check Female too.
10.	Student data retention (Section 3.3.3.2): Section 3.3.3.2 requires retention of data for each individual student for a minimum of five years following account creation. An interpretation system minimizes student data and does not create student accounts. Please confirm the retention requirement applies to the interpretation service records actually collected (e.g., session records referencing a student meeting), rather than requiring creation of student accounts.	This requirement refers to any student records if created. There is no requirement to create student accounts unless necessary for system functionality.
11.	SOC 2 Type 2 report handling (Section 3.3.5.1): Please confirm that the SOC 2 Type 2 report may be submitted marked proprietary/confidential per Sections 10.0 and 11.0 and excluded from the redacted public copy.	Response from Tech: The SOC 2 Type 2 may be marked as proprietary/confidential and will be excluded from the redacted public copy. NOTE FOR PROCUREMENT: Please do not include the SOC 2 Type 2 with any public documents. Only the MCPS security team should review. The MCPS security team can provide a summary of if it is acceptable.
12.	Page limits and format: Is there a page limit for the technical response or the pricing proposal?	No.
13.	Are tabs/dividers required for the hard-copy original?	No.
14.	Can MCPS clarify whether the desired solution must include both automated/AI interpretation capabilities and access to qualified human interpreters, or whether offerors may propose a primarily human-interpreter model with technology-enabled delivery?	The intent is not to utilize human interpretation, but rather technical solutions add to our current human solutions.
15.	For large-scale meetings and events, can MCPS provide estimated annual usage volumes, including number of events, typical duration, expected attendee counts, and anticipated language demand?	See the answer 7.
16.	For one-on-one interpretation, can MCPS provide estimated monthly or annual volumes for OPI, VRI,	See the answer 7.

	and/or in-person interpretation by language, school/site, and service type?	
17.	Does MCPS expect the awarded vendor to provide only the interpretation platform/system, or also interpreter staffing, scheduling, monitoring, training, and ongoing operational support?	See the answer 14.
18.	Will MCPS consider multiple awards by service category, such as automated platform services, OPI/VRI services, large-event interpretation, and/or specialty languages?	Yes.
19.	Can MCPS identify the priority languages expected under this contract, including any low-incidence languages, ASL, indigenous languages, or languages requiring specialized educational terminology?	Not ASL, However the technical solution should support our 7 serviced languages (Amharic, Chinese, French, Korean, Spanish, Portuguese, Vietnamese). However a device or app should be able to address any language reported by families as the “language used at home” see the link https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1ZEZmwNXBnaDhJQQBh40Ffz7g26cXyreF/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=105167944393898882908&rtpof=true&sd=true
20.	Section 3.2.2.1 references EIPA scoring for K-12 settings. Does MCPS intend EIPA certification to apply only to sign language interpreters, or to all interpreters proposed under this contract?	No.
21.	For spoken-language interpreters, what minimum credentials, testing standards, or certifications will MCPS accept as equivalent evidence of interpreter qualification?	The solutions requested are not human, but device or app (AI) supported.
22.	Are interpreters required to complete MCPS-specific background checks before performing any remote services, or only before providing services on MCPS property or interacting with students in person?	The solutions requested are not human, but device or app (AI) supported.
23.	Can MCPS define the minimum acceptable performance thresholds for automated interpretation, including accuracy, latency, and quality standards by language or use case?	Offerors should include performance metrics in their application.
24.	Where automated interpretation is insufficient for legal, accessibility, special education, disciplinary, or sensitive meetings, should offerors include a required human interpreter escalation workflow in the base proposal?	Requested solutions will not be used for these types of situations.

25.	Can MCPS clarify whether AI-generated interpretation may be used for all meeting types, or whether certain contexts must be handled only by qualified human interpreters?	The solutions requested are not human, but device or app (AI) supported.
26.	For “human-in-the-loop” escalation, does MCPS require live interpreter handoff in real time, or is post-event review/support acceptable for certain use cases?	The solutions requested are not human, but device or app (AI) supported.
27.	Can MCPS clarify whether a SOC 2 Type 2 report is mandatory at proposal submission, or whether equivalent security documentation may be accepted?	Technology staff will have to answer this as I believe this is boilerplate RFP language concerning integration of enterprise systems.
28.	Will MCPS permit subcontracted technology providers or interpreter platforms if the prime contractor remains responsible for FERPA, HIPAA, encryption, data retention, and data deletion obligations?	This would require legal review, but I believe this is acceptable.
29.	Can MCPS clarify whether session audio, captions, transcripts, chat logs, metadata, or usage records may be stored, and if so, for what minimum and maximum retention periods?	More importantly, usage analytics would be required, transcripts and chat logs likely as well should a legal review be necessary. Retention periods can be negotiated.
30.	The RFP prohibits using MCPS data to train AI/LLM tools without written consent. Can MCPS confirm whether vendors may use de-identified operational metadata for service monitoring, reporting, or quality assurance if no student/personally identifiable information is retained?	MCPS data (including de-identified operational metadata) may not be used to train AI/LLM without consent. The Contractor may collect and use aggregated de-identified Confidential Information for the Contractor’s lawful quality assurance and for no other purpose; provided, however, that all direct and indirect personal identifiers are permanently removed and there is no reasonable basis to believe that the remaining information in the records can be used to successfully link the de-identified information to an identifiable individual or to MCPS. Furthermore, the Contractor agrees not to: (i) attempt to re-identify de-identified Confidential Information; and/or (ii) transfer de-identified Confidential Information to any party unless that party agrees not to attempt to re-identify the de-identified Confidential Information and unless MCPS has provided written express consent of the transfer.

31.	Does MCPS require all data to be hosted within the United States?	The Contractor shall not maintain or store Confidential Information outside of the United States. To the extent that the Contractor uses cloud computing services, all Confidential Information provided by MCPS or MCPS Users shall be securely stored with a commercially reasonable third-party vendor using physical servers located solely within the United States and subject to network security measures consistent with industry standards.
32.	Can MCPS identify the systems that the interpretation solution may need to integrate with, including LMS, SIS, Clever, SSO, Microsoft Teams, Zoom, Google Meet, or other district platforms?	I do not anticipate this type of integration. The RFP seeks an app, online or device interpretation support.
33.	Sections 3.3.8.4 and 3.3.8.5 reference LMS gradebook sync, assessment data, Performance Matters Unify, QTI files, and assessment exports. Are these requirements applicable to this interpretation-system procurement, or are they general digital-tool requirements that may not apply to interpretation services?	This section is intended to ascertain whether responding systems have LTI or similar functionality which would enable integration with MCPS core systems. Not Applicable is an appropriate answer.
34.	Can MCPS clarify whether the selected vendor is expected to provide districtwide user accounts for all staff, limited administrator accounts, or access on a per-request/per-event basis?	Ease of access, in the moment need and likely not account based.
35.	For large events, who is responsible for providing microphones, transmitters, headsets, onsite technical support, and network connectivity: MCPS, the vendor, or both?	Typically, MCPS staff provide technical AV support. Reminder— not seeking a human based solution. So no transmitters, headsets etc.
36.	Will MCPS provide sample event workflows or use cases so offerors can align implementation plans and pricing assumptions?	Should be discussed during a pre-bid conference.
37.	Should offerors provide pricing by usage minute, per event, per user/license, per language, per interpreter hour, or may vendors propose multiple pricing models?	See the answer 8, No human-based (interpreter hour) is being sought.
38.	Does MCPS prefer a not-to-exceed annual cap, tiered usage pricing, or fixed annual subscription pricing for platform-based services?	See answer 8.
39.	Should vendor-provided devices, if any, be priced separately from interpretation services and platform/software fees?	MCPS seeks device and app based services, no human-based services. We already have those solutions

40.	Can MCPS confirm whether pricing should include all training, implementation, onboarding, customer support, reporting, and account management costs?	Yes
41.	Can MCPS confirm that proposals must be submitted only by mail, courier, or hand delivery, and that no electronic submission will be accepted?	You must submit 1 original hard copy and 1 flash drive with 1 original and 1 redacted copy, no electronic submissions are accepted.
42.	For the required flash drive submission, should the redacted copy be provided as a separate file from the original proposal, and are there any required file naming conventions?	You have to create a separate folder named “Redacted Copy”
43.	If addenda or errata are issued, will MCPS post them only on the MCPS Event Calendar, or also through EMMA?	Both.
44.	Is MCPS seeking an established language services company that provides interpretation through its existing technology platform, or is MCPS seeking a software company to develop and implement a new interpretation-management system?	Existing solutions
45.	May a language services company submit a proposal using its existing platform and interpreter network, or does the scope require custom software development?	Existing solutions that do not utilize human-based systems
46.	Must one offeror provide both large-event AI interpretation and one-on-one human interpretation, or may offerors submit proposals for only one of the two use cases?	We are seeking technology solutions like an app or a device as described here and, in the RFP,—simplicity of access, use and not human-based
47.	Does MCPS anticipate making separate awards for the large-event AI solution and one-on-one human interpretation services?	Can but prefer a vendor that manages, controls both solutions (sub-contracting if necessary)
48.	Please provide MCPS’s estimated annual usage for the following services: ○ Over-the-phone interpretation ○ Video remote interpretation ○ Human remote simultaneous interpretation ○ AI interpretation ○ On-site interpretation, if included	We are seeking technology solutions such as an app or a device as described here and in the RFP—simplicity of access, use and not human-based. Anticipated use envisions events, community engagement meetings, small group meetings and one-on-one discussions. Not human-based.
49.	Please provide the anticipated language mix, including the highest-volume languages.	See the answer 19.
50.	How many large meetings or events does MCPS anticipate annually? Please provide the typical event duration, attendance, number of required languages, and delivery format, such as in-person, virtual, or hybrid.	See the answer 7.

51.	Does MCPS currently use an interpretation provider or interpretation platform? If so, can MCPS provide historical usage and spending information that offerors may use to prepare pricing?	See the answer 1.
52.	Does MCPS have an anticipated annual budget or not-to-exceed amount for this contract?	Not at this time.
53.	Should offerors develop their own pricing format, or will MCPS issue a pricing schedule? Please confirm the pricing categories MCPS wants offerors to include.	Offerors should present pricing structures. Reminder we are seeking an app, online, or device solutions
54.	Section 3.2.1.4 requires an average connection time of under 30 seconds. Does this requirement apply to every language individually or to the service overall?	A technology solution that is not human-based should provide immediate interpretation, therefore no reference to connection time should be a concern. Section 3.2.1.4 is likely not necessary.
55.	Section 3.2.2.1 references an Educational Interpreter Performance Assessment score of 3.5 or higher. Does this requirement apply only to sign-language interpreters, or does MCPS intend it to apply to spoken-language interpreters?	See the answer 5.
56.	Are on-site spoken-language interpretation and American Sign Language interpretation included in the requested scope, or is the one-on-one human interpretation scope limited to OPI and VRI?	No ASL, no human-based interpretation services are being sought.
57.	Sections 3.3.3.2 and 3.3.4.4 through 3.3.4.7 reference student accounts, student-performance data, assessments, teacher dashboards, skill gaps, and standards-mastery tracking. Are these requirements applicable to an interpretation system?	Not applicable.
58.	Are the Clever rostering, Student Information System, LTI 1.3, LMS gradebook, Performance Matters Unify, assessment-score, answer-key, and QTI 2.1 requirements in Section 3.3.8 applicable to this RFP?	This section is intended to ascertain whether responding systems have LTI or similar functionality which would enable integration with MCPS core systems. Not Applicable is an appropriate answer.
59.	Are the SCORM requirements in Section 3.3.10 and the NIMAS/NIMAC requirements in Section 3.7 applicable to the interpretation services and platform?	These requirements refer to support and Professional Development materials provided to the district. If a PD package is provided, will it be in a SCORM package that can be hosted in the MCPS LMS. Do your materials comply with IDEA?
60.	Section 3.3.5.7 references independent evaluations such as the Common Sense Privacy Seal or iKeepSafe. Are either of these certifications mandatory, or will a	MCPS technology office will need to respond to this question. May reflect needs associate with enterprise solutions.

	current SOC 2 Type II report and comparable security documentation satisfy this requirement?	To the extent that the Contract requires the Contractor to provide online or mobile services to MCPS that involve the collection, maintaining, or use of Confidential Information that includes Personally Identifiable Information regarding MCPS students, the Contractor warrants that it has signed-on to the K-12 School Service Provider Pledge to Safeguard Student Privacy (the “Student Privacy Pledge,” available at www.studentprivacypledge.org) and agrees to manage such Confidential Information in a manner consistent with the Student Privacy Pledge.
61.	Is HIPAA compliance required because MCPS anticipates the interpretation of protected health information, or is HIPAA listed as a general platform-security requirement?	The Contractor shall comply with all federal, state, and county laws and regulations applicable to the Contract regarding data collection, privacy, and security.
62.	Section 3.3.3.2 requires student data to remain in the system for at least five years after account creation and one year after graduation. Will interpretation-platform users require individual student accounts, or may the system operate through staff and school-level accounts without maintaining student profiles?	This requirement refers to any student records if created. There is no requirement to create student accounts unless necessary for system functionality.
63.	Section 3.3.2.2 states that MCPS must be able to disable a system modification for 365 days after release. Does this apply to all platform updates or only new AI features and other substantive modifications?	The district will have the option of disabling any system modification for 365 days from release. This is not just for AI.
64.	Attachment A references Executive Order 11246, which was revoked in January 2025. Should offerors complete Attachment A as written, or will MCPS issue an updated certification?	Complete Attachment A as written.
65.	Is MCPS recompeting an existing contract for these services, or is this the first time MCPS is procuring the services described in the Scope of Work?	This is a totally new RFP for this service.
66.	What specific languages is MCPS currently seeking interpretation support for under this RFP?	We are not limiting to a specific list. While MCPS supports (in house translation) of 7 specific languages. We support through language line and human-to-human TPT interpretation for any requested language. Families in MCPS speak about 170 different languages.

67.	Are there particular languages for which MCPS is experiencing the greatest need, shortage, or difficulty securing reliable coverage?	See answer 66.
68.	Is MCPS open to awarding contracts to multiple providers, including smaller providers that can offer strong coverage for selected languages rather than the district's full language portfolio?	We are seeking an AI powered online or app solution as well as a handheld device solution. Your questions seem to indicate a human-to-human situation.
69.	May a provider submit a proposal for specific languages only, or must each proposer demonstrate the ability to cover every language requested by MCPS?	See answer 66.
70.	Would MCPS consider a hybrid service model, with certain languages available for scheduled in person interpretation and a broader selection available virtually?	See answer 66.
71.	For in person services, are interpreters expected to cover all MCPS schools throughout Montgomery County, or may a proposer identify the geographic areas and languages it is able to serve?	This does not fit the request. See answer 66.
72.	Does MCPS anticipate primarily scheduled interpretation, on demand interpretation, or a combination of both?	See answer 66 – on demand through an app or device.
73.	What types of one on one interactions are expected to make up the greatest portion of the need, such as parent teacher conferences, enrollment meetings, family engagement meetings, IEP meetings, disciplinary meetings, or other school communications?	General discussions or event support. Higher need meetings (especially those with legal requirements) will be covered by our current TPT human-to-human services and are not part of this RFP.
74.	Are specific interpreter certifications, professional interpretation credentials, background checks, training requirements, or minimum experience levels required for each interpreter?	See answer 73.
75.	Is use of the proposed SaaS interpretation platform mandatory for every awarded provider, or could MCPS award a portion of the interpretation services to a provider that supplies qualified interpreters while utilizing an existing MCPS or partner technology environment?	SaaS or hand held device. No human-to-human services.
76.	Would MCPS permit a smaller interpretation provider to partner or subcontract with a technology company that provides the SaaS infrastructure while the language provider supplies interpreters?	See answer 66. Subcontracting is considered.
77.	Is there historical or estimated usage data available showing approximately how many interpretation requests or hours MCPS anticipates annually,	Minutes, numbers of calls, years etc. can be viewed here, however, not broken down by language. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-

	particularly by language and by in person versus virtual service?	Klgw-FR1yZSpXP9mFXjyqOMunr3nl5k/vi ew?usp=sharing
78.	Does MCPS intend to award a single or multiple vendors?	Single (preferred) or single with a subcontractor acceptable.
79.	The RFP references both human interpretation services and AI-enabled interpretation capabilities. If a proposer offers both options, how will MCPS evaluate and compare the respective human and AI components? Is there a preferred deployment model, or does MCPS intend to evaluate alternative approaches based on the overall best value provided?	Incorrect. See answer 66.
80.	Would MCPS consider amending the solicitation to permit vendors to identify and price optional training services separately from the base solution? While vendors may include standard user orientation and onboarding at no additional charge, more extensive administrator, train-the-trainer, custom workflow, or large-scale deployment training may require significant resources and would be more appropriately offered as optional services for MCPS's consideration.	No training services are requested.
81.	Expected usage and deployment size: Please provide anticipated quantities or estimates for the number of schools, authorized staff users, students, annual one-on-one sessions or minutes, large-scale events, simultaneous participants, concurrent language channels, and vendor-provided devices. If estimates are unavailable, please provide the pricing scenarios MCPS would like offerors to address.	Handheld devices for 211 schools (perhaps 5-6) per school. The app solution would be for large event or to be accessed as needed.
82.	Interpreter qualifications: Section 3.2.2.1 references a minimum EIPA score, which is generally associated with educational sign-language interpreting. Is that requirement intended only for ASL interpreters?	See answer 66—no human-to-human interpretation is requested.
83.	What certifications or proficiency standards does MCPS require for spoken-language interpreters?	See answer 82.
84.	Thirty-second connection target: Is the under-30-second connection time in Section 3.2.1.4 a mandatory service-level requirement for every requested language and modality, or an average performance target across the service?	As the solution is SaaS or handheld device there should be no connection time consideration.
85.	Hosting and deployment options: Is MCPS seeking a vendor-hosted SaaS solution exclusively, or would MCPS also consider or prefer deployment within an MCPS-controlled cloud environment or dedicated private tenant? If MCPS is	MCPS will consider the vendor proposed solution.

	interested in an MCPS-hosted or dedicated environment, please identify its preferred cloud infrastructure, security architecture, data-residency requirements, and division of responsibilities for hosting, backups, maintenance, monitoring, and product updates.	
86.	Go Live Time: In order to create a compliant plan and schedule for implementation, does MCPS have a desired Go-Live window relative to the award date of December?	Negotiable. Certainly prior to spring of 2027 (HS graduations).
87.	Because the RFP anticipates multiple awards and refers to experience in each vendor's selected service area, may an offeror propose for only one use case or subset of modalities, such as AI-supported large events, rather than providing every AI, VRI, OPI, and human consecutive interpretation service?	Yes.
88.	Please provide historical or forecast annual usage by modality, including OPI minutes, VRI minutes, human consecutive interpretation hours, AI interpretation minutes, number and average size of large events, highest-volume languages, and rare-language demand, together with any applicable annual not-to-exceed budget.	See answers 66 and 77.
89.	Please confirm whether the student assessment, performance dashboard, LMS gradebook synchronization, Performance Matters Unify, AKO PDF, and QTI 2.1 requirements in Sections 3.3.4 and 3.3.8 apply to interpretation-system vendors; if they apply, please describe the interpretation-related data and workflows MCPS expects these functions to support.	Not applicable.
90.	Must every awarded solution provide qualified human-interpreter escalation, and if so, what coverage hours, language availability, average and maximum connection-time SLAs, interpreter credential requirements, and service-level remedies will apply to OPI, VRI, and event interpretation?	See answers 66 and 84.
91.	Please identify the SIS, LMS, identity provider, and other systems in scope for initial implementation, and confirm whether a current SOC 2 Type II report and WCAG 2.1 AA Accessibility Conformance Report are mandatory at proposal submission for both the prime platform and all interpretation or AI subcontractors.	The vendor should provide support for the Clever single sign-on (SSO) and secure rostering platform, which is the district's preferred method for data synchronization. The vendor must be able to sync data using the LTI 1.3 or higher standard with the LMS. The vendor must provide a current SOC 2Type 2 report to verify

		the effectiveness of their security controls and commitment to data integrity and confidentiality over a sustained period. Contractor will ensure continued compliance with WCAG 2.1 Level AA. The Entity bears sole responsibility for determining the accessibility of such technology and must ensure that it can be edited or remediated as necessary to comply with accessibility standards.
92.	What was the annual spend or volume (or expected) for each contract year?	Negotiable.
93.	What challenges has MCPS encountered with its current approach to interpretation, or what challenges does MCPS anticipate under this contract?	High volume and therefore high cost as current solutions require human-to-human interpretation.
94.	Section 3.0 describes two distinct use cases. May an offeror propose on one use case only, and will MCPS evaluate and award the two use cases separately?	SaaS, app, or handheld device, essentially an on demand (online/app) service or a handheld device to provide immediate interpretation.
95.	Will this contract be a single or multiple award? If it is a multiple award, how will MCPS distribute work among the awarded vendors?	Work is on demand (see answers 94 and 81).
96.	Is there a required language list for this contract? What are the highest-volume languages by service type, and which languages must be available on demand rather than by scheduled appointment?	NO scheduled appointments. See answers 66 and 68.
97.	For large-scale events, approximately how many events per year should an offeror plan for, what is the typical attendee count, and how many target languages are typically required simultaneously at a single event?	Consider a graduation ceremony. 6000 people. 3-8 languages. 26 of those events. We should have the ability to offer the service for any community event we host. This could be 30-50 more per year (likely of smaller sizes).
98.	Section 3.1 references high-quality audio capture, including multi-directional and lapel microphones. Is venue audio equipment supplied by MCPS, or is the vendor responsible for supplying and pricing it?	Not applicable. Devices or solutions need to be able to hear amplified or spoken word.
99.	How do attendees receive interpretation at a large-scale event: on their own devices through a browser or application, through a dial-in line, or through receivers provided at the venue?	See answer 94.
100.	How much notice will MCPS typically provide for a large-scale event request, and how far in advance will	Some events are scheduled, scripts, agendas and terminology in advance is not needed as this on demand

	scripts, agendas, and terminology be made available for glossary preparation?	service is provided through an APP, SaaS or handheld device that hears spoken word.
101.	No pricing form is included with the solicitation. Does MCPS have a required pricing format?	No specific price format is required.

Saudy Espinal, Buyer II
Department of Procurement

Please indicate your receipt of this notice by signing below and returning with your proposal or under a separate cover.

Accepted: _____
Name and Title

Company Name: _____