



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

**ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
COURTS (AOC)**

REGARDING:
INDEPENDENT CODE QUALITY
ASSESSMENT

PROPOSALS DUE:
3 PM, MAY 13, 2011

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1.1 The Judicial Council of California, chaired by the Chief Justice of California, is the chief policy making agency of the California judicial system. The California Constitution directs the Council to improve the administration of justice by surveying judicial business, recommending improvements to the Courts, and making recommendations annually to the Governor and the Legislature. The Council also adopts rules for Court administration, practice, and procedure, and performs other functions prescribed by law. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency for the Council and assists both the Council and its chair in performing their duties.
- 1.1.2 The California Court Case Management System (CCMS) V4 project is a software development effort intended to create and deploy a single statewide case management system to support California's trial courts. This development effort is being performed by a systems integration firm and sponsored by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).
- 1.1.3 The CCMS project combines code from the AOC's CCMS V3 and concepts from the AOC's CCMS V2 and expands upon the services and functionality provided by those systems. The CCMS V4 development effort began in 2007 and is presently in core functionality product acceptance testing. The system is currently comprised of approximately 6 million lines of Java code.

In December 2009/January 2010 significant quality issues were discovered in the system as it prepared to enter acceptance testing in the spring of 2010. As a result, the project was delayed approximately one year to address identified issues, and recently re-entered acceptance testing for core system functionality.

The AOC and the State of California are interested in assuring that quality issues have been successfully dealt with prior to exiting acceptance testing and beginning deployment to three early adopter courts. To support that effort, the AOC is seeking an independent review of CCMS to determine whether significant quality or maintainability problems remain.

1.2 INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION

- 1.2. The Information Services Division (ISD), a division of the AOC, coordinates court technology statewide, and supports coordination throughout the judicial branch; manages centralized statewide technology projects; and optimizes the scope and accessibility of accurate statewide judicial information.

1.3 REQUESTS FOR PROPOSAL OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

- 1.3.1 The AOC invites all qualified and interested software development consulting companies (hereinafter “vendor,” “proposer” or “service provider”) with proven experience, to submit proposals to perform a rapid quality assessment of the California Court Case Management System (CCMS) software development project and resulting products. The purpose of the assessment is to obtain an independent opinion about quality and appropriateness of the processes used to create the software as well as an assessment of the quality, consistency and maintainability of the software itself.

The results of this assessment may be used to provide the basis for development-vendor (“Vendor”) discussions and AOC decisions about deploying the system into production.

The CCMS application is currently in the Product Acceptance testing phase. It is the expectation of the AOC that conducting this review will not require a halt in the project; rather, it will be performed in concert with the remaining development and testing effort without significant disruption.

- 1.3.2 The AOC wishes to conduct an independent review of CCMS focusing on three areas.

- 1.3.2.1 CMMS Project level compliance with CMMI level 3 - The development Vendor was previously assessed at CMMI Level 3, but the scope of that review was the larger Vendor organization and not limited to the CCMS project. The AOC will be performing, under a separate solicitation and separate contract, a Standard CMMI Appraisal Method for Process Improvement (SCAMPI) appraisal of the CCMS development project.

- 1.3.2.2 CCMS Application Review - Review a sample of project artifacts to determine their internal consistency and assess their quality with respect to best practices for a project of this size and complexity.

- 1.3.2.2.1 Contractor will randomly select artifacts, including requirements, design documents; sections of code and test scripts and conduct a traceability assessment and quality review.

- 1.3.2.2.2 The contractor will also conduct non-random reviews of system components and supporting artifacts suggested by analysis of code

and data about the effort to date, including but not limited to: reported fault density, change management history, cyclomatic complexity, call frequency, the results of the separately contracted SCAMPI appraisal, and other mechanisms to be determined by the contractor.

1.3.2.3 Exploratory Testing

- 1.3.2.3.1 Contractor will use existing acceptance test scripts as a point of departure for the exploratory testing of CCMS, creating defect reports to document any defects identified.

2.0 TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

- 2.1 The AOC has developed the following list of key events from the time of the issuance of this RFP through the intent to award contract. All dates are subject to change at the discretion of the AOC.

EVENT	KEY DATE
RFP issued:	April 29, 2011
Deadline for questions to solicitations@jud.ca.gov	May 9, 2011 No later than 3 p.m.
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted	May 13, 2011 No later than 3 p.m.
Evaluation of proposals (<i>estimate only</i>)	May 16-18, 2011
Interview of top candidates (<i>estimate only</i>)	May 19, 2011
Notice of Intent to Award (<i>estimate only</i>)	May 20, 2011
Negotiations and execution of contract (<i>estimate only</i>)	May 23, 2011

3.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

- 3.1 The AOC seeks the consulting services of a vendor to perform a rapid quality assessment of the California Court Case Management System (CCMS) software development project and resulting products ***for approximately two (2) months***. The expected contractual responsibilities and work requirements are set forth in Attachment 2, Contract Terms and Conditions. The work will be conducted in two locations: the Golden Gate Avenue Offices in San Francisco and the Vendor's location in Santa Ana, California.

- 3.2 Proposers must submit their hourly rates and unit price for the required deliverables, of the CCMS Code Quality Assessment.
- 3.3 After scoring and evaluation of all proposals, if it is determined that no single vendor or vendor consortium proves adequate to address the full range of requirement categories; the AOC may choose to award portions of this RFP to multiple vendors or vendor consortiums.

4.0 RFP ATTACHMENTS

- 4.1 Included as part of this RFP are the following attachments:
 - 4.1.1 Attachment 1, Administrative Rules Governing Request for Proposals. Proposers shall follow the rules, set forth in Attachment 1, in preparation and submittal of their proposals.
 - 4.1.2 Attachment 2, Contract Terms and Conditions. Contracts with successful firms will be signed by the parties on a Standard Agreement form and will include terms appropriate for this project. Terms and conditions typical for the requested services are attached as Attachment 2, Contract Terms and include: Exhibit A, Work to be Performed; Exhibit B, Payment Provisions; Exhibit C, Contractor's Key Personnel (to be determined); Exhibit D, Standard and Special Provisions; and Exhibit E, Attachments.
 - 4.1.3 Attachment 3, Proposer's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms. Proposers must either indicate acceptance of Contract Terms, as set forth in Attachment 2, Contract Terms, *or* clearly identify exceptions to the Contract Terms, as set forth in this Attachment 3. If exceptions are identified, then proposers must also submit (i) a red-lined version of Attachment 2, Contract Terms, that clearly tracks proposed changes to this attachment, and (ii) written documentation to substantiate each such proposed change.
 - 4.1.4 Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form. The AOC is required to obtain and keep on file, a completed Payee Data Record for each Proposer prior to entering into a contract with that vendor. Therefore, vendor's proposal must include a completed and signed Payee Data Record Form, set forth as Attachment 4, or provide a copy of the form previously submitted to AOC.
 - 4.1.5 Attachment 5, Pricing Information and Conditions. Proposers must submit their pricing as set forth in Attachment 5, Pricing Information and Conditions.
 - 4.1.6 Attachment 6, Pricing Proposal Template. Proposers must use the file named "ISD-201004-GW Independent_CCMS Application_Quality_Assesment-Attachment 6 20110428.xlsx" to submit their pricing.

5.0 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

- 5.1 Proposals will be evaluated by the AOC on a 100 point scale using the criteria set forth in the table below. Proposers must clearly demonstrate how it meets the requirements of the evaluation criterion.

Evaluation Category	Possible Points	Corresponding RFP Sections or Attachments
Specialized experience and technical competence	40	6.2.1.2 Key personnel relevant experience 6.2.1.3 Resumes with references 6.2.2 Past Record of Performance
Reasonableness of cost projections	30	4.1.5 Attachment 5, Pricing Information and Conditions 4.1.6 Attachment 6, Pricing Proposal Template 6.2.4.1 Cost Proposal
Proposed Implementation Plan and Methodology	20	6.2.3.1 Work Process Proposal 6.2.3.2 Proposed Work Plan
Company Information, Contract Compliance and Resource Availability	10	4.1.3 Attachment 3, Proposer's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms. 4.1.4 Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form 6.1.1 Proposer Information 6.1.2 Statement of Availability 6.1.3 Compliance with Contract Terms

6.0 SPECIFICS OF A RESPONSIVE PROPOSAL

6.1 Company Information, Contract Compliance and Resource Availability:

6.1.1 Proposer Information – Provide the following information about your firm:

6.1.1.1 Proposer's point of contact, including name, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone and facsimile numbers in a cover letter.

6.1.1.2 Number of years your firm has been in the business of providing services similar in nature to the work set forth in this RFP.

6.1.1.3 Number of full time employees.

6.1.1.4 Disclose any judgments, pending litigation, or other real or potential financial reversals that might materially affect the viability of the proposer's firm.

- 6.1.1.5 Annual gross revenue from your most recent audited or reviewed profit and loss statement and balance sheet. State the audit/review year and the annual gross revenue. The AOC may request a copy of your most recent audited or reviewed profit and loss statement and balance sheet.
- 6.1.2 Statement of Availability - A list of existing professional time commitments.
- 6.1.3 Compliance with Contract Terms - Complete and submit Attachment 3, Proposer's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms. The AOC will not be accepting proposed changes to these terms.
- 6.2 The following information shall be included in the proposal and demonstrated separately for each key personnel candidate proposed:
 - 6.2.1 Specialized expertise and technical competence
 - 6.2.1.1 Demonstrate the proposed key personnel's relevant experience and technical competence to conduct a review of the CCMS application deliverables and artifacts.
 - 6.2.1.1.1 Minimum of 5-7 years of coding experience.
 - 6.2.1.1.2 Proficiency with JAVA, SQL and Oracle databases
 - 6.2.1.1.3 In-depth knowledge of J2EE and WebLogic
 - 6.2.1.1.4 Experience with reviewing other developers code
 - 6.2.1.1.5 Familiarization with TIBCO middleware, Adobe Livecycle, Oracle Security Products and the Rational Toolsuite is a plus.
 - 6.2.1.1.6 Good communication skills, with both technical and non-technical audiences
 - 6.2.1.1.7 Experience deploying applications in a large data center and understand the relationship between multiple hardware platforms and the interrelationship of different operating systems.
 - 6.2.1.1.8 Principles of information systems architecture for enterprise-wide systems development such as: client/server and multi-tiered, distributed system architecture including internet based application delivery mechanisms.
 - 6.2.1.1.9 Strong analytical capabilities and the ability to breakdown complex ideas into manageable pieces.
 - 6.2.1.1.10 Knowledge of the principles of systems design, implementation, and development.
 - 6.2.1.2 Provide the most recent resume and the names, physical and electronic addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of three (3) clients for

whom the proposed key personnel has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by the proposer.

- 6.2.2 Past record of performance. Discuss each proposed personnel's record of performance on past projects, especially on contracts with government agencies or public bodies, including such factors as quality of work, ability to meet schedules, cooperation, responsiveness, and other IT technical considerations.
- 6.2.3 Proposed Implementation Plan and Methodology:
 - 6.2.3.1 Work Process Proposal - A summary of proposer's processes for this engagement, with projected time estimates, per deliverable.
 - 6.2.3.2 Proposed Work Plan - a high-level estimate of time-to-completion, from concept to successful delivery of all desired project deliverables
- 6.2.4 Reasonableness of cost projections.
 - 6.2.4.1 Cost Proposal - The cost proposal must be submitted as set forth in Attachment 5, Pricing Information and Conditions and Attachment 6, Pricing Proposal Template. It is expected that all service providers responding to this RFP will offer the service provider's government or comparable favorable rates.
 - 6.2.4.2 Provide the fully burdened hourly rate of each proposed key personnel.
 - 6.2.4.3 Include a total not to exceed contract sum for the work and allowable expenses considered by this RFP
- 6.2.5 Ability to meet requirements of the project.
 - 6.2.5.1 Discuss each key personnel's availability and ability to complete the work within the project schedule, set forth in Exhibit D, Work to be Performed, in Attachment 2, Contract Terms.
 - 6.2.5.2 For purposes of this RFP, vendors are to estimate a total of 336 hours of work for the two (2) months; additionally, the eventual contractor(s) will not work more than forty (40) hours per week unless preapproved, in writing, by the project manager.
 - 6.2.5.3 Compliance with Contract Terms. Complete and submit Attachment 3, Proposer's Acceptance of the RFP's Contract Terms. Also, if changes are proposed, submit a version of Attachment 2, Contract Terms with all tracked changes, as well as written justification supporting any such proposed changes.

6.2.5.4 Tax recording information. Complete and submit Attachment 4, Payee Data Record Form, or provide a copy of the form previously submitted to the AOC.

7.0 SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

- 7.1 Responsive proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements noted in Section 6.0, Specifics of a Responsive Proposal, above. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the state's instructions, requirements of this RFP, and completeness and clarity of content.
- 7.2 Proposers will submit **one (1) original and three (4) copies** of the proposal, signed by an authorized representative of the company, including name, title, address, and telephone number of one individual who is the responder's designated representative.
- 7.3 Proposals must be delivered by the due date to the individual listed under Submission of Proposals, as set forth on the cover memo of this RFP.
- 7.4 Only written responses will be accepted. Responses should be sent by registered or certified mail or by hand delivery.
- 7.5 In addition to submittal of the original and four copies of the proposals, as set forth in Section 7.2, above, proposers are also required to submit an electronic version of the entire proposal on CD-ROM.

8.0 INTERVIEWS

The AOC anticipates conducting interviews with top ranked proposed key personnel candidates to clarify aspects set forth in the written proposal. If conducted, interviews will likely be conducted at the AOC's offices in San Francisco. The AOC will not reimburse candidates for any costs incurred in traveling to or from the interview location. The AOC will notify prospective vendors regarding interview arrangements.

9.0 RIGHTS

The AOC reserves the right to reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, as well as the right to issue similar RFPs in the future. This RFP is in no way an agreement, obligation, or contract and in no way is the AOC or the State of California responsible for the cost of preparing the proposal. One copy of a submitted proposal will be retained for official files and will become a public record.

10.0 CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

The Administrative Office of the Courts is bound by California Rules of Court 10.500, see:

http://www.courts.ca.gov/7260.htm?title=ten&linkid=rule10_500

If the AOC receives a request for public access to material submitted in response to this RFP, the AOC will determine, in its sole opinion, whether marked material is exempt from disclosure under

Rule 10.500 or applicable law. If the AOC, in its sole opinion, finds or reasonably believes that the material so marked is exempt from disclosure, that material will not be disclosed. If the AOC finds or reasonably believes that the material so marked is **not** exempt from disclosure, the AOC will contact the proposer with a request to substantiate its claim for confidential treatment, but may disclose the information pursuant to rule 10.500 and applicable law regardless of the marking or notation seeking confidential treatment.

END OF FORM