NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION
Joseph Ponte, Commissioner

Susana Chávez Hersh, Deputy Director
Central Office of Procurement

Bulova Corporate Center
75-20 Astoria Boulevard, Suite 160
East Elmhurst, NY 11370

Office: 718 546-0768
Fax: 718 278-6205

June 26, 2014

ADDENDUM # 3
Request for Proposal for Furnishing of all Labor and Materials Necessary and Required for an "Investigative Case Management System" PIN 072201443MIS

Dear Prospective Bidder:

Pursuant to §3-02(i) of the Procurement Policy Board (PPB) Rules, the Department Correction (DOC) is issuing Addendum # 3 to the solicitation for "Investigative Case Management System" PIN 072201443MIS.

PROPOSAL DUE DATE
Please be advised that the Proposal Opening Date for the above referenced procurement remains **July 01, 2014 at 11:00AM**

DEADLINE FOR CLARIFICATIONS
The deadline for questions and/or clarifications has passed. The Department will endeavor to answer any questions received from here on, but there may not be sufficient time for replies to be received before the bid due date.

QUESTIONS

1. Given the size and scope of this case management endeavor, and the kickoff to summer and vacation schedules, would it be at all possible to please be granted another short extension so we can properly prepare the response?

   Response: There will be no further extension.

2. We would like to notify our references that you would be making contact.
   a. What is the time frame contact will be made to the references?
      Response: We will notify proposers regarding our intent to contact references closer to the actual date.

   b. Can you provide us with the email address that will be used so that we can be sure that your message does not get caught in SPAM blockers?
      Response: If we have trouble reaching the references via email, we will make sure to call them.

c. Will references be required to complete a questionnaire? If so, how extensive will the questionnaire be?
Response All references will be asked the same basic questions related to satisfaction with project work.

3. If a vendor has a state of the art ICMS solution that exceeds the budget estimate provided within the RFP should the vendor respond? Yes Or No?

   Response: All solutions will be considered.

4. Is DOC requesting for the ability to define required fields and mask characteristics (date format, time format, number is specific format etc.) of an entry field (1.1.0.1.1.1)?

   Response: It is anticipated that required fields will be defined during system configuration. Administrative users should be able to update tables, table values and business rules.

5. Can you provide an example of the configurable business rule for an action you wish to maintain (3.1.7)?

   Response: Example: User enters disposition of a case. Case status changes to closed.

6. Is this referring to exposed web services data (15.1.X)? Please Confirm.

   Response: Yes

7. What SSO is currently being used (19.2.0)?

   Response: Microsoft Active Directory is used for SSO.

8. It is assumed that this is DOC IT's responsibility (19.4.5)? Please Confirm.

   Response: Protection against malware is DOC and DoITT's responsibility.

9. In noting IDE it is assumed this is calling for a user interface not an actual Development Interface (20.4.1)? Please Confirm.

   Response: This requirement is for an interface for development support.

10. Forms and Notifications – Is this area to store these items for download to be filled in and processed as hard items, or is this asking for data entry forms, the soft equivalent of the forms?

    Response: The request is for data entry forms unless *print out for fill-in* is indicated in the *output type* column.

11. It mentions that you want your IT team to be able to support the system going forward. Are you requesting to purchase the actual source code? Or individual licenses for users? Thanks in advance for any assistance you can provide.

    Response: This depends on the solution and it is anticipated that options will be presented in the bid.

12. Please provide clarification on Functional Requirement 9.5.4 "Provide an index of elements recorded for a case".

    Response: This requirement refers to the ability to display all attributes of a case (sortable) at any point in the processing of a case.

13. Please provide clarification on Functional Requirement 9.6.11 "Restrict discovery package pickups to the assigned individual or agency."

    Response: This refers to the ability to record the authorized person picking up the discovery package.

14. Are travel and expenses included in the 1M budget or should the vendors list this separately? E.g. Discovery Sessions, UAT, Training, Deployment etc.

    Response: Expenses need to be bundled in the hourly rate.

15. Where can we find/review the NYC DOC Technical Standards?

    Response: See attachment to addendum 1.

16. Where can we find/review the NYC DOC Development Standards?

    Response: See attachment to addendum 1.

17. How does a CIS differ from an Incident? Can these two terms be used interchangeably? i.e. a pre-Case record?

    Response: Incidents are distinct from cases; i.e. incidents may or may not result in cases.

18. What is the difference between a Case Management Action and a Case Activity? Are they one and the same?

    Response: Please review the data element map which refers to Case Management Actions.

19. What tools and technologies do you currently use for monitoring and maintenance?

    Response: See addendum 1, question 18.

20. What is the volume of historical cases in each of your current systems? During the pre-proposal conference, it was decided that you will be providing this information to the vendors.

    Response: The approximate volume of historical cases is as follows:
    ITTS/Investigation – 71,000
    ITTS/Trials – 15,000
    Time Matters/General Counsel – 6,200
    Time Matters /EEO – 3,000
    OLRMS – 10,000

21. Since data import is needed from existing/legacy system, can we get details of the data? (internal vs. external, data format, push/pull mechanism etc.)

    Response: Data is entered into the databases as outlined in the RFS.

22. Is city open to using off the shelf product? eg. REMEDY etc,?

    Response: Yes, if configured to meet the requirements.

23. What are the typical attributes of a case; and for documents is versioning needed?

    Response: Please see Data Element Map; Yes, versioning would be helpful.

24. How many letter templates/user configured documents are involved in this upgrade?

    Response: See Forms and Notifications list.

25. Has the city identified a hosting provider? If not, would the city be open to hosting by the engaged contractor?

    Response: It is anticipated that DOC will be hosting the solution.

26. How much data is involved? (quantity)

    Response: See question #20 above. There are multiple data elements for each case.

27. For workflows specific to "Legal" (and others too), is the city anticipating general public interface to lodge complaints?

    Response: No

28. Clarification on Bullet 5, Page 3 - Closure/Disposition: Is the City looking to declare the content associated with the case as a record with disposition / retention schedule once the case is closed?

Response: Disposition is associated with the case, not the contents of the case.

29. Clarification on Bullet 6, Page 3 - Analytics / Reporting: Is there an expectation to integrate with City's existing Cognos system for reporting?

    Response: That is an option.

30. Reference to 4.3.6: What is the expectation from identify individual responsibility for a case assignment? Please elaborate

    Response: The requirement is to assign individuals to cases.

31. Reference to 4.3.11: Will a pre-defined weight/priority level suffice to achieve this functionality? Or is the expectation for the investigator to select these items and for the solution to determine weight based on these factors?

    Response: Algorithms will be defined by the user groups.

32. Reference to 4.3.12: Please clarify? Does the solution need to calculate the weight of the case or the individual based on his/her caseload?

    Response: Weights of the cases will be determined by defined algorithms.

33. Reference to 4.5.1 to 4.5.4: Is the expectation to develop a timesheet management workflow as part of this solution? Or since this is a desired functionality, is the expectation for the DOC to be able to develop a timesheet workflow in the future using this solution?

    Response: DOC currently derives these reports from the legacy applications and would like the proposed solution to provide this functionality.

34. Reference to 5.3.0 to 5.3.2: Could you provide an example of related cases and what's the expectation of identifying the relation? Could a simple Case Ref No. suffice or is there a need to have an hyperlink to the other case? Who identifies case reference number or creates a link to create the relation? System or User?

    Response: Example: The same individual staff person could have multiple cases open across user groups. It is important to validate that individual from a master table while processing multiple cases. Users open and close cases and select entities from master tables. The system should enforce business rules.

35. Reference to 9.8.2: How is the system receiving documents from external sources?

    Response: Users must be able to upload documents from external sources.

Please sign below in acknowledgment of this addendum.
***Submit this addendum with your bid.**

Deputy Director

I Acknowledge Receipt of this Addendum.

____
Bidder/Company Name (Print)

____
Authorized Representative (Print Name)

____
Authorized Representative (Signature) Date