

**SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA
OFFICE OF THE JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATOR
SUPREME COURT DRUG COURT OFFICE**

Proposal No. LASC-DC001

**Request for Proposals (RFP)
for
Drug Court Case Management System
Upgrades and Improvements**

- I. Purpose
- II. Background
- III. Submission of Proposals
- IV. Pre-proposal Conference
- V. Timetable for Proposals
- VI. Scope of Services
- VII. Contents of the Proposal
- VIII. Evaluation Criteria
- IX. Errors and Omissions in Proposal
- X. Disqualification
- XI. Oral or Written Discussions
- XII. Contract Award and Execution
- XIII. Public Nature of Prospective Contract
- XIV. Court Discretion
- XV. Changes, Addenda, or Withdrawal of Proposals
- XVI. Cost of Preparing Proposals
- XVII. Audit of Records
- XVIII. Record Retention
- XIX. Billing and Payments

**SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA
OFFICE OF THE JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATOR
SUPREME COURT DRUG COURT OFFICE**

Proposal No. LASC-DC001

**Request for Proposals
for
Drug Court Case Management System
Upgrade and Improvements**

I. Purpose

The Supreme Court of Louisiana’s Judicial Administrator’s Office (hereinafter the “Administrator”) invites qualified vendors to submit proposals for providing a system upgrade and improvements to the Supreme Court’s web-based Drug Court Case Management system (DCCM).

II. Background

The DCCM was deployed in 2003 for use in adult and juvenile drug courts around the State. The DCCM is an ASP.NET web-based application with a SQL 2005 database server that serves as the primary case management and data collection tool for all 45 of the State’s drug court programs. The DCCM is designed to support the monitoring, research, and evaluation activities of the Supreme Court Drug Court Office (SCDCO). The need currently exists to engage a vendor to upgrade and improve the DCCM.

III. Submission of Proposals

Proposals must be received by 10:00 AM CST on June 25, 2008 at the address below.

Scott Griffith
Deputy Judicial Administrator
Louisiana Supreme Court
Supreme Court Drug Court Office
1555 Poydras Street, Ste. 1550
New Orleans, LA 70112

Proposals received after this deadline will not be considered. All envelopes containing a proposal must bear the name of the entity making the proposal, and must have the following clearly written or typed on the face of the envelope: “Proposal for DCCM Upgrade and Improvements.” No faxed or e-mailed submissions will be accepted.

All questions relative to this RFP should be directed to Scott Griffith, Deputy Judicial Administrator and not to any other person at the Supreme Court. Mr. Griffith may be reached at (504) 568-2025 or sgriffith@lajao.org.

IV. Pre-proposal Conference

A Pre-proposal Conference will be held Wednesday, May 14, 2008 at 10:00am CST, Louisiana Supreme Court, 4th Floor Conference Room, 400 Royal Street, New Orleans, LA 70130. Prospective proposers may participate in the conference to obtain clarification of the requirements of the RFP and to receive answers to questions they may have about the project. Any firm intending to submit a proposal should have at least one duly authorized representative attend the conference. Individuals planning on attending the conference should notify Scott Griffith in advance of their intention to participate using the Registration Form on the last page of this RFP.

Although impromptu questions will be permitted and spontaneous answers will be provided during the Conference, the Court's official answers to any questions will only be provided in written form in response to written questions. All questions to which an official response is sought must be in writing and received by 5:00 on the date indicated in the Timeline for Proposals section of this RFP. Questions can be submitted by mail, fax or e-mail. Mailed questions must be postmarked by the date indicated in the Timeline for Proposals section of this RFP. Written questions and answers will be posted on the Louisiana Supreme Court's website (www.lasc.org).

Since the information made available during the written question and answer process may raise additional questions, the Administrator may provide for an additional inquiry period. Details regarding an additional inquiry period will be posted on the Court's website.

V. Timetable for Proposals

A. Issue date of RFP	April 30, 2008
B. Pre-proposal Conference	May 14, 2008
C. Deadline for submitting written questions	May 21, 2008
D. Proposal submission deadline	June 25, 2008

The Administrator reserves the right to amend this timetable as it deems necessary.

VI. Scope of Services

The desired improvements to the DCCM are outlined in the attached Drug Court Case Management System Design Specifications document (Attachment A). The enhanced system will be compatible with SQL Server versions 2005 and 2008.

All programming must conform to best practices for secure coding and is subject to code review. All code, including source code, will become the property of the Court and code versioning will be tracked on Microsoft Team Foundation Server hosted by the Louisiana Supreme Court Judicial Administrator's Office.

A copy of the application and database will be provided to interested vendors upon execution of a non-disclosure agreement. A non-disclosure agreement is incorporated into this RFP as Attachment B. A signed original non-disclosure agreement must be received by the administrator before the database and application will be released.

VII. Contents of the Proposal

Proposals must contain all of the following information:

- A. An overview of the firm's business operations, including:
 1. a brief history of the firm
 2. a description of the firm's organizational structure
 3. a summary of the types of clients with whom the firm has worked during the last three years to include the nature of the work performed for these clients
 4. the location and address of the office where project staff will be housed and from where the project will be directed.
- B. A summary of the firm's training and experience with regard to projects such as the one described in this RFP.
- C. References from at least two of the firm's clients for whom work was performed which is similar to that described in this RFP. The references should include the name of a contact person, his/her title, physical and e-mail addresses, and telephone numbers. The Administrator may but is not obligated to contact these clients.
- D. The name(s) of the person(s) who will be authorized to make representations for the firm, their titles, physical and e-mail addresses, and telephone and fax numbers.
- E. Contact and other information on those individuals who would be assigned to work with the SCDCO on the proposed project, including a description of their experience in providing services to clients whose needs were similar to those described in this RFP.
- F. A summary of the firm's strategy for achieving the desired upgrades and improvements as outlined in Attachment A.
- G. A detailed description of how the following components will feature in the proposed strategy:
 1. project staffing
 2. project staff accessibility
 3. project tasks and deliverables
 4. project timeline
 5. product development
 6. project progress reporting
 7. product testing
 8. product deployment and installation
 9. user training
 10. product support
 11. warranties
- H. A summary cost proposal identifying total projected costs.
- I. A detailed cost proposal indicating the costs associated with the following project components:

1. product development
2. product testing
3. product deployment and installation
4. user training
5. product support

(Please note that all anticipated expenses must be incorporated into the cost proposal. There will be no reimbursement for travel, meals, telephone, photocopying or other expenses.)

- J. The firm's financial statements for the past 3 years.
- K. Applicable insurance declarations pertinent to the work to be performed for the Court as referenced in the attached sample contract (Attachment C).
- L. A description of any facilities, equipment, staff, or other resources the firm expects the Administrator to provide.
- M. Certification that the firm has permission to use and deploy all code used in the project and that the firm will not deploy any copyrighted code into the application unless the firm provides proof of permission to use it.
- N. Brand and version of all developments tools used to write, compile and deploy the application.

VIII. Evaluation Criteria

The following factors will be considered in selecting a vendor for the job:

- A. The vendor's experience, qualifications and success in developing, enhancing, and supporting web-based case management applications.
 1. Considerations:
 - a. Does the vendor appear on the basis of prior work and/or training to be qualified to perform the work being requested? (The focus here is on the development/enhancement/support nature of the services to be provided.)
 - b. Has the vendor ever developed a web-based case management system?
 - c. If so, was the system similar to the DCCM in terms of complexity, functionality and deployment?
 - d. Has the vendor ever enhanced an existing application?
 - e. If so, were the enhancements similar in scope to those being requested?
 - f. Has the vendor ever had experience supporting a web-based case management system?
 - g. If so, does the nature and structure of the support relationship appear to have been satisfactory/successful/economical?
 - h. Does the vendor have any experience in the development, enhancement or support of a web-based drug court case management system?
 - i. Does the vendor have experience in developing, enhancing, and supporting web-based case management applications in a setting in

which the application must be able to complement other applications? (The focus here is on the nature of the environment in which the work needs to be undertaken and the interface between the DCCM and other applications.)

- j. Do references (if any) support the vendor's suitability for the proposed project?

2. Point value: 30 points

B. The clarity, detail and responsiveness of the vendor's strategy for providing DCCM upgrade and improvement services.

1. Considerations:

- a. Has the vendor proposed a clear, specific, reasonable and responsive approach to the project that is likely to meet expectations as outlined in the System Design Specifications Document?

- b. Is the proposed approach clear, specific, reasonable and responsive with regard to the following?

- 1. project staffing
- 2. project staff accessibility
- 3. tasks and deliverables
- 4. project timeline
- 5. product development
- 6. project progress reporting
- 7. product testing
- 8. product deployment and installation
- 9. user training
- 10. product support
- 11. warranties

- c. Does the vendor's proposed timeline for project activities reflect all key steps?

2. Point value: 40 points

C. The vendor's cost proposal.

1. Considerations:

- a. Has the vendor provided sufficient detail regarding costs associated with the following?

- 1. project administration
- 2. product development
- 3. product testing
- 4. product deployment and installation
- 5. user training
- 6. product support

- b. Does it appear that costs for all aspects of the project have been included in the cost proposal?

- c. Does the total cost for the proposed project relate positively to the services and product to be provided?

2. Point value: 30 points

An Advisory Committee may be impaneled to assist the Administrator in the selection of a vendor; however, the Administrator has sole authority to select a vendor for the project.

IX. Errors and Omissions in Proposal

The Administrator will not be liable for any error in any proposal. Proposer will not be allowed to alter proposal documents after the deadline for proposal submission, except under the following condition: The Administrator reserves the right to make corrections or clarifications due to patent errors identified in the proposals by the Administrator or the proposer. The Administrator has the right to request clarification or additional information from the proposer.

X. Disqualification

The deployment of software on this project to which the vendor does not have rights to deploy will result in disqualification.

The Administrator reserves the right to verify all information provided by a proposer via direct contact with the proposer's prior clients. The proposer and any prior project personnel must agree to provide the necessary authorizations for the Administrator to verify any of the proposer's previous work. Misstatements of experience and scope of prior projects shall be grounds for disqualification of the proposer from further consideration.

XI. Oral or Written Discussions

Written or oral discussions may be conducted with one or more of the most qualified proposers. If written and/or oral discussions are held, the Administrator will schedule a time and place for the oral or written discussions. Each proposer should be prepared to discuss and substantiate any of the areas of the proposal it submitted, its own qualifications for the services requested, and any other area of inquiry relative to its proposal.

The Administrator reserves the right to select a vendor based upon the proposals alone without additional written or oral discussions.

XII. Contract Award and Execution

The Administrator reserves the right to enter into a contract without further discussion of the proposal based on the content of the proposals submitted.

In no event is a proposer to submit its own standard contract terms and conditions in response to this RFP. Proposers are advised that the Administrator intends to negotiate terms and enter into a contract involving provisions similar to those included in the attached sample contract (Attachment B).

XIII. Public Nature of Prospective Contract

All proposals submitted in response to this RFP, and any contract which might ultimately be agreed upon, will be open to public inspection by any interested person, firm or corporation. Trade secrets or other proprietary information submitted by a proposer as part of its RFP may not be subject to public disclosure, provided the proposer specifies the relevant law supporting its request for confidentiality. However, the proposer must invoke the protections of this section prior to or upon submission of its proposal, must identify the specific data or other materials to be protected, and must state the reasons why protection is necessary. Any aspect of the proposal which addresses the cost of providing the requested services will not be considered confidential under any circumstance. Any proposal marked as confidential or proprietary in its entirety may be rejected without further consideration or recourse.

The proposer must clearly designate the part of the proposal that contains a trade secret and/or privileged or confidential proprietary information as “CONFIDENTIAL” in order to claim protection, if any is available, from disclosure. The proposer shall mark the cover sheet of the proposal with the following legend, specifying the specific section(s) of the proposal sought to be restricted in accordance with the conditions of this legend:

“The data contained in pages _____ of the proposal have been submitted in confidence and contain trade secrets and/or privileged or confidential information and such data shall only be disclosed for evaluation purposes, provided that if a contract is awarded to this Proposer as a result of or in connection with the submission of this proposal, the Administrator shall have the right to use or disclose the data therein to the extent provided in the contract. This restriction does not limit the Administrator’s right to use or disclose data obtained from any source, including the proposer, without restriction.”

Further, to protect such data, each page containing such data shall be specifically identified and marked “CONFIDENTIAL.”

Proposers must be prepared to defend the reasons why the material should be held confidential. If a competing proposer or any other person seeks review or copies of another proposer’s confidential data, the Administrator will notify the owner of the asserted data of the request. If the owner of the asserted data does not want the information disclosed, it must agree to indemnify the Administrator and hold it harmless against all actions or court proceedings that may ensue (including attorney’s fees), which seek to order the Administrator to disclose the information. If the owner of the asserted data refuses to indemnify and hold the Administrator harmless, the Administrator may disclose the information.

All proposals, contracts and other documents presented in connection with this RFP become the property of the Administrator.

XIV. Court Discretion

The Administrator reserves the right to change the calendar of events or issue addenda to the RFP at any time. The Administrator also reserves the right to reject, in full or in part, all proposals submitted, and/or to cancel or reissue this RFP when such action is in the Court's best interest. Issuance of this RFP in no way constitutes a commitment by the Administrator to award a contract.

Any contract which may be awarded shall be based upon the proposal which is most advantageous to the Court. All contracts are subject to the availability of funds.

XV. Changes, Addenda, or Withdrawal of Proposals

The Administrator reserves the right to change the calendar of events or issue addenda to the RFP at any time. The Administrator also reserves the right to cancel or reissue the RFP.

If a proposer needs to submit changes or addenda, such shall be submitted in writing, signed by an authorized representative of the proposer, and cross-referenced clearly to the relevant proposal section. All such changes must be received prior to the deadline for proposal submission.

A proposer may withdraw a proposal that has been submitted at any time up to the proposal closing time and date. To accomplish this, a written request signed by the authorized representative of the proposer must be submitted to the Administrator.

XVI. Cost of Preparing Proposals

The Administrator is not liable for any costs incurred by proposers prior to issuance of or entering into a contract. Costs associated with developing the proposal, preparing the proposal, and any other expenses incurred by the proposer in responding to the RFP are entirely the responsibility of the proposer, and shall not be reimbursed in any manner by the Administrator.

XVII. Audit of Records

The State Legislative Auditor or other auditors so designated by the Administrator shall have the option to audit all accounts directly pertaining to the resulting contract for a period of five (5) years after project acceptance or as required by applicable State or Federal law. Records shall be made available during normal working hours for this purpose.

XVIII. Record Retention

The successful proposer shall maintain all records relating to any contract which is agreed upon for a period of at least five (5) years after the Administrator's acceptance of the final deliverable.

XIX. Billing and Payments

Payment will be based on the successful completion of milestones and deliverables to be specified in the contract. This is a fixed fee contract; therefore, expenditures on travel, meals, and other expenses will not be reimbursed.

REGISTRATION FORM
Drug Court Case Management System
Upgrade Proposal
RFP LASC-DC001

The purpose of the Pre-proposers' Conference is to provide potential proposers with an opportunity to present questions and obtain clarification relative to this RFP.

Complete this form and FAX to Scott Griffith at (504) 568-2027.

The Pre-proposer's Conference will be held on May 14, 2008 at 10:00am at the Louisiana Supreme Court, 4th Floor Conference Room, 400 Royal Street, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Registration Information		

Name		

Company/Firm		

Title		

Street Address or PO Box (if applicable)		

City	State	Zip Code
Phone Number: (___) ___ - ____ Fax Number: (___) ___ - ____		
Email: _____		

Number of individuals who plan on attending the Pre-proposers' Conference from your organization?

_____ (total number including yourself)

What is the best way for the Court to send your registration confirmation?

- Mail Email Fax Phone