

**QUESTIONS & ANSWERS**  
**RFP # 14-007-02**  
**INFO-HUB SYSTEM INTEGRATION**

**PART # 1**

1. Why was BPMS installed and there is no mention of business process models in the engagement?

**A: The Webmethods suite includes this functionality. Where it makes sense to use BPMS, we have the ability to do so.**

2. Is there an overall Business process defined? If no, is defining one part of the scope?

**A: Business processes are being defined within the business units as it pertains to their applications, but the exchange business processes will be defined as part of the scope of this project.**

3. Additionally the following components installed but no reference to in the scope:

4. Fair Isaac Blaze Advisor

**A: The Webmethods suite includes this functionality.**

5. Centrasite Community Edition

**A: The Webmethods suite includes this functionality.**

6. Optimize components

**A: The Webmethods suite includes this functionality.**

7. CAF

**A: The Webmethods suite includes this functionality.**

**Should factor in time and effort for the above?**

**12/9/13 – If the feature/functionality will be used then yes.**

8. PMO involved? **Answer was yes.** Any other information to provide such as expectations?

**A: PMI project management practices and documentation is required, to include a project charter, project management plan, work breakdown structure, communications plan, requirements management plan, change management plan, and a risk management plan.**

9. Enterprise architecture involved? **Answer was yes.** Any Lead architect or resource that needs to be pulled into discussions regarding architecture? Will resources that understand the architecture be available for deeper discussions?

**A: Submit architecture questions in writing following the RFP guidelines/timeline and they will be answered.**

This question is just trying to understand if someone will be available to answer architecture question if they arise later. We will refer to the guidelines in the RFP if required later.

10. What is the timeline? Is there a hard end date?

A: Go Live scheduled for February of 2015, but this is not a hard date and is expected to be determined by the SI project plan for having the data exchanges completed.

11. Any existing architecture diagrams? We have some of production webMethods inventory, is there an architecture diagram that ESB is going to be interacting with?

12. Is there governance in place - service catalog or plans to establish?

A: I'm not clear how this relates to the project. The overall larger iCJIS project is implementing three new applications so no service catalog is currently in place. There will be governance established, but I might need some examples of what you are asking about to see the relevance to the SI.

With CentraSite in place, there is possibility to start enterprise wide service registry, repository to catalog, and governance. However, the community edition might limit capabilities. For now, we will exclude it in the scope.

12/9/13 – The community edition is only for runtime. It does not include governance for development.

13. Do they require help with setting up a COE?

A: If you are referring to a "Center of Excellence" then no, this is not a project to establish any sort of Fusion Center.

14. Is there interest in Mobility?

A: yes

15. Servers hosted or in house and what level of access would we be provided?

A: Servers are in house and the SI will be provided "as needed" access via vpn and remote desktop and physical access.

16. Do we need to review platform for improvements such as memory issues?

A: The webmethods servers have been configured to the specifications provided by Software AG. Programmatic memory leaks will need to be addressed by the SI and developers on a case by case basis.

17. Document has a number of acronyms that are not defined. Can we get more information on the same? IEPD, CMS, OMS etc.

A: Information Exchange Packet Data, Court Management System, Offender Management System, PD CMS is Public Defender Case Management System.

18. Do you have an Integration/SOA Roadmap?

A: no

## Platform Questions:

1. What does the current infrastructure look like?

A: We have a development, Test, staging, and production environments. The staging environment is set up exactly like the production environment.

2. Do we need to be concerned with the size of the platform?  
A: Not sure what is being asked. We are using virtual machines so we can easily add resources as needed.

Was curious about scaling if the platform didn't have enough processing capacity to support requirements. The answer helps.

3. Has it been scaled properly?  
A: We have scaled everything based on discussions with Software AG. In addition, our servers are virtual so resources can be added or subtracted as needed.
4. Can you share details on middleware (webMethods) capacity planning, current resource (memory, CPU etc.) utilization and expected saturation time, high-availability clustering?

A: Since these will be all exchanges built with new systems, we do not have some of these details at this time. With virtual machines, we can add or subtract resources as necessary.

5. Has a capacity planning exercise been executed and/or Is there a need for a capacity planning exercise?

A: Yes, a capacity planning exercise could be planned.

6. What is the split of the Middleware servers (webMethods) amongst -- a) Production servers; b) Development servers; c) QA & Test servers -- location wise?

A: Currently, all servers are located at our west data center.

7. What are the key applications deployed in your organization that uses Middleware (webMethods) and on what platform are they running? Total number of integrations currently in the platform?

A: Currently there are no integrations running on Webmethods. It is intended to begin with the iCJIS project.

8. Current OS mentions 2008 server. Highly recommend this is revisited and Linux is considered.

A: The pros and cons of going with this should be included in the RFP response.

9. Is the platform clustered?

A: If by "clustered", you mean fault tolerance cluster, then no.

10. Are there HA requirements? If so are the systems we are interfacing set up for HA?

A: The systems involved will include their HA requirements. The exchanges will also have HA requirements.

11. Will we have access to resources such as OS level resource, Network resource, DB resources?

A: SI will be provided "as needed" access via vpn and remote desktop and physical access. Sorry, was referring to actual people resources. Just trying to ensure we have the appropriate skill sets available.

12/9/13 – We have network administrators, technicians, DBAs, etc. that we have on staff.

12. Any external facing interfaces? Didn't look like it but wanted to confirm.

A: For the System Integrator, we do not have any external facing interfaces at this time.

13. Have you planned for a service window of support for management of Middleware servers (webMethods) across your various locations? Eg: 24x7 support, 8x5 support etc

A: We are working on the requirements needed.

14. Any third party applications required such as PGP?

A: No

15. Any certificates required?

A: No. We have an in-house CA.

16. Security or compliancy Concerns?

A: We need to conform to GFIPM and PCI requirements. We are also affected by HIPPA and HITECH (Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health Act). Additionally, the successful vendor will need to sign security agreements in order to access the system.

17. Load balancer in place? Software or hardware?

A: Yes, Software, Cisco Application Control Engine (ACE) 4710, in a dedicated hardware package with SSL offloading processors.

**Integration/Interface Questions - The answers to these questions are critical to providing a more accurate estimate. Could you please validate the following 3 assumptions based on the answers:**

**1. If "yes" then that applies to all interfaces**

2. If “to be determined” it should be part of scope for the SI to define or finalize.
3. If “It depends on the individual interface or on some exchanges.” it should be part of scope for the SI to determine during requirements gathering.

With this in mind, we have expanded some of our answers.

Based on the information provided in the spreadsheet on pages 37-46 there is a need to rewrite the existing point to point interfaces into 30 webMethods services. The services need to follow a Service Oriented Architecture and will comprise of 25 real time interfaces and 5 batch interfaces.

1. Is there a need for flexibility to change source/target System? **Yes**
2. Is Queueing required on inbound to middleware? **yes, for some exchanges**
3. Is Queueing required on outbound side from middleware? **yes for some exchanges**
4. Is throttling required on inbound side to middleware? **Yes; The WebMethods Integration Server has the ability to throttle**
5. Is throttling required on outbound side from middleware? **Yes; The WebMethods Integration Server has the ability to throttle**
6. What protocol is used inbound to middleware? **The exchanges will vary**
7. What protocol is required outbound from middleware? **The exchanges will vary – we anticipate using web services for the majority of exchanges**

Could this be elaborated please? Our approach is based on Reusable Framework and unified development standards that significantly reduce subsequent interface efforts. For ex. some of ESBs interface protocols are HTTP(S), FTP(S), JMS, webServices, Java, .NET, and various adapters. Similarly it would be very helpful to provide better estimation if we know the capabilities of various other apps ESB will need to interface, like below

<b>System/ App</b>	<b>Available interfacing protocols</b>
ESB	HTTP(S), FTP(S), JMS, webServices, Java, .NET, Native adapters, etc
CMS	Odyssey supports standards-based NIEM XML transactional data Exchanges. Communication between the Information Hub and Odyssey’s core integration services will utilize the Odyssey Translation Bus (OTB) service, as depicted in the diagram below. The OTB service provides an external XML (e.g., NIEM) interface to the underlying core integration services. The Odyssey Translation Bus implements the following key services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Persistence – persistent message storage for</li> </ul>

	<p>guaranteed delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queuing – asynchronous message processing where needed.</li> <li>• Translation – translation between the external XML formats (e.g., NIEM) and the core Odyssey API XML format.</li> <li>• Management – administration services for message tracking and error recovery when needed.</li> <li>• Security - authentication and authorization security.</li> <li>• Web Service - external communication via industry standard SOAP XML web service. The APIs are web services that allow on-demand adding, updating and querying data in Odyssey using a defined message based interface. API messages support on demand adding, updating or querying of Odyssey. API messages are backward compatible across application version releases, which enables the ability to build durable application interfaces while taking advantage of the evolving evergreen Odyssey platform. APIs are implemented as web services, called with a properly formatted XML message. APIs may be called in one of two ways, either as a single message, or as a compound transactional message with several component messages chained together as a single unit of work. API documentation includes a user reference guide, a WSDL definition file (web services definition language), a Microsoft Word specification document for each API, and an enforced XML schema file (XSD) for each API.</li> </ul> <p>Configurable Integration Publishing The Configurable Integration Publisher is an application service that automatically publishes XML messages based on events that occur within the application.</p>
<p>OMS</p>	<p>The database is a standard JDBC compliant relational database - SQL server. Alongside the business tier of the software suite lays a separate set applications used strictly for interfacing, the IEngine and the Mule ESB (Enterprise service Bus) integration platform. These platforms can be used to respond to internal system events, such as changes to offender information, as well as listen for and respond to externally driven events, such as from a third party application. The IEngine can be used with a variety of transport mechanism, such as Web Services, FTP, HTTP, Shared File System, OLE, Active X, or proprietary Win32 dll's that are provided with many vendor products. Mule is a widely used and accepted open source</p>

	<p>platform for transporting data. The Mule platform supports many transport mechanisms, such as Web Services, FTP, HTTP, HTTPS, SSL and File Transport. The full set of Mule Transports can be found on the Mule website. <b>XML</b> – Our preferred transport protocol for information sharing is by utilizing the GJXML subset of the NIEM 1.0-1.1 schema. We have implemented several interfaces utilizing XML and GJXML 3.3, most. <b>Web Services</b> – This type of interface is preferred by GTL. <b>Direct Database Access – Shared File System. FTP. Batch Export to File. Application Program Interfaces</b> – GTL uses native Win32 API</p>
PDS	<p>Justware API - New Dawn Technologies offers an Application Programming Interface (API), allowing customers with developer resources to evolve their JustWare implementation, create robust integration to third-party applications, and develop their own NIEM-based interfaces. <b>Web-service based:</b> Because all data from the API also goes through the JustWare business layer, all validation, security, and workflow will be executed as if the data were coming from the JustWare client itself. XML</p>
DA	<p>Justware API - New Dawn Technologies offers an Application Programming Interface (API), allowing customers with developer resources to evolve their JustWare implementation, create robust integration to third-party applications, and develop their own NIEM-based interfaces. <b>Web-service based:</b> Because all data from the API also goes through the JustWare business layer, all validation, security, and workflow will be executed as if the data were coming from the JustWare client itself. XML</p>
SCSO	<p>Webservices, ftp</p>

8. Is transformation required in middleware? **Yes, for some exchanges**
9. Are lookups required in middleware? **Yes**
10. How many touch points are required to extract the data? **To be determined: there are many different exchanges, some used by the sending and 1 receiving system and others used by multiple systems.**
11. Any aggregator patterns required? **To be determined – WebMethod Flows assist with aggregator patterns.**
12. Is there any complex business logic or rules to be implemented? **WebMethods BPM can assist with this. Most likely, there will be a couple of exchanges that will require complex business rules**
13. Is encryption required? **yes**

14. Is there a synchronous response required to acknowledge the receipt in the middleware? **Yes, for some exchanges**
15. Is an async response required to say middleware has sent payload to target (is that a separate interface) - how long will it take to generate? **To be determined**
16. Can a unique conversation ID be used across all touch points for traceability? **To be determined**
17. What are the performance requirements for each of the sync / async responses? **To be determined**
18. Is performance testing required for the interfaces? **Yes, for all exchanges**
19. Are there any linked interfaces that need to be considered as part of a process? Is this interface a building block to enterprise process? **Eventually, we would like to open our ESB up to other Shelby County applications. So yes, this could be a possibility. We would like to encourage reusability where possible.**
20. Is order of processing important - does it need to be maintained? **On some exchanges**
21. Are there any special reprocessing instructions / timing? Do we need to consider month end, year-end processing? **Yes; these decisions will be made upon design of the exchanges**
22. Are there any dependencies on other systems and do we need to be aware of availability of these systems? **yes**
23. What manual override mechanism need to be considered to rerun or stop the interface? **To be determined**
24. Are there any reporting requirements? **Yes – to be determined during design phase**
25. Does the source/target have the ability to deal with receiving duplicate transactions? **To be determined**
26. What is the current average data size of these transactions? **Varies per exchange**
27. What is the anticipated growth in volume / frequency? **Most exchanges are 'real-time' and the frequency varies**
28. What is the current peak number of transactions per day/month/year? **The Sheriff's office handles approximately 55,000 bookings a year and the courts handle approximately 280,000 filings annually.**
29. What is the current average number of transactions per day/month/year? **This would vary by exchange.**
30. What can cause the volume to change? Is there heavier month end / year end processing? - Do we need separate the interface to avoid impacting other interfaces or schedule it off hours? **System impact is always a consideration;**
31. Any specific BI requirements? **Yes - Is it possible to expand? Question is to find whether we need to estimate efforts for a separate ESB DB for tracking the necessary data for BI (like # systems, service usage, types of usage, peak times, amounts, demographics, various KPIs to be tracked in ESB or to be feed into an existing BI?**  
**We have purchased the WebMethods Insight module and plan to utilize what we have**

32. Who will be responsible for resending the transactions? What is the reprocessing approach? **It depends on the individual interface.**
33. Are any external partners involved? **Yes.**
34. Do they have the required test environments / procedures in place? Have we worked with them before? **Yes or will be in place. We are not aware of your business partners.**
35. What visibility is required into the overall health of the business process / interface? **From what we understand, some of the tools that are part of the Webmethods suite will allow us to monitor the health of the business processes (example: Insight).**
36. What monitoring is required? Any specific up time requirements or mandates? **Yes. The court system may possibly require 24/7 availability.**
37. What alerting / reporting is required on failures etc? **Yes. If the interface is determined to be mission critical one, then appropriate staff will need to be notified. Some failures can be addressed the next business day.**
38. What KPIs are required to be collected? **Currently, KPI requirements have not been defined.**
39. Is BAM required? **This is included in the Webmethods suite that was purchased.**
40. Is BPM required? **This is included in the Webmethods suite that was purchased.**
41. Any HA requirements - outage requirements? **The systems involved will be include their HA requirements. The exchanges will also have HA requirements.**
42. Does service identification need to be taken into consideration? **Yes.**
43. Are source / target / middleware systems housed in same location - is network connectivity / performance going to be a problem? **Yes. Virtual servers/connectivity is available.**
44. Transactionality requirements (how many systems are involved - how long running is the transaction etc)? **It depends on the individual interface.**
45. Has component reuse been factored in? **It depends on the individual interface. Reusability is possible for some interfaces.**
46. Any requirements for publish subscribe options? Will more systems use this data? Is this data a subset or can it be changed to be a superset to accommodate future requests? **The requirements have not been defined however publish subscribe is and options. Yes, more systems could use this data.**
47. Is the middleware expected to archive / delete payload? If yes then why? **It depends on the individual interface.**
48. Is the middleware expected to persist and restore data? If yes then why? **It depends on the individual interface.**
49. Does building this require modifications, rework and/or testing of any other interfaces? **Rework or testing may be involved with existing interfaces with our documents management system.**
50. Does building this require any other interface to be decommissioned? If so what are the steps to decommission the interface? **Currently, we do not have any existing interfaces(excluding the document management-previously mentioned).**

51. Do source / target systems have same number of environments available? **No.**  
The CMS, OMSe, and ESB each have a test, training, staging, and production environments. The PD and AG office have two systems – test and production.
52. Is there enough data available for testing? Can the data be accessed or used? Do we need to create our own test data? **It depends on the data required for the individual interface being tested.**
53. Authentication required - SSO / LDAP? **Yes.**
54. Has time been built in to account for design review, code review, documentation, and testing?  
**A: All respondents are expected to propose their schedule to include these necessary activities.**
55. What protocols do the source and target system support? **To be determined, based on individual target system.**
56. Does the technical design adhere to and account for the functional being requested in the functional specification? **???? The exchanges listed in the RFP are for ones that exist in the current system. This functionality needs to be continued in the new systems. Since the Court, PD, and OMS systems are in the process of being installed, it is the responsibility of the SI to create the technical specifications and IEPDs that addresses the business needs.**
57. Are complex composites split into individual simple composites? **It depends on the individual interface.**
58. Is this a synchronous or asynchronous process? If synchronous state why. **It depends on the individual interface.**
59. Will this interface support parallel processing? **It depends on the individual interface.**
60. Does this interface use any API's (Custom/Standard)? If yes, then please provide the details along with parameters. **API's are available; however parameters have not been defined.**
61. What are the error handling procedures/requirements? **Standard error handling procedures should be designed for each interface.**
62. Any special character or language considerations? **Not for the interfaces - possibly for the portal.**

### Testing Questions:

1. What are the expectations for functional or user acceptance testing? Will functional resources be available to help define functional test scripts or do functional test scripts currently exist?  
**A: Functional test scripts will be defined by the various application business partners. Operations staff will be available for user acceptance testing as defined in the project work breakdown structure.**
2. Any testing software currently being used? Load testing? Hudson is mentioned, are there already scripts in place or do they need to be developed and included in scope?

A: Currently there are no scripts developed.

## Process Related questions

1. Do you follow any specific development methodology for the middleware applications?  
A: In the past, we have used SDLC for the in house programs. The majority of the team members are scrum certified so Agile can be an option.
2. Any documentation standards we need to follow?  
A: IEPDs must be created for all NIEM exchanges.
3. Any processes or procedures that we need to be aware of to help with smooth execution?  
A: No.
4. Please let us know the number of projects currently being executed that will need to be considered for the transition?  
A: Please reference Appendix I of the RFP for the list of exchanges.  
Do you use any configuration control tool for the webMethods platform? Is configuration management a part of scope?  
A: Please reference the Shelby County Build Environment listed on page 12 of the RFP. Just to clarify, you are using your hudson environment to manage configurations across the platform?  
12/9/13 – At this point in time, we are only using Hudson for configuration management.
5. What are the metrics being used to measure the quality of service?  
A: Availability and response time will be used.
6. What is the expected service level for each of the above metrics?  
A: The CMS availability is ideally 100%.
7. What is the process and tool set used for deploying latest updates, patches and upgrades on your servers?  
A: Please reference the Shelby County Build Environment listed on page 12 of the RFP. Ok, reason for question as we have seen customers use hudson environments for code deployment but not applying patches and updates.  
12/9/13 – At this point in time, we are not using Hudson for deployment.
8. Should the code follow the general coding standards?  
A: Yes, code should adhere to best practices and allow for reusability. In addition, we do conduct code reviews.
9. Should naming convention follow general standards?  
A: Best practices should be followed. Shelby County naming standards for the ESB are in the process of being developed.

## Incident Management

1. Can you share details on the existing Incident Management Process?

A: Currently, we are using Service Desk Express(SDE) for tracking all incidents and work orders.

2. What are all the tools deployed for monitoring and managing the webMethods platform?

A: We use Orion to monitor our existing applications. When alerts are raised, our Network Operations Center (NOC) will open a work order and assign it to the appropriate queue. In addition, with the Webmethods tools purchased, we can monitor KPIs and alert appropriate staff.

3. Are the monitoring tools integrated with your Help desk tool? Do the alerts lead to trouble tickets? If no is that in scope?

A: See the previous answer for monitoring tools.

## Present Team

1. What is the current team's middleware knowledge and strengths? How is the team structured?

A: The Shelby team has been trained on Webmethods. We have some team members that are strong in Java. The Shelby team consists of one Lead Systems Analyst leading the development team.

2. What will be the business impact in case of failure of your key middleware (webMethods) servers?

A: It could shut down Criminal Court cases.

- 
1. For the web portal, will the federated queries access the Sherriff Subpoena system in addition to the Odyssey, OMSe, JustWare PD, and JustWare DA systems?

A: Just Odyssey & OMSe

2. For each system to be accessed in the federated search, what are the "record types" that will be returned in a list of search results? For example, searching the Court CMS could return a list of cases and the OMS could return a list of inmates.

A: It should return records for the person being queried to include all bookings in

Jail and Correction Center, probation status with Pretrial (from Odyssey), current mugshot photo, court cases, bond amounts, etc.

3. Will any system accessed by the federated search return more than one “record type”?

A: Yes

4. Approximately how many search fields are expected for the for the web portal search screens (e.g., 10 fields, 25 fields, 100 fields)?

A: 10 or less

5. Can you please provide additional information regarding the anticipated search fields required for the web portal search functionality (e.g., name, date of birth, docket number)?

A: name, RNI number, booking number, case number, dob, and ssn (this list may not be all inclusive, but is what we generally expect.)

6. For the web portal search functionality, does Shelby County anticipate that a user would enter a single search request and see a single, unified list of matching results for any of the connected systems? Alternatively, would you expect matching results from each connected system to be displayed separately (e.g., a list of matches from the court CMS, another list of matches from the OMS, etc.)?

A: Unified list of matching results for all connected systems

7. Does Shelby County anticipate any “drill-down” functionality to be required from the web portal search results? If yes, will the retrieved information be a full detail view of a single record from one system or a single/unified view from multiple systems?

A: I might not understand this question since I fail to see the difference between this and the previous question. We expect a single view from multiple systems.

8. Does Shelby County anticipate the web portal to produce reports and/or dashboards using information obtained from the source system(s) as part of publishing functionality? If yes, can you please provide additional information (e.g., how many reports, what are the data source systems)? If not, what is Shelby County’s vision in terms of any “publishing” functionality the portal might provide?

A: We don’t see portal dashboards as within scope of this project. The portal will likely be used to publish reports, but not within scope of this project.

9. Does Shelby County have one or more existing user directories (e.g., Active Directory, OpenLDAP) that can be used for the web portal user authentication and authorization? If yes, can you please provide additional details (i.e., how

many existing directories, who are the owners of the directories, what platform are the directories based on, approximately how many users do the directories manage)? If not, will the Proposer be expected to provide directory services?

**A: Shelby County and other stakeholders have Active Directory. The RFP describes a GFIPM security solution for the portal. The proposal should include plans for how to implement such a solution.**

10. Does Shelby County currently use or maintain any federated security services, such as Active Directory Federation Services (ADFS)?

**A: No**

11. Will the web portal have access to data that requires the use of two-factor authentication?

**A: No. This is only local data, not federal.**

12. Will the web portal need to be compliant with FBI CJIS Security Policy requirements for two-factor authentication (e.g., require the use of hardware tokens or smartcards)?

**A: No**

13. For the "SI is Mentor/Support Role" model, what is the expected level of involvement for the SI in comparison to Shelby County?

**A: Shelby County would do the exchange analysis and development. The SI would be available for questions, implement testing plan and review for accuracy.**

- 
1. The Cost Proposal asks for a cost breakout by exchange (suggested tabular format on p. 34). But the task list on pages 20 and 21 require some foundational work that would support development and implementation of all exchanges (e.g., Business Analysis, Facilitate Data Exchange Roadmap, Prioritize Exchanges). Should the proposal itemize costs for each.

**The proposal should not itemize costs by tasks. Most of these tasks should be included within the itemized cost by exchange, though the knowledge transfer plan should specify the task roles being proposed. Certain tasks are necessarily per exchange, but part of the overall project planning (e.g. Roadmap, connectivity guideline, test plan).**

- 
1. Who will be responsible for conducting the mandatory criminal background checks?
  2. What are the fees associated to process a criminal background check?
  3. Are the Proposer's staff able to complete the fingerprinting for the background check at a location outside of Shelby County?

1. The Shelby County Sheriff's Office will conduct any necessary background checks.
2. There are no associated fees since the Sheriff's Office is one of the stakeholders in this project.
3. There will not be background checks for remote staff.

---

We are one of the participants for above proposal and have a question on working with partners for final proposal.

- i) Can we have partners / Alliances that were not part of initial discussion to submit to proposal?
- ii) i.e If "Yes", can the alliance include both companies in proposal or only the one that participated in initial discussion to be the prime and other need to be sub contractor of services, etc?

I would prefer a single contract with the company that participated in the prebid as the prime and any business partners included as sub-contractors (it's not necessary for subs to have participated in the prebid).

If this preference is backed by policy, then the answer is:

This will be a single contract with the company that participated in the prebid as the prime and any business partners included as sub-contractors (it's not necessary for subs to have participated in the prebid).

- 
1. On Page 10 the RFP mentions that a technology assessment was performed by IJIS institute and the National Center for State Courts. Can the assessment be made available for review by companies interested in submitting a response to the RFP?

A: Yes

2. If a private company participated in developing the technology assessment, is that company eligible to submit a response to perform the work requested in this RFP? If so, who is the company?

**A: No, they are not permitted to respond to this RFP as a primary or subcontractor. This includes the National Center for State Courts and their subcontractor Tetrus.**

3. At the top of page 14, the RFP states that the contract will be awarded November 2013 but the bids are not due until December 2013. What is the date that the contract will be awarded?

**A: The proposal timeline on page 6 is correct. Notification of award will be January, 2014.**

4. With regard to working with Software AG's webMethods system:

a) Are classes required by the vendor awarded the integration business?

**A: No. webMethods classes for Shelby County developers and administrators were purchased directly from Software AG and were/are planned for the dates identified on page 18, section A.**

b) Are there certifications that will be required?

**A: No**

5. On page 17, are the discovery meetings mentioned on page 17 the same as the mandatory discovery meetings documented on page 6 (December 4-6) before the proposal due date?

**A: Yes**

6. On page 18, will the provider be required to train county staff to write components and exchange code? Will the exchange work identified in the RFP be performed by the provider or will the provider be required to train county personnel to actually write the exchanges?

**A: It's expected to be a mix of both depending on the specific exchange. The response will be itemized by exchange as specified on page 34.**

7. On page 32, section 2d, "please describe the ESB solution being proposed." Our understanding is that Software AG's , webMethods will be used , please confirm this is the case and this section is not relevant to the RFP response.

**A: Correct, Software AG's webMethods will be used.**

8. Will the Microsoft development environment be considered for this project?

**A: Microsoft .Net is not being considered for the info hub exchanges. It could be proposed for the web portal solution. It is a Java development environment.**

9. Appendix 1; Does the sending agency “Info Hub” refer to the Software AG Platform? If not, what does the “Info Hub” in the chart represent?

A: Yes

10. On page 17, there is a reference to federated queries. Is there a specific list of queries? Are there any more details on the web portal and federated queries? Do the queries only involve the three systems mentioned on page 11 or would they include external agencies such as Appriss or NCIC? Is there detailed documentation available on the types of queries Shelby County would like to have in place?

A: Federated queries will mainly include only the three systems on page 11, more specifically, just 2 of the 3, Odyssey and OMSe. It might include Mugshot (Dataworks Plus) if the OMSe does not store the booking photo in their database. There is no list or details of federated queries, but examples include criminal history by name, booking number or records and identification number (local inmate number). This would be expanded in future projects to other systems.

---

The following are the few question related to the overall System and Portal/Federated Query.

## System

1. What is the state of other projects (below) in the Project Life Cycle Development? Is there go-live is also targeted along with the Info hub or they will be available in Production before? Can we ask for their deliverables timeline?

Public Defender Case Management (PDCM)

Offender Management System (OMS)

Court Management System (CMS)

A: All 3 projects are in phase 2, project planning. As stated in the prebid conference, the OMS and CMS will go live with the Info, currently scheduled for February, 2015. The PDCM is tentatively scheduled to go live October, 2014.

2. If applicable, can we ask for the list of deliverables and their schedule committed by or asked from the above three vendors / projects?

A: Yes. I can provide a Statement of Work for each of the 3 projects that will include deliverables and schedule.

3. Can we get any existing documentation on existing P-to-P system? If County cannot provide it now, does any such documentation exist?

A: We cannot provide such documentation now, but it does exist.

4. Does county use IEPDs as of today?

A: No. This is the first project moving Shelby County to this strategy.

5. The appendix in the RFP lists 22 data exchanges. Also at page 16, it is mentioned that this number is a variable. Is it a true statement? If so, by what time this exchange will be finalized?

A: This number is variable in that it can be redefined by the System Integrator. The System Integrator may have a more efficient method of defining the exchanges that combines some into a single document or breaks one out into multiple exchanges.

6. Are the proposed three systems (PDCM/OMS/CMS) contracted on Pay-Per-Use Model or they will be hosted and managed by the County after go-live?

A: Hosted and managed by Shelby County

7. Are there any SLA agreements between County with its data exchange partners?

A: Not for these Info Hub exchanges that mostly involve new applications being deployed.

## Portal

7. What are the business objectives of Portal? Is the detailed scope defined or is part of contract? Is the development of portal part of Information Hub?

A: To be a single point of entry for all criminal justice queries, providing the appropriate level of access depending on user. There is not currently a detailed scope, but it can be detailed as part of the contract. The development of the portal is one of the deliverables of the System Integrator. If it is "part of the Information Hub" depends on how the Info Hub is defined.

8. Who are the possible actors for the portal? Say Clerk of the Court, family of the inmate etc.

A: Family of inmate, bonding companies, attorneys, law enforcement, various community programs, victims, anyone with an interest in an individual's criminal court case history, dispositions, sentencing, arrests, bond amount, court dates/times, visiting hours, anticipated release date, booking photo, date and time booked, charges, or warrants.

9. Any regulatory requirements for the development of portal?

A: Yes, the Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Security Policy version 5.1, CJISD-ITS-DOC-08140-5.1

## **Federated Query**

10. What are the multiple sources intended for feeding the federated query? Is Info Hub one of such systems?

A: Odyssey, OMSe, JustWare PD and JustWare DA will all feed the federated query. The Info Hub is the ESB connecting these systems.

11. What are the number of federated queries expected?

A: Not yet defined.

12. Who are the potential consumers of these queries?

A: Same as portal from question 8.

13. Any example of federated query?

A: Yes, search on personal, identifiable information like name, or DOB, or records and identification number returns a criminal history report of sorts listing all bookings in the jail and Correction Center, any warrants, current mugshot, criminal court case history, case statuses, current custody status, bond amount if applicable, etc. (see item #8 above).

14. Is the federated query part of the portal?

A: Yes, it's synonymous.

---

Question Set #2 RFP 14-007-02

## **General**

1. Are Proposers required to subcontract with an LOSB for the goods and services requested in this RFP?

A: No

2. Will Shelby County Government (Shelby County) provide a Development environment for the awarded vendor to utilize to complete the services in this RFP?

A: Yes

## **Web Portal**

1. Can you please define the expectations for the web portal functionality?

A: Search on personal, identifiable information like name, or DOB, or records and identification number returns a criminal history report of sorts listing all bookings in the jail and Correction Center, any warrants, current mugshot, criminal court case history, case statuses, current custody status, bond amount if applicable, etc.

2. Will the web portal be used for public and/or internal use? Who are the anticipated users of the web portal?

A: Both internal and external users, family of inmate, bonding companies, attorneys, law enforcement, various community programs, victims, anyone with an interest in an individual's criminal court case history, dispositions, sentencing, arrests, bond amount, court dates/times, visiting hours, anticipated release date, booking photo, date and time booked, charges, or warrants.

3. Can you please define the expectations for the web portal security requirements?

A: Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Security Policy version 5.1, CJISD-ITS-DOC-08140-5.1. We would like to see a GFIPM (Global Federated Identity and Privilege Management) solution, but we will consider proposed security solutions in this response.

4. Can you please provide additional details regarding what information the web portal is expected to publish? Will the published information be stored in a document repository for the user to access? Will the published information be delivered to another system/application?

A: Expected to publish the type of information from question #1. We haven't envisioned it as a document repository or see any need to store query results to another system, but we will allow system integrators to propose whatever they consider a best solution.

5. For the web portal, what systems will the federated queries access? What type of information will be searched? What type of information will be retrieved?

A: Odyssey, OMSe, JustWare PD and JustWare DA will all feed the federated query. See question #1 for types of information.

6. Can you please define the expectations for the federated query security requirements?

A: Federated queries are on the web portal and would have the same security requirements from question #3 above.

## **Information Exchanges**

1. Does Shelby County expect the Court Management System, Offender Management System (OMS), and Public Defender Case Management System (CMS) to be the only participating systems for the information exchanges?

A: These are the main participating systems to be included in this scope of work. There are a couple of exchanges involving an in house application (Sheriff's Subpoena).

2. Will the vendors for Court Management System, OMS, and Public Defender CMS be responsible for developing the necessary code changes in their systems to integrate with Info Hub?

A: This question is too vague to answer in this format. I'm certain this will be a discussion item during the discovery meetings. Please make sure to bring it up.

3. Will the vendors of the Court Management System, OMS, and Public Defender CMS connecting to Info Hub provide the format/requirements of the exchanges or will they adhere to the format of exchanges created in the IEPD?

A: They will adhere to the format of the exchanges created in the IEPD.

---

The RFP #14-007-02 calls out that we need to adhere to "Living Wage Ordinance #328", Section VI, Item I." We don't find that section in the doc. Can you please help us what where we can find more, or we need to do in this regard?

That is no longer a valid request so please do not respond.

---

1. iCJIS Web Portal

The County mentioned at the Bidders Conference that the Portal would be implemented after the information exchanges.

- For the purpose of costing, when does the County expect to develop the detailed functional requirements for the Portal?
- Does the County expect the vendor to provide the Portal cost in the initial fixed price?
- Should the Portal cost be built into the exchange pricing?

2. When does the County anticipate posted the answers to questions asked?

1. iCJIS Web Port

- Some of the functional requirements came out in the responses to vendor questions
- Yes
- Yes

2. Today

---