

Questions & Answers
RFx# 3000015626
Modernization of the Regulatory Management System

1. Section 4.1 of the RFP states that all work must be done onsite at the Poydras Building. It also states in the case of natural or manmade disasters ... "Contractor's staff will be able to work from a location that is agreeable to both parties." Given the current COVID environment is this project one in which it will be acceptable to perform the contracted services from a remote location with minimal onsite work?

Please refer to section 4.1 of the RFP, in its entirety.

2. In the initial RMS Solicitation Attachment, there are 2 Software Programming items listed for pricing. But in the new attachments you mention that we may have several resources including Project Managers, Architects, Developers, Testers. And the pricing / Cost sheet in the attachment has items listed as Fixed Cost as per Delivery Phase. Which one of the 2 should we be submitting?

The Proposer shall provide the total cost per milestone in accordance with Attachment IV – Cost Summary, including, but not limited to, travel and project expenses, for providing all services described in this RFP.

3. Does the new proposed online solution have to be on LA State servers? Or will they reside on the any Cloud Services?

Yes, they will need to remain hosted on LA State servers.

4. Is the State currently using any cloud services that we can use? AWS, Azure or Google Cloud?

No cloud services will be utilized for hosting.

5. If we propose our own Cloud services, will we be able to charge a Monthly Maintenance fee to the State for maintaining the new RMS system?

No.

6. After the delivery of the new RMS System will there be a continuous maintenance phase?

There will be a continuous maintenance phase outside of this contract. There will be a warranty period of coverage attached to this project.

7. How do you envision us manage Bugs and Feedback submission for the new RMS system? This is not part of the RFI currently and we felt that there should be some way for us to collect the Bugs and Feedback if any so that we can act upon in a timely manner.

Team Foundation Server (Azure DevOps Server) or GitHub can be utilized. Other technologies can be recommended but will need approval from the LDI Project Manager before being utilized.

8. Rewrites are difficult to get done properly especially in a fixed deliverable arrangement like this. Rewrites without requirements are difficult to quantify the effort. For example:

- a. The RFP mentions moving business logic out of the UI but does not describe any such business logic so as to allow us to evaluate complexity at any level of uncertainty. Can LDI provide the business logic?

- b. There seems to be quite a few reports in Section 5.5, but there isn't enough info to determine the degree of difficulty. Can LDI provide more information about reports?

Business Logic and Reports will be only modified, if necessary, and will not be fully rewritten. Due to the sensitive nature of our code base, both business logic and reports information will only be given out to the awardee of this contract.

- 9. Will LDI accept representative resumes with the assurance that actual staff will meet the same qualifications or better?

Refer to section 1.9.6 Proposed Staff Qualifications of the RFP.

- 10. Is there an incumbent for this project?

No.

- 11. Will LDI share the project budget?

The budget for this project is \$550,000.

- 12. Section 2.1 describes what work needs to be performed in person and the remaining work performed via VPN connection. However, section 4.1 states all work will be performed onsite at the Poydras Building, 1702 North Third Street, Baton Rouge, LA 70802 using only LDI Software and Equipment, unless prior approval is granted by the State Project Manager. Will LDI verify that remote work is acceptable with the noted exceptions in 2.1?

Please refer to section 4.1 of the RFP, in its entirety.

- 13. What is the budget for this project?

The budget for this project is \$550,000.

- 14. Can the majority of the work and meeting be performed off site?

Please refer to section 4.1 of the RFP, in its entirety.

- 15. Is there an incumbent vendor?

No.

- 16. Is there a page limit for the proposal response?

No.

- 17. Does the state have any preference for hosting the new system?

On-site LDI servers.

- 18. Would the state consider extending the deadline for submission?

No.

- 19. The proposal will be submitted on Sept 21 and notice of intent to award announcement will be on Oct 2. Will there be any oral presentation or demo held prior to shortlisting/notice of intent to award?

No.

- 20. Does the state prefer any specific methodology? Agile, Waterfall, Hybrid?

Yes, the state prefers a hybrid methodology.

- 21. Is support and maintenance part of the scope of this project or will the state handle this on its own?

Support and maintenance will be handled outside of this contract.

- 22. Will the State provide SMEs for each of the Functional Areas to expedite the project?

Yes.

Will the State also provide a sample of users from each functional area for User Acceptance Testing?

Yes.

23. Does the new system need to be integrated with any external/3rd party system? If yes, please provide details of the external system.
There should not be any changes to existing 3rd party system integration.
24. Is there an incumbent performing the conversion of the current system?
No.
25. Considering the current Covid situation would the State consider a remote implementation of this solution?
Please refer to section 4.1 of the RFP, in its entirety.
26. Is there a requirement to migrate data from the legacy system?
No.
27. Is the current EMS system conversion the primary focus of this RFP? If so is this a new initiative?
Yes, converting the EMS portion of RMS to an MVC structure is the primary focus of this RFP. Yes, this is a new initiative.
28. Is the conversion of the EMS to MVC currently in progress?
No.
29. There is a mention of 'Deliverables also include deploying and testing the mobile application in the Apple Store and Google Store.' Can we get details of this functionality? Is this part of EMS?
This was put into the RFP in error. This project does not include any mobile application development or testing.
30. Is offsite/offshore development permitted for this work?
Please refer to section 4.1 of the RFP, in its entirety.
31. "RMS is made up of two primary components, which are CRAFT and EMS. CRAFT includes Complaints, Rates, Forms, Legal, Enforcement, Fraud, Taxes, and Market Conduct. CRAFT is the modern part of the RMS system and is based on MVCS and associated technologies." – Can you share the high level architecture, physical architecture, and data flow diagrams for CRAFT?
These details will be made available to selected vendor post award.
32. "RMS is made up of two primary components, which are CRAFT and EMS. CRAFT includes Complaints, Rates, Forms, Legal, Enforcement, Fraud, Taxes, and Market Conduct. CRAFT is the modern part of the RMS system and is based on MVCS and associated technologies." – Are the functional and technical designs of CRAFT documented and will they be made available to the selected vendor post award?
These details will be made available to selected vendor post award.
33. "The system directly interfaces with the NAIC to retrieve license information for entities which are not licensed within the state and, via the same interface, pushes data to the NAIC systems for other states to use. Additionally, the system receives numerous types of transactions from the NAIC online systems which update the system throughout the business day. These transactions include license renewals, address changes, and appointments to name a few. These transactions include both the data component and require fees for the transactions." – Can you provide the integration approach for interfacing with NAIC, banks and IA interface with RMS application (ex: batch, file based, Web Services, etc.) and intent is to keep these same integrations in place.

The 3 listed approaches are all currently utilized. The intention is to keep all existing integrations in place.

34. "The rewritten codebase shall blend in seamlessly with the current RMS codebase that is already written in MVC. Automated/CI build features, as well as improvements to the responsive design, shall be included in this project." – Are CRAFT screens already responsive and is this requirement for the EMS screens only?

Most CRAFT screens are web responsive. The minimum requirements for this project are for the EMS screens to be web responsive.

35. "The rewritten RMS code base shall have the same functionality as the current LDI MVC codebase as well as be developed with testing in mind, to include unit test functionality." – What is the expected unit test coverage and what is the unit testing framework used? Is there any benchmark for coverage % which should prevent code from going into builds?

The expected unit test coverage is ~50% including the most critical areas. The unit test framework utilized is Visual Studio Test Tools.

36. "Automated/CI build features, as well as improvements to the responsive design, shall be included in this project." – What is the current Continuous Integration framework/tools used for CRAFT?

TFS Builds.

37. "The contractor shall provide development services to rewrite the approximately 90 legacy web form pages in the Regulatory Management System, from Web Forms to MVC." – Can you provide the average number of elements across EMS web forms?

Elements vary from 5-50 per screen, with an average of 30.

38. "The contractor shall provide development services to rewrite the approximately 90 legacy web form pages in the Regulatory Management System, from Web Forms to MVC." – Can you provide a list of web forms with multiple tabs and the count of tabs for each?

Please reference Section 5 (RMS Screens and Menus).

39. "Deliverables also include deploying and testing the mobile application in the Apple Store and Google Store." – Can you clarify this requirement, is a native mobile application required?

This was put into the RFP in error. This project does not include any mobile application development or testing.

40. What is the technology used for Reports?

Active Reports.

41. "The software system being installed shall be designed and configured by the Contractor to operate within the State's hardware, software and networking environments as specified in Attachment II." – Will the State provide vendor with required software and licenses needed for development?

Yes.

42. What has LDI spent on the initial implementation, annual support, hosting, enhancements and change orders for the current RMS system(s)?

Initial implementation was completed over 15 years ago. The annual RMS support, enhancements and change orders are rolled into overall application maintenance project, that is currently \$849,960 annually.

43. What funding does LDI have to put towards the initial system implementation? What, if any, amount of these funds may be subject to expiration and by what date(s)? And what has LDI budgeted for ongoing system maintenance, hosting, future enhancements and support beyond the implementation project?
The funding we have available for the initial system implementation is \$550,000. The funds will expire at the end of the project term which is TBD. The contractor who maintains our software maintenance contract at that time will be responsible for support beyond the implementation project.
44. What vendor(s) has LDI interacted with, received presentations, proposals, responses to RFIs, demonstrations and/or pricing related to this implementation prior to this RFP being issued?
None.
45. Given the comprehensive and complex nature of this RFP, will LDI please consider an extension of all RFP related deadlines, including the deadline to submit proposals?
No, extension will be given for this RFP.
46. The RFP makes it clear that LDI intends to have Proposers rewrite the existing RMS codebase and technology. Please elaborate upon why LDI would not consider proven COTS licensing system providers that could propose to migrate existing data from both existing RMS and MVC systems to a configurable solution that would provide the required data points, screens, functionalities and features LDI could benefit from versus paying potentially significantly more for ongoing / additional development of the existing RMS technologies?
The specific LDI functionality, business logic and integration with other systems would require significant upgrades/costs if we attempted to utilize a COTS system. The RMS is not just a licensing system.
47. Will LDI consider proposals from qualified COTS Licensing and Enforcement platform providers? If so, can the RFP be revised to reflect LDI's willingness to do so?
No.
48. Item 1.9.6 specifies that "All work must be done on site..." For proposal purposes, what assumptions should Proposers make regarding project work that is typically performed onsite (i.e. training, initial discovery, etc.) versus items performed by Proposer staff at their office location(s) such as configuration, testing, etc.?
Please refer to section 4.1 of the RFP, in its entirety.
49. What mechanism do Proposers have for taking exceptions / making suggestions to specific contract language?
Please refer to section 1.28 of the RFP.
50. Sections of the RFP, such as 1.3, in which "all source code..." to be becomes sole property of LDI. This may be problematic for some COTS system Proposers (should LDI accept proposals from these type of vendors) as source code is proprietary and confidential. What option(s) is LDI open to in order to keep COTS system source code from being distributed outside of LDI's use?
Please see the question and answer to question number 47.