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

Answers to Questions Regarding
Request for Proposals
for
Drug Court Case Management System
Upgrades and Improvements

Proposal No. LASC-DC001

I. Re Proposing Vendor:

1. In the view of the SCDCO how much preference will be given to the previous vendor ACT?   Why is the SCDCO considering other vendors to make the modifications?

Answer: No preference will be given to prior vendors. Due to the scope of the changes requested and the time that has elapsed since deployment, the Administrator feels that it is in the Court's best interest to solicit proposals outlining strategies that can be employed to achieve project goals. The Administrator is aware that there are a variety of ways in which these goals can be met, and the RFP process provides the Court with an opportunity to review and consider the range of solutions submitted.

2. What has been ACT's role in the DCCM since deployment in 2003?

Answer: The contract period ended in early 2005. ACT performed limited work on the application in the fall of 2005. This work was limited to end user support and bug fixes.

3. Was another vendor involved in discussion during development of the software requirement specifications described in the Appendix to the RFP? If so is this vendor disqualified from bidding on the upgrade?

Answer: The system design specifications were developed by the SCDCO; however two firms, ACT and Interactive Information Systems, have been involved in DCCM related work and provided DCCM related input over the last several years.

ACT is the original developer of the DCCM and provided limited work on the application subsequent to its deployment. (See No. 2 above.) Interactive Information Systems conducted a technical analysis of the application in 2005 and performed bug fixes in 2005 and 2006.

Interactive Information Systems also attended meetings of various DCCM users and stakeholders in the Spring of 2006. These meetings were convened by the SCDCO for the purpose of getting input from practitioners and others regarding the development of drug court performance standards and the general case management needs of users of the application. It is contemplated that the DCCM will be an integral part of the development of such standards and the measurement of program performance pursuant to them, and the SCDCO wanted a technical perspective on the implications to the application of the recommendations that came out of those meetings. Interactive Information System compiled the input of stakeholders and the SCDCO's evaluator, and information from that compilation was incorporated into the System Design Specifications document referenced in the RFP as "Attachment A."

All responsive proposals that are received by the date indicated in the RFP will be accepted. No disqualification of any potential vendor will be made in advance of the receipt and full review of the proposals.

4. Will greater points be awarded to a New Orleans based firm that can establish on-site presence versus an out of State firm?

Answer: No. The RFP requires that a description of project staff accessibility be included in the proposal. See Section VII. of the RFP.

5. Does the experience of the prospective proposer need to be specifically a web based case management application, or can the proposer show experience in case management applications and separately, web based applications?

Answer: It is expected that the proposer will have experience in both case management systems and large scale web-based applications. Proposals from vendors whose case management applications are not developed and deployed in a web-based setting will be considered.

6. Can you elaborate on or clarify how the 30 evaluation points for the vendor's cost proposal will be determined?

Answer: Cost will be one among several factors that will be considered in the evaluation of a proposal. Scores will be compiled using a consensus scoring approach. Reasonableness of costs will be considered in the context of the strategy being recommended and the degree to which the Evaluation Committee feels the proposed strategy meets project goals. Proposals containing strategies that in the opinion of the Evaluation Committee are most advantageous to the Court will be given the highest scores.

II. Re Code Ownership:

1. Does the original vendor ACT or the SCDCO own the existing DCCM source code?

Answer: SCDCO owns the existing DCCM source code.

2. Does the SCDCO require that all source code in the new DCCM be owned by SCDCO and not the vendor?

Answer: Yes.

3. If the contractor proposes their own proprietary software for use on the project, will the state require all rights and source code to that software with the ability to modify, maintain or provide the software to other agencies?

Answer: Yes.

III. Re Development Effort/Process:

1. Must the source code reside on SCDCO servers during the development process so that SCDCO can conduct code reviews?

Answer: Source code will need to be transferred to SCDCO servers at intervals agreed to by the SCDCO and included in the vendor's Project Work Plan.

2. The RFP is asking for specific modifications to the existing system. Does this imply that the SCDCO is not looking for a COTS system and will only consider modifications to the existing DCCM code base?

Answer: SCDCO will consider proposals which include strategies involving a new code base.

3. Are there any specific deadlines for completion of the project, or for completion of any portions of the project?

Answer: Vendors are free to suggest deadlines in their proposals.

4. Are there any priorities to the work to be accomplished? Appendix A, which describes the work to be accomplished, is quite exhaustive. Are you expecting one single delivery, with all work accomplished, or are you expecting several smaller deliveries, each containing some portions of the desired functionality? If you are expecting several smaller deliveries, can you define a priority order for the twenty major sections within Appendix A?

Answer: No priorities have been set. It is anticipated that deployment of the completed and enhanced application will result in minimal disruption to application use.

5. Do you have published guidelines to follow on secure coding standards?

     Answer: Please refer to published Microsoft documents. See
http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/security/aa570401.aspx.

6. What is the expected length of the warranty period?

     Answer: 12 months.

7. What type of issues will be considered warranty items?

     Answer: Please refer to the sample contract Section II.B.

8. Has a budget for the project been identified? How is this project funded? Is it funded through a grant or through the Drug Court's operating budget?

     Answer: There is not currently a budget for the project, which will be funded through the SCDCO's operating budget.

9. What percentage of the total fees does the court intend to hold back as a retainage?

     Answer: Ten percent .

10. It is our understanding that the project will be performed on a fixed fee basis. Is this correct?

     Answer: Yes.

11. Do we have to agree to the sample contract as written or is negotiation expected?

Answer: Although certain portions of the contract may be open to negotiation, the SCDCO will expect the winning vendor to enter into a contract that is substantially similar to the one provided in "Attachment C."

12. Can we have access to the source code of all referenced third party components?

Answer: All available code was supplied with the application CD. Vendors that have not received the application CD should contact the SCDCO.

13. Is the winner responsible for doing data conversions if the system is rebuilt?

Answer: SCDCO anticipates that some data conversion will be necessary. The degree of conversion may depend on the strategy proposed by the vendor. The vendor selected for the project will be responsible for data conversion.

14. Is the use of 3rd party components acceptable, such as LLBLGen, Infragistics, etc.?

Answer: The use of 3rd party tools is acceptable but these tools must be disclosed in the proposal and approved by the SCDCO.

15. How many users will need to be trained on the application? Where are these users located and where will training need to take place?

Answer: Only a small group of users will need to be trained by the vendor selected for the project. It is expected that those users trained by the vendor will in turn train other users at the respective courts. The vendor selected for the project may be asked to provide demonstrations or presentations regarding the project to statewide points of contact or other similar audiences.

16. Is the court open to having the developers who will work on the system perform the development on-site at the Royal Street or Poydras Street locations?

Answer: No.

17. What web browsers will the improved application need to support?

Answer: The application will be hosted on Server 2008/IIS7, preferably compiled under x64 architecture, and able to run on IE7. Any Active-X controls or client side components must be approved by the SCDCO.

18. It appears that there is a PDF component in the existing application. Does the court intend to continue using PDF or would it prefer to switch to MS InfoPath?

Answer: Use of PDF files is expected to continue. However, vendors are free to propose/suggest an alternate format. Justification should be provided regarding the value and/or utility of such alternate formats.

IV. <u>Re Existing Application Documentation</u>:

1. Do you have a current architecture diagram outlining servers, desktops, and other hardware? If so, can it be provided to prospective proposers?

Answer: No.

2. Do you have a current software inventory for the current application? If so, can it be provided to prospective proposers?

Answer: The application CD provided to vendors upon request contains this information. Vendors that have not received the application CD should contact the SCDCO.

V. <u>Re Application as it Exists Currently</u>:

1. Since the DCCM was deployed in 2003 have any modifications of the software occurred and by what vendor?

   Answer: Yes, minor modifications were completed by ACT and by Interactive Information Systems, LLC. See section I., No. 2 and No. 3, above.

2. Are there any third-party libraries used in the project that the programming team must become familiar with?

   Answer: In addition to what has already been made available on the application CD, Adobe's FdfAcx.dll and FdfTk.dll reside in the system directory for pdf generation.

3. How many simultaneous users must the application support?

   Answer: There are approximately 550 active users of the application. It is anticipated that no more than 150 would use the application concurrently.

4. What version of SQL is the current application presently running under?

   Answer: Sql 2005 w/compatibility level option set to 2000. Winning vendor will be responsible for ensuring compatibility with sql 2008.

5. Is Team Foundation Server currently installed or is the vendor responsible for installation and set up?

   Answer: It was installed and is maintained by the Judicial Administrator's Office.

6. What current facilities, equipment, staff and resources are being used to support the existing application?

   Answer: Support is provided by the Judicial Administrator's Office.

7. Do you currently own a spell check tool – either internally developed or purchased from a third party vendor?

    Answer: No.

VI. <u>Re New Functionality Requirements</u>:

1. Please describe the functionality of a Group Action Wizard in further detail (Section XIX)?

    Answer: The wizard is used to apply a particular action to multiple clients in one execution. Current functionality only allows the Group Action Wizard feature to generate new Progress Note records.

2. What information is to be populated to the Personal Information Screen?

    Answer: All data captured through the screening process should reside in other database tables available for display and edit via the Personal Information pages.

3. Section IX., Item T. What is the real requirement? Storing the actual images in the database will significantly increase the size of the database, and will adversely affect performance. However, if your objective is to have the images accessible through the database, then a solution such as storing file pathnames in the database, while leaving the images stored in the file structure of the web server, would be preferable for database size and application performance.

    Answer: Unless it can be demonstrated otherwise, we believe that a properly designed system that limits the uploaded photos to a maximum size as well as displays only a thumbnail to the user would not noticeably affect performance. There are currently 5,800 photos ranging in size from 2 to 3,400KB totaling 3.5GB storage.

4. (Section XXI) What is the objective with this requirement? Are you looking for one link, editable by an administrator, containing the location of the CASI instrument? Or, are you looking for a link associated with each client, containing the individual CASI results for that client?

Answer: At a minimum, a link to the CASI is desired. The current application links each client to a completed ASI evaluation, but there is no functionality associated with the link.

5. Are you also interested in the ASI, or only the CASI?

Answer: We are interested in both.

6. It seems there will be significant overlap between the questions you currently ask in your drug section, and the questions that will be asked during the CASI. How do you want to address this?

Answer: That will depend on how the CASI is made available through DCCM. See number No. 4 above.

VII. Re Reporting/Printing Capability:

1. What software do you use in the existing application to print Client Screening Information?

Answer: No facility currently exists for printing client screening information.

2. Do you have a pre-defined layout to print Client Screening Information? If so, can you provide to prospective proposers?

Answer: No.

3. Do you have a pre-defined layout to print Journal Notes? If so, can you provide to prospective proposers?

      Answer: No.

4. Is the code for creating reports written in .Net, or is a third-party reporting tool used?

      Answer: Reports existing with DCCM were written in .Net. Sql Server Reporting Services is an acceptable tool. Adobe's FdfAcx.dll and FdfTk.dll reside in the system directory for pdf generation.

5. We were unable to locate many of the reports mentioned in the RFP in the source code that was provided. Do all of the reports mentioned in the RFP currently exist or will they need to be created?

      Answer: These reports need to be created.

6. All of the reports that we located in the existing application are rendered in HTML. Is it the Court's desire to have these reports remain in HTML or to utilize another method, such as MS Reporting Services or Crystal Reports?

      Answer: Sql Server Reporting Services is an acceptable reporting tool.

VIII. <u>Re Security</u>:

1. Please describe the specifications and business requirements regarding SharePoint Integration.

      Answer: SharePoint will be used for document collaboration, discussion lists, announcements, and related functions, independent of the DCCM application itself. Vendors can either propose to write the application within SharePoint, utilizing its content databases, or as an

independent application and database that will run within the SharePoint web part. The point is to provide a seamless user experience and single sign-on for both applications.

2.   Does the DCCM system need to use Microsoft Active Directory authentication?

Answer: Yes.

3.   How do you identify staff that is no longer in the program?

Answer: The field LOCKED on database table DBO_USERS is set to 1.

IX. Re Integration with Other Systems; Import/Export Functionality:

1. Describe the DCCM's areas of integration with any existing systems or external systems such as financial systems, etc.

Answer: There are currently no areas of integration.

2. What information is exported, what format will the information be exported in, and should the export feature be a functionality on the web application?

Answer: Export formats to include Excel and SPSS.

3. What format will the data referenced in section IX-G be in? Will the data be imported directly from an external application, from an exported file, etc?

Answer: Preference is for a web service. Local drug court programs use different vendors for drug testing services.

X. Re Performance:

1. Item R. Will you be providing measurements of current system performance? Will you be able to more clearly define what typical web based case management system response times would be, and what response times would be acceptable to end users, and would be satisfactory to administrator? The vendor will need to know current performance (the "before" picture), and then will need concrete goals against which to measure success (the "after" picture).

Answer: It is not the intention of SCDCO to set a benchmark for every query type. There is a general point of acceptability to end users. A sample of query performance of the existing application tracked queries taking longer than 5 seconds to complete within a particular date range. Of particular note is the time insert statements took to complete, as no other application presently running registered insert statements above the 5 second threshold. Users in the field have reported that submitting screens into the Journal can take as long as 90 seconds to return a refreshed page back to them. It is noted that the courts with a larger number of clients report the worst performance.

XI. Re Hosting/Maintenance:

1. Does the SCDCO want the vendor to provide hosting or maintenance cost?

Answer: SCDCO will host the application. Vendors should include an ongoing maintenance arrangement in their proposal.