SEARCH

The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics

Francis X. Aumand III
Chairman

Ronald P. Hawley
Executive Director

Request for Proposals for Software Development Services

Issued: December 3, 2012

Responses Due: December 17, 2012

Contact:

James Douglas

Information Sharing Specialist

SEARCH

jdouglas@search.org

916-710-0320

Table of Contents

Introduction

Background

SEARCH

SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, is a nonprofit membership organization created by and for the states.

Since 1969, SEARCH's primary objective has been to identify and help solve the information management problems of state and local justice agencies confronted with the need to exchange information with other local agencies, state agencies, agencies in other states, or with the Federal government.

SEARCH is governed by a Membership Group comprised of one gubernatorial appointee from each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories, as well as eight at-large appointees selected by SEARCH's Chair. Members are primarily state-level justice officials responsible for operational decisions and policymaking concerning the management of criminal justice information, particularly criminal history information.

Funding for SEARCH activities is provided by annual fees from Member states for the operation of the consortium and Board of Directors; grants from various U.S. Federal government agencies; state grants; and Federal, state, and local contracts.

Additional information about SEARCH is available at http://www.search.org.

The National Information Exchange Model (NIEM)

With roots in state and local government, NIEM is a community-driven, government-wide, standards-based approach to exchanging information.

It started with a group of 20 states that joined forces to overcome the challenges of exchanging information across state and city government boundaries.

This grassroots effort, called the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative, set into motion the creation of a seamless, interoperable model for data exchange that could solve a range of information-sharing challenges across a variety of government agencies. After a two-year effort, the first pre-release of the Global Justice XML Data Model (GJXDM) was announced in April 2003.

Parallel to the GJXDM effort was the start-up of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The mention of metadata in the president’s strategy for homeland security in the summer of 2002 galvanized the homeland security community to begin working toward standardization.

These collaborative efforts by the justice and homeland security communities—to produce a set of common, well-defined data elements for data exchange development and harmonization—led to the beginnings of NIEM.

Built upon GJXDM's success and lessons learned from utilizing it, NIEM was launched in 2005, uniting key stakeholders from Federal, state, local, and tribal governments to develop and deploy a national model for information sharing and the organizational structure to govern it.

NIEM was formally initiated in April 2005 by the chief information officers of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the U.S. Department of Justice. In October 2010, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services joined as the third steward of NIEM.

Since 2005, NIEM has issued three releases: 1.0 in 2006, 2.0 in 2007, and 2.1 in 2009. With anticipated delivery in fall 2013, NIEM is working toward a release of NIEM version 3.0. All 50 states and 19 Federal agencies are committed to using NIEM at varying levels of maturity.

Through North America Day efforts, NIEM exchanges are being developed to allow for a more efficient and consistent method of sharing important public health and safety information, representing a significant first step in the development of a borderless network of information exchange between the U.S., Canada, and Mexico.

Additional information about NIEM is available at http://www.niem.gov

Project Description

The NIEM Program, in partnership with the Object Management Group (OMG), has recently produced a Unified Modeling Language (UML) Profile for NIEM. This profile, which OMG has adopted as an industry standard, seeks to establish a technology- and vendor-neutral means of defining NIEM "content" from model package descriptions (MPDs)[1] to core NIEM domains and namespaces.

NIEM owes a significant part of its success to the freely-available tools that developers use to build conformant descriptions of their exchanges. Such tools lower the barriers to entry for jurisdictions wishing to use NIEM to support their information exchanges. The NIEM UML Profile offers the NIEM community a chance to take the next leap forward in tool provisioning. The Profile allows us to take advantage of the rich array of UML-based tool capabilities available in the marketplace, from code generators to analysis tools and beyond, thus broadening the tools available to expand the use of NIEM.

This project will develop an *open source implementation of the NIEM UML Profile*. This tool will allow MPD developers to specify any MPD in a conformant UML model and generate the resulting MPD artifacts from the model. This will not only continue to ensure the availability of no-cost model development tools to the NIEM community, but will also provide an open source platform on which organizations in the community—including government agencies, non-profit organizations, and for-profit companies—can assemble more sophisticated or custom-purpose tools.

The tool will take advantage of the UML modeling (and metamodeling) capabilities in the Eclipse platform, in order to reduce development costs and enable creation of a rich, user-friendly application interface.

Purpose

SEARCH intends to purchase software development services from a qualified Vendor, in order to build an *open source implementation of the NIEM UML Profile*. The purpose of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to solicit bids from prospective vendors that are interested in performing these services for SEARCH.

Following the selection of a successful Vendor, SEARCH intends to enter into a contract with that Vendor to perform the services. The period of performance under the resulting contract is expected to be January 1, 2013, through December 31, 2013.

SEARCH reserves the right to cancel this RFP at any time, and to decline to enter a contract with any Vendor. Neither the issuance of this RFP nor the submission of responses by vendors obligates SEARCH to make any purchases.

[1] https://www.niem.gov/technical/model-package-description/Pages/mpd.aspx

Schedule

The schedule for this RFP is as follows. The due date of each milestone is defined as 4:00 PM Pacific Standard Time, unless indicated otherwise. This schedule is subject to change at SEARCH's sole discretion at any time.

MILESTONE	DATE
SEARCH issues RFP	December 3, 2012
Vendors submit questions to SEARCH	**December 7, 2012**
SEARCH posts responses to questions	December 10, 2012
Vendors submit RFP responses to SEARCH	**December 17, 2012**
SEARCH designates successful Vendor	December 19, 2012
SEARCH and successful Vendor agree on contract	**December 26, 2012**
Vendor begins work	January 2, 2013

Administrative Requirements

Prospective vendors are responsible for ensuring that their responses conform to the following requirements.

RFP Coordinator (Proper Communication)

The Coordinator for this RFP is:

James Douglas
Information Sharing Specialist, SEARCH
jdouglas@search.org
(916) 212-5978

Upon release of this RFP, all communications between prospective vendors and SEARCH concerning this RFP must be directed to the Coordinator. Communication about this RFP between prospective vendors and SEARCH staff other than the Coordinator may result in disqualification of such vendors.

Reliance on Written Communication

Oral communication between SEARCH and prospective vendors is unofficial and non-binding on SEARCH. Vendors may rely only on written information issued by the Coordinator.

SEARCH will post all written information and correspondence with prospective vendors on the same Website at which this RFP was originally posted. It is the responsibility of each prospective Vendor to visit the Website to find information posted by SEARCH. SEARCH will make no effort to contact prospective vendors to inform them of written communication posted to the Website.

SEARCH will remove the names of prospective Vendor firms and individuals, along with their contact information, from any written communication. However, by submitting a question to SEARCH, prospective vendors acknowledge and accept that SEARCH is not liable for third parties' usage of written communication to identify prospective vendors.

Vendor Questions Invited

SEARCH invites questions from prospective vendors regarding this RFP. Such questions are intended to help SEARCH clarify RFP requirements, and communicate additional useful information about the NIEM UML Profile Implementation development effort.

In their questions, vendors should make reference to information in this RFP by line number(s) to facilitate SEARCH's response and to ensure clear communication.

Vendors should review publicly available information about SEARCH and NIEM prior to submitting questions. This information is available at http://www.search.org, as well as http://www.niem.gov.

Following the milestone established for the receipt of questions, SEARCH will post its responses to the same Website at which this RFP was originally posted. It is the responsibility of each prospective Vendor to visit the Website to view the responses.

Vendor Complaints Regarding RFP Requirements

If a prospective Vendor believes that any requirement in this RFP unduly or unfairly restrains competition, then the Vendor must state such belief in writing to the RFP Coordinator prior to the milestone established for submission of questions. The statement should reference specific language in the RFP by line number(s).

SEARCH will evaluate all such complaints and will respond, in writing, to the complaining Vendor only, in advance of the milestone established for posting of responses to questions. SEARCH may, in its sole discretion, determine that it is in SEARCH's best interests to alter the RFP to address the complaint. SEARCH may also, in its sole discretion, issue amendments to this RFP to address Vendor complaints, or for any other reason.

SEARCH's discretion and decisions regarding Vendor complaints and questions are final.

Response Contents and Format

Prospective vendors must submit responses in Microsoft Word (Office 97 version or more recent) or Adobe PDF format (version 6.0 or more recent). Responses must be submitted via email directly to the RFP Coordinator, with documents attached to the email. Information provided in the body of the email, rather than attachments thereto, will be ignored by SEARCH.

SEARCH will acknowledge receipt of responses via email, by direct response to the submitter's email, within one (1) business day of receipt.

Responses submitted by other means, including but not limited to in-person, fax, or postal delivery, will not be accepted.

Response Presentation and Format Requirements

Prospective vendors may format their response in accordance with their best judgment, keeping in mind that SEARCH must be able to read each response easily.

When printed, each response must print clearly in black-and-white on 8.5" x 11" paper.

Responses in excess of 30 total printed pages will be disqualified.

Responses must clearly identify each requirement in this RFP immediately preceding the Vendor's response to that requirement. Requirements in this RFP are indicated by grey shading, and are of the form “Mandatory/Scored Requirement X.”

Responses must be written in English.

Delivery of Responses

The prospective Vendor’s response to this RFP, in its entirety, must be received and acknowledged by the RFP Coordinator in advance of the due date specified in the schedule above. Late responses will not be accepted or considered.

Cost of Response Preparation

SEARCH will not reimburse prospective vendors for any costs incurred in preparation of a response to this RFP.

Waive Minor Administrative Irregularities

SEARCH reserves the right to waive minor administrative irregularities contained in any response. Additionally, SEARCH reserves the right, at its sole option, to make corrections to prospective vendors’ responses when an obvious arithmetical error has been made in the price quotation. Prospective vendors will not be allowed to make changes to their quoted price after the response submission deadline.

Errors in Response

Prospective vendors are liable for all errors or omissions contained in their responses. Prospective vendors will not be allowed to alter response documents after the deadline for response submission. SEARCH is not liable for any errors in responses. SEARCH reserves the right to contact a prospective Vendor for clarification of response contents.

Right to Cancel

SEARCH reserves the right to cancel this RFP at any time, for any reason. Issuing this RFP does not obligate SEARCH to enter into a contract with any Vendor or make any purchases.

Incorporation of Documents into Contract

By submitting a response, prospective vendors acknowledge and accept that the requirements of this RFP and the contents of the Vendor’s response will be incorporated into any contract entered into as a result of this RFP.

No Costs or Charges

By submitting a response, prospective vendors acknowledge and accept that SEARCH shall not be liable for any costs or charges incurred prior to the formal and complete execution of a contract between SEARCH and the successful Vendor.

Non-Endorsement and Publicity

SEARCH’s selection, if any, of a successful Vendor does not imply endorsement of the Vendor’s capabilities, personnel, products, or services. By submitting a response, Vendor agrees to make no reference to SEARCH, its staff, business partners, or granting agencies in any literature, promotional material, brochures, sales presentation, or the like, regardless of method of distribution, without the prior review and explicit written permission of SEARCH.

Withdrawal of Response

After submitting a response, prospective vendors may withdraw such response at any time.

Prospective vendors may resubmit a response at any time up until the milestone specified in the solicitation schedule above.

Optional Vendor Debriefing

Prospective vendors, whether successful or unsuccessful, may request a debriefing of the results of SEARCH's review of responses. Vendors must notify the RFP Coordinator via email of a request for debriefing within two (2) business days of the announcement of a successful Vendor.

The optional debriefing will not include any comparison between the response and any other responses submitted. However, SEARCH will explain the factors considered in the evaluation of the Vendor's response and the alignment of Vendor's capabilities with the solicitation requirements.

Vendor Requirements

Vendor Profile

Mandatory Requirement 1

Prospective Vendor's response must indicate:

- Legal business name
- Legal status (corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, etc.) and state of incorporation, if applicable
- Year the entity was organized to do business, as it now substantially exists
- Address, voice and fax telephone numbers, and Internet Website URL for primary correspondence/contact
- Organizational chart indicating principal corporate organization, and identifying where in the organizational structure the proposed project participants reside
- Names and titles of principal officers

Vendor Points of Contact

Mandatory Requirement 2

Prospective Vendor's response must indicate the name, title, and full contact information for the point of contact regarding this RFP.

Prospective Vendor's response must indicate the name, title, and full contact information for the staff member with accountability and the ability to obligate the Vendor for the development project envisioned by this RFP.

Acknowledgment of Terms and Conditions

SEARCH intends to manage the NIEM UML Profile Implementation development effort as follows:

1. SEARCH will maintain an ongoing list of potential NIEM UML Profile Implementation features. SEARCH, not the Vendor, is responsible for maintaining this list. While SEARCH would welcome suggestions as to potential new features from the Vendor, SEARCH will not compensate Vendor for time researching or evaluating potential features unless previously agreed in writing by SEARCH and Vendor.

2. In maintaining the list of NIEM UML Profile Implementation features, SEARCH will seek input and advice from key stakeholders, such as the NIEM Technical Architecture Committee (NTAC), the Project Manager for the Information Sharing Environment (PM-ISE), the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and SEARCH staff. Vendor will take direction only from SEARCH.

3. The Vendor will perform work in two-week increments called "iterations." An iteration starts on a Saturday and ends fourteen (14) days later on a Friday.

4. On the last day of an iteration, SEARCH and the Vendor project team will meet to select features from the list for implementation during the next iteration. SEARCH expects these meetings to occur via telephone and Web-enabled conference service, the costs of which will be borne by SEARCH (<u>not</u> including telephones, workstations, and broadband Internet access at Vendor's site necessary to participate).

5. For the first iteration under the contract, the planning session referenced in #4 above will occur as part of contract finalization.

6. Once the features are selected for implementation, Vendor will provide within one (1) business day a firm, fixed-price bid for implementing each feature. After receiving the bid from the Vendor, SEARCH may adjust the scheduled features, in order to reduce the price, or for any other reason. Vendor will have an opportunity to provide a new fixed-price bid after any changes in the scheduled features. Once agreement is reached between SEARCH and Vendor, they will execute a work order via email formalizing the agreement.

7. "Implementation" of features includes the following:
    a. Writing of source code, in accordance with the technical specifications below.
    b. Development of tests that demonstrate proper functioning of each component within the NIEM UML Profile Implementation.
    c. Continuous (daily) integration of new source code into the code base, including fully automated (unattended) building of executables from source, execution of tests, and reporting of results.

8. On the final day of the iteration, SEARCH and the Vendor project team will meet for a review of progress, documentation of lessons learned, and a formal decision from SEARCH to continue the project for another iteration. If the decision is to continue development, then SEARCH and the Vendor project team will repeat steps 4, 5, and 6.

9. If Vendor fails to implement a promised feature by the last day of the iteration, then Vendor will not receive payment for any resources expended in (partial) development of that feature. SEARCH may, at its sole discretion, schedule such a feature for inclusion in a future iteration's scope.

10. Vendor will invoice for each iteration's work upon SEARCH acceptance of iteration results.

11. Either SEARCH or Vendor may terminate the contract resulting from this RFP on the last business day of any month, with or without prior notification to the other party.

In addition, the following terms and conditions will apply throughout the project:

- SEARCH and the Vendor project team will meet weekly for up to thirty (30) minutes to review progress. Additional meetings will be scheduled as necessary. These meetings will take place via telephone and Web-enabled conference as necessary. The cost of Vendor participation in these meetings will be factored into Vendor's bid for the iteration features.

- Vendor must be available for communication and consultation between the hours of 8:00AM PT to 5:00PM PT, whether the current time is Standard or Daylight.

- Vendor agrees to permit SEARCH to inspect any and all source code artifacts, documentation, scripts, tests, and the like, at any point during the project. At a minimum, Vendor will provide SEARCH with a zip archive file containing all artifacts upon SEARCH's request at any time.

- While Vendor will store and maintain source code at its facility, Vendor acknowledges and accepts that deliverables and artifacts, including but not limited to source code, documentation, scripts, tests, and the like, are developed as "works for hire" and are the property of SEARCH from the moment they are created.

- At the termination of the contract resulting from this RFP, Vendor will transfer possession of all deliverables and artifacts developed under such contract to SEARCH, and will destroy all copies in the Vendor's possession.

Mandatory Requirement 3

Prospective Vendor's response must acknowledge and accept each and every one of these terms and conditions, and acknowledge Vendor's commitment to enter into a contract with SEARCH that specifies these terms and conditions. A response that does not acknowledge and accept each and every one of these terms and conditions will be deemed non-compliant with this mandatory requirement, and will be disqualified from further consideration.

Acceptance of Technical Specifications

1. The Tool will be developed in the Java programming language, using the Java 2 Standard Edition platform, version 1.6 or higher.

2. The Tool will consist of a set of "plug-ins" to the Eclipse rich client platform, version 4.2, as defined at http://www.eclipse.org. SEARCH intends to make it available as a single download (Java virtual machine downloaded separately from java.sun.com), and as a separate plug-in that can be installed into a separate Eclipse installation.

3. Tool development will require use of the Eclipse Modeling Framework (EMF) and UML metamodels available in the Eclipse framework, unless mutually agreed between SEARCH and the contractor.

Mandatory Requirement 4

Prospective Vendor's response must acknowledge and accept these technical specifications, and acknowledge Vendor's commitment to constrain its development approach in accordance with them. A response that does not acknowledge and accept these technical specifications will be deemed non-compliant with this mandatory requirement, and will be disqualified from further consideration.

Vendor Qualifications

Mandatory Requirement 5

Prospective Vendor's response must include résumé(s) of the Vendor's proposed project team.

The team must include at least one (1) full-time Java developer. The team will include a “team lead” role; this team member will be responsible for project management and coordination on the Vendor team. The team lead will be the primary point of contact for SEARCH on the project. The team lead must have at least five (5) years of experience working on the Java platform. Additional developers, if any, must have at least one (1) year of experience working on the Java platform.

Scored Requirement 1 – 25 pts.

Prospective Vendor’s response must describe its experience and qualifications as they relate to the technical specifications listed above, especially as related to the Java programming language and Eclipse platform. The response must highlight those aspects of the proposed project team’s résumé(s) most relevant to the technical specifications and requirements (i.e., experience on projects that had similar technical/application requirements, whether in the public safety / justice domain or not).

Scored Requirement 2 – 25 pts.

Prospective Vendor’s response must describe its experience and qualifications as they relate to the project management approach and software development methodology inherent in the “terms and conditions” listed above. The response must highlight those aspects of the proposed project team’s résumé(s) most relevant to this project management approach and software development methodology. The response should go beyond merely stating that a particular agile methodology was used; Vendor must demonstrate that its team followed the guidelines of that methodology on significant past projects.

The response should describe at least one (1) project delivered successfully by the Vendor in the past, using a similar approach/methodology. The response should provide the name and contact information of a contact person who can verify Vendor’s successful delivery of the project by the Vendor using a similar approach/methodology.

Scored Requirement 3 – 20 pts.

Prospective Vendor’s response must describe its experience and qualifications in the areas of public safety business analysis, information exchange design and implementation, and architecture. This experience and qualifications can include prior projects in the law enforcement, courts, corrections, probation, parole, motor vehicle administration, prosecution, and first-responder domains. Vendor’s response should identify team members’ familiarity with the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM).

Scored Requirement 4 – 20 pts.

Prospective Vendor’s response must provide the name, organization, mailing address, email address, and telephone contact information for two (2) references for whom Vendor has successfully completed a similar project. (“Similar project” means a project that used similar technologies, addressed a similar business problem [implementing a UML or EMF profile], supported a similar domain [justice, public safety], or any/all of these.) One of these references may be the same individual and/or organization provided in accordance with Scored Requirement 2 above.

Financial Quote

Scored Requirement 5 – 10 pts.

Prospective Vendor’s response must state the hourly rate for each of the team members described in Mandatory Requirement 5 above. A response may, but need not, state the same hourly rate for each team member (if multiple team members are proposed). This hourly rate is inclusive of all expenses and will be the only basis of payment by SEARCH to Vendor.

Evaluation Process

Overview

The successful Vendor will be the prospective Vendor that:

1. Meets all the mandatory requirements of this RFP, and
2. Scores the highest on Financial Quote and Vendor Qualifications criteria.

Administrative Screening and Mandatory Requirements

Upon receipt of a Vendor's response, SEARCH will review such response for compliance with all mandatory requirements of the RFP, including timely submission in the proper format. Any response not complying with each and every mandatory requirement will be excluded from further consideration. Vendors are responsible for careful review of their responses, prior to submission, to ensure that each mandatory requirement has been adequately addressed.

Scoring

A team of evaluators will be convened by SEARCH to review scored requirements. A weighting, based on a maximum point value, will be given to each of the five (5) scored requirements as shown above, for a total potential score of 100.

Financial Quote will be scored as follows:

Vendor score = 10 x (highest cost – Vendor cost) / (highest cost – lowest cost)

Where "cost" is the average of the hourly rates provided under Scored Requirement 5 above.