DII E-Sign Routing Slip

IT Activity/Project Name: Department of Corrections - Offender Management System

Department: Department of Corrections

Oversight Project Manager: Barbara Cormier

Document(s) for Approval:

__Business Case/Cost Analysis

__Contract

__RFP or SOW

X IR Final report

__Other (please specify):

Has the Business Case been approved already? Originally submitted in Feb. 2013 in older format

Please include a copy of the approved Business Case in the e-sign package for reference.

Currently working with DOC to update Business Case in updated template and it is nearly completed

Is this a resubmission for approval? No

If yes, please list the issues &/or questions that needed to be addressed to obtain approval. Provide responses to those questions/issues &/or indicate where they are addressed within the document to be e-signed.

Other Comments?

BA (Over 100K)		
Oversight Project Manager	E-SIGNED by Barbara Cormier on 2013-08-06 14:36:17 GMT	August 06, 2013
Contract & Procurement Specialist		
Subject Matter Expert		
CTO or Designee		
Deputy Commissioner		
CIO	E-SIGNED by Richard Boes on 2013-08-06 14:42:27 GMT	August 06, 2013

State of Vermont

Independent Review
Offender Management Solution

Submitted to the
State of Vermont, Office of the CIO
August 3, 2013

V1

Prepared by:
Doug Rowe, PMP, Project Manager
Charlie Leadbetter, PMP, Principal
Evan Kohn, Senior Consultant
Berry Dunn McNeil & Parker, LLC (BerryDunn)
100 Middle Street, PO Box 1100
Portland, Maine 04104-1100
207.541.2330, drowe@berrydunn.com
207.541.2249, cleadbetter@berrydunn.com
207.541.2265, ekohn@berrydunn.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section provides a summary of the Independent Review.

The State of Vermont's Department of Information and Innovation (DII) engaged Berry Dunn McNeil & Parker, LLC (BerryDunn) to conduct an Independent Review (IR) of InterAct's proposal response dated April 4, 2013, to the State's Request for Proposal (RFP): Department of Corrections Offender Management System (OMS) that was released on February 15, 2013. BerryDunn interviewed staff and management from the DII, State Department of Corrections (DOC), the Agency of Human Services (AHS), and InterAct. The assigned DII Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO) Oversight Project Manager (OPM) and the State's DOC IT Manager provided BerryDunn with additional documents that were used to conduct this review.

At the time of this Independent Review a State of Vermont statute required the DII to conduct an Independent Review for all information technology projects estimated to exceed $500,000. In this case, the Independent Review examines the selection process for the OMS project. The State Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) sought an independent assessment of the:

- Proposed costs
- Architecture of the proposed solution
- Vendor's proposed implementation plan
- Vendor's capacity to provide the proposed equipment, support, and services.

The primary objective of the Independent Review is to identify risks and issues that may impact the success of the project, and determine mitigation strategies for each risk and issue.

The entities involved in this Independent Review include, but are not limited to: the preferred OMS vendor "InterAct" and other stakeholders in the State of Vermont such as, DII, Agency of Human Services Information Technology (AHSIT), the DOC and the EPMO, collectively referred to as "the State."

The findings identified in the Independent Review were discussed with the DOC IT Manager as soon as they were identified.

In 2012, BerryDunn conducted an Independent Review of the DOC's selection of an offender management system which was proposed to the State by InterAct. During this Independent Review a number of significant risks were identified which resulted in the following recommendation:

> "BerryDunn recommends that this project should not move forward as currently proposed by the vendor: an application development project to develop a hosted, web-based solution based on the functionality of the client-server JailTracker solution currently available on the market. This recommendation was based on many significant risks to the state, including:
>
> - A web-based version of the software that is being developed for the State that does not exist today
> - The State assisting the vendor to develop this new application

- The vendor lacks experience in a multi-function environment (jails, prisons and community supervision)
- The resulting hardware/software is proposed to be hosted in an off-site location
- The State reports it does not have mature policies and procedures in place to support this model
- The replacement of the legacy PAS system with the proposed solution does not result in a positive Return on Investment (in the first 10 years after deployment)."

The RFP for an OMS, issued on February 22, 2013 included a modified set of requirements:

- The requirement for a web-based system was removed
- It allowed for system hosting by the vendor as an option
- It required the selected vendor's project manager to have attained PMP certification from the Project Management Institute

During this Independent Review no high impact risks or issues were identified. Some of the High Impact risks described in the 2012 Independent Review report remain, however due to InterAct's proposed approach in the April 4, 2013 response they have been ranked as Medium Impact or Low Impact risks. One issue and 13 risks were identified during this Independent Review. They are described later in this report.

1.1 Summary of Findings

Through a series of interviews with InterAct and key State staff, BerryDunn identified 35 findings. A summary of these findings can be found in Table 1 below. Many of the findings resulted in the identification of potential project risks or issues. Appendix C and Appendix D list summaries of the risks and issues respectively. Appendix E includes a cross reference between the Findings and the associated Risks or Issues. Findings are defined as follows:

Finding: A relevant discovery, identified during the execution of this Independent Review that may lead to one or more Risks and/or Issues.

As BerryDunn conducted its on-site activities, we organized our meetings with the State and Vendor into the four major areas of the IR process: Acquisition Cost Assessment, Technical Architecture, Implementation Plan, and Organizational Readiness. When we identified a relevant finding, we documented it for later consideration with regards to the creation of Risks and Issues. Our findings have also been organized into the four major areas of the IR process:

Table 1 – Summary of Findings

Area Evaluated	Findings
Acquisition Cost	• InterAct has proposed a $0 perpetual license for the JailTracker solution • Implementation costs are budgeted under software—product license • InterAct proposed a 2% flat percentage annual increase in hosting fees • The change control process for the InterAct solution post-implementation does not clearly define software changes vs. software defects • InterAct responded negatively to RFP Contract Provision #10 that required the State to serve as the intellectual property owner • The State does not have plans to use SafeTown or Interdex, though usage of the services is included in the proposal
Technical Architecture	• InterAct is proposing a client-server based Commercial Off-the-Shelf (COTS) solution, which will require configuration as well as some customization to be usable by the State of Vermont • The State reported that they are confident that JailTracker sentence computation calculations will be accurate • The State reported that they are confident in InterAct's ability to build effective field/case management modules • The State expressed concern about how JailTracker will accept legacy data, minimum and maximum sentences, and manipulation of legal statuses • No redundancy exists between the institutions and the central data center, which presents a single point of failure for network connectivity • InterAct's proposed plan for a Security Risk Assessment is not clear

Area Evaluated	Findings
Implementation Plan	• InterAct proposed a hybrid system deployment model, which includes the implementation of appliances at each of the DOC facilities; DII has indicated that this approach is not acceptable; in subsequent discussions with DII and InterAct, there is general agreement that Citrix or Terminal Services will meet the needs of the project • The State and InterAct do not have a clear understanding of their respective roles and responsibilities for data cleansing • The State has clearly articulated expected procedures for performing data migration • The InterAct proposal describes multiple Service Level Agreement (SLA) models for the InterAct solution and hosting services • The State does not plan to migrate inmate biometric data to JailTracker • The State does not plan to automate the migration of inmate photos to the JailTracker system • The State will implement the client-server program, JailTracker, first and have the option of implementing the web version, InterAct OMS, a year afterward or later; it is not clear whether the InterAct OMS will have been implemented by another state DOC prior to the time VT wants to implement • State stakeholders have differing knowledge of whether all or some data in PAS will be migrated to JailTracker • The State will use InterAct's document management system, not the AHS On-Base solution • InterAct has proposed the use of the InterAct Electronic Health Records (EHR) module as part of the overall solution at no-extra charge • InterAct is proposing NLETS as the hosting services provider instead of Secure24, which was proposed during the last procurement • The DOC has identified a team of five key leaders to provide project oversight • The proposed implementation approach does not have a clear training strategy • The State expressed a desire to be heavily engaged during any project phases that include software customization • InterAct's help desk will accept calls from anyone in the State's DOC • It is not clear what resources will be needed from the AHS IT team during implementation and roll-out • The InterAct proposal included a number of grammatical typos and formatting inconsistencies

Area Evaluated	Findings
Organizational Readiness	• The State is in the process of mapping the current PAS system data elements, with completion expected in July • The State's proposed Project Manager is currently allocated to this project part-time • The proposed Sierra Systems Project Manager does not have experience with OMS implementation or JailTracker • The DII EPMO Project Oversight Manager's assignment and allocation to this project represents 1.5% of the project cost • InterAct plans to implement InterAct OMS (web version) with County jail systems with 300-800 beds, though it does not have existing plans in place to implement the solution in a statewide corrections environment; all of the company's future software development efforts will focus on InterAct OMS, the web version of their software • The Procurement Department did not appear to play an active role in the Evaluation Process, though it would be up to the Department to defend any challenges to the process

1.2 Summary of Key Risks and Issues

BerryDunn identified both Risks and Issues as a result of this Independent Review. The Project Management Institute (PMI) provides an important distinction between the two, and BerryDunn believes that this section must include a narrative regarding Risks and Issues.

Risk: Uncertain events or conditions which, if they occur, have a negative effect on the project's objectives. Risks are events or conditions that may occur in the future.

Issue: An Issue is a situation which has occurred or will definitely occur, as opposed to a Risk which is a potential event.

1.2.1 Risk Summary

During BerryDunn's review of the OMS Implementation Project, 13 risks were identified. The proposed solution is InterAct's legacy client-server solution, which is currently commercially available and meets many of the requirements described in the RFP. During the 2012 procurement process, InterAct proposed a web-based solution which was not yet commercially available. The direct risks inherent with the development of this web-based solution to meet the State of Vermont DOC OMS RFP requirements were significant. The DOC modified requirements prior to issuing the OMS RFP dated February 22, 2013. In response to this RFP, InterAct proposed their commercially available client server system. The State has reported a desire to deploy the web-based version of the proposed solution once it is commercially available and has been proven to support a multi-functional (jails, prisons, probation & parole) state environment that currently exists in the State of Vermont. InterAct's product roadmap for the JailTracker solution includes migration of the user experience to a web-based platform by summer, 2014. InterAct has indicated that this solution will be deployed in many of their medium-to-large jail customers in 2014 and 2015. There are no current plans to deploy this web-based version in a state environment. The State has the option to remain on the client-server version indefinitely, or until that platform is no longer supported by InterAct. The JailTracker roadmap does not indicate when support for the client-server platform will be discontinued. A Field Case Management module does not exist in the client-server version of JailTracker. This module must be developed specifically for the State of Vermont DOC.

Although this requires customization of the InterAct solution, the effort and risk is significantly less than InterAct's solution proposed in 2012.

Additionally, BerryDunn has a concern that the JailTracker solution may not be configurable enough to support the complex state-level sentencing statutes without some level of code customization. The JailTracker solution is not deployed in any state DOC environment. Although it is deployed in many medium and large jail environments, sentence computation models are typically much easier to implement via system configuration in those environments, since the sentences are typically much shorter than in a state DOC environment.

During the 2012 Independent Review a risk related to the State's development of a process for defining policies and procedures to support a Public Cloud environment was described. During the interviews for this Independent Review representatives from AHSIT have indicated that the currently proposed solution is a client-server application being hosted at an off-site facility, and thus not falling under the definition of a "cloud-based solution." Because of this, we have removed this risk during the 2013 Independent Review.

DII is currently reviewing Security and Hosting NLETS documentation to determine if the NLETS supports the state and national standards for a data center that hosts sensitive corrections data and complies with all HIPAA standards. BerryDunn recommends that this process be completed and that DII feels comfortable with the proposed hosting center prior to the execution of the contract.

In both the 2012 and 2013 InterAct proposals, the proposed solution included a document management module. In 2012 it was not clear how the deployment of this module would integrate or compete with the evolving standard to use OnBase as the document management solution within AHS. During the interviews conducted as part of this 2013 Independent Review, the DOC indicated that OnBase is no longer the preferred document management solution for AHS, and that the intent is to leverage InterAct's proposed document management module to the extent possible. The DOC reported that this would be a significant advancement from the current situation where no document management solution is in use.

During the 2012 Independent Review the State (DOC) originally recommended that the State Implementation Project Manager (PM) be a part-time resource. This was largely driven by available funding for this resource. During this 2013 Independent Review BerryDunn found that a part-time resource was still being considered; however during the facilitation process to solicit the State's plan for mitigating risks and issues it became clear that a full-time PM will be utilized for this project. The PM is assigned from the AHS PMO and will be dedicated to this project on a full-time basis throughout the implementation of the OMS. The assigned PM does not have corrections or OMS implementation experience. However the DOC has documented that they are comfortable with this gap since a strong team from the DOC will be supporting her throughout the process. BerryDunn believes that a risk still exists, but it is significantly lower than the similar risk documented during the 2012 Independent Review. AHS has not yet decided if the assigned PM will be comprised of two part time PMs, the currently assigned PM for full-time, or an alternate resource as a full-time resource.

In the 2012 InterAct proposal, the proposed PM did not have InterAct implementation experience, nor did he have any OMS implementation experience, and he was not a PMP. The 2013 InterAct proposal includes a modified model for the deployment of JailTracker. Under this model InterAct would provide the software while Sierra Systems would play the role of systems

integrator (SI) to implement the solution. This model is widely accepted in the market as viable. However, even though the proposed InterAct (Sierra Systems) PM has OMS implementation experience and is a PMP, he has no experience implementing JailTracker. InterAct has indicated that this gap would be filled by a close collaboration between the proposed InterAct PM and the InterAct Product Management team. BerryDunn believes that this approach significantly lowers the risk impact documented in the 2012 Independent Review, but does not completely eliminate the risk.

A summary table of Key Risks can be found in Appendix C.

1.2.2 Issue Summary

During BerryDunn's review of the OMS Implementation Project, one issue was identified. This is a significant improvement over the 2012 Independent Review when 19 issues were identified. The single issue is related to InterAct's proposed annual increase in hosting fees without proving the value associated with the increase. The DOC IT Manager has indicated that this issue will be addressed during negotiations with InterAct.

A summary table of key Issues can be found in Appendix D.

1.3 Independent Review Recommendations

The 2012 Independent Review of the OMS selection reported that the proposed solution was a large-scale application development project, not a simple configuration of a COTS solution. The primary elements of the application development project included the development of a new web-based user interface and the development of custom application modules to accommodate the unique requirements of the DOC. Once developed, the State would have been the first and only customer on the new platform. In InterAct's current proposal, they propose their currently available client-server version of JailTracker, with an upgrade path to a web-based version once it is commercially available in the market. This proposed solution significantly decreases the risk to the State from the 2012 proposal.

During the execution of this Independent Review, BerryDunn uncovered no High Impact risks or issues; all risks and issues were categorized as Medium or Low Impact. This is a significant improvement from the 2012 Independent Review report. BerryDunn recommends that the State focus on four primary risk areas if a decision is made to enter into a contract with InterAct to deploy the JailTracker solution. These areas are:

- Configuration of JailTracker to meet the unique sentence computation algorithms of the State of Vermont
- Planning and execution of a data migration strategy
- Project management
- Migration of the JailTracker from a client-server model to a web-based solution

The risks and issues described in this report include BerryDunn's recommendations for mitigating these risks, as well as the State's plan for doing so. BerryDunn recommends that the State implement the client-server JailTracker solution, currently available in the market and in use at multiple customer sites. The implementation would include configuration and custom software development of modules to accommodate the unique requirements of the DOC, but would not involve the development of a new web-based user interface specifically for the State.

Should the State accept this recommendation, BerryDunn suggests that the State negotiate the following points with InterAct:

- Software Acquisition and Implementation fees must align with these recommendations
- InterAct's product roadmap for the JailTracker solution must be clearly articulated, including a target date for the completion and market readiness of the web-based product
- The State should reserve the right to implement the web-based version of the JailTracker solution, once developed and tested in the market, at no additional cost beyond the annual maintenance fees paid for the acquired JailTracker solution; this model is currently proposed by InterAct
- Ensure that the InterAct Project Manager's skill set is supplemented by an InterAct team that has experience in deployment of JailTracker in a complex environment
- Full support for the deployed client-server solution will be provided throughout the entire duration of the warranty period
- The State will make the first maintenance fee payment at the end of the warranty period
- The payment terms must be directly related to key project deliverables
- The software fees, maintenance fees, and payment structure will be clearly articulated in the contract documents before contract execution

In addition to these negotiation points, BerryDunn recommends that a full-time State Project Manager, with a PMP certification and experience implementing at least one OMS in a multi-functional environments be employed for a project of this size, complexity and risk level. If the State PM does not have experience implementing an OMS, BerryDunn recommends that their skill set be supplemented with a State DOC resource that has OMS implementation experience.

2.0 OVERVIEW OF THIS DOCUMENT AND BACKGROUND

This section provides background information, approach, assumptions, and objectives of the Independent Review. It also describes the scope of the Independent Review to give readers appropriate context when reading the analysis and findings found in this report.

2.1 Scope of this Independent Review

In accordance with the Independent Review of Proposed Offender Management Solution Project Statement of Work (SOW), BerryDunn conducted an independent review of the Vermont OMS initiative. It is the intent of the State that the following items be addressed through the SOW:

- A Project Planning and IR kickoff meeting with the primary goal to introduce the participants and discuss the IR process going forward
- Review of all pertinent materials, contracts, SOW's, project work plans and other documentation as necessary to establish an understanding of the project(s) and proposed work being reviewed
- On site meetings: Approximately 2 to 3 days on-site at State offices in Vermont collecting information and interviewing stakeholders
- A teleconference call with the selected system vendor
- Identification of risks and cataloging them into a risk register
- Facilitation of a discussion of strategies to mitigate risks with Oversight Project Manager (OPM), Project Sponsor and Stakeholders
- Working with various stakeholders to develop specific responses to identified risks. It is our expectation that out of the risk analysis effort comes specific plans/strategies and actions that are taken or planned to be taken to address those risks (i.e. accept risk, mitigate risk, transfer risk, etc.)
- Work with OPM to ensure the Risk Response Plan is finalized with Sponsor before final review with CIO
- Conduct meetings and collect other information as necessary to complete the deliverables
- Create an Independent Review report according to the SOW, **and deliver the draft document to the OPM at least 24 hours prior to the scheduled presentation of the information to the CIO**
- Hold an on-site meeting to present the IR report to the CIO and answer any questions
- Update the IR report incorporating feedback received. OPM will "close" out IR with CIO once the IR report and all Risk response plans have satisfied the CIO
- Via the OPM, obtain CIO sign-off to signify the acceptance of the IR deliverables at the conclusion of the IR engagement

The scope of this document is fulfilling the requirements of Vermont Statute, Title 3, Chapter 45, §2222(g):

"The secretary of administration shall obtain independent expert review of any recommendation for any information technology activity initiated after July 1, 1996, as information technology activity is defined by subdivision (a)(10) of this section, when its total cost is $500,000 or greater. Documentation of such independent review shall be included when plans are submitted for review pursuant to subdivisions (a) (9) and (10) of this section. The independent review shall include:

(1) an acquisition cost assessment;
(2) a technology architecture review;
(3) an implementation plan assessment;
(4) a cost analysis and model for benefit analysis;
(5) a risk register and risk response plan; and
(6) an impact analysis on net operating costs for the agency carrying out the activity."

During this process the State also requires the development of a Risk Management Plan. This process requires the Independent Review Vendor to collaborate with the impacted State agencies to develop a specific plan for addressing each of the identified risks in the Risk Matrix, resulting in a Risk Management Plan.

2.2 Review Approach

In conducting our Independent Review, the following activities were completed:

Table 2 – SOW Requirements and Activities Performed

SOW Requirement	Activity Performed	Date(s) Performed
The State notified BerryDunn of award of the OMS Independent Review Project.	BerryDunn issued formal document request of EPMO OPM, Martha Haley.	5/10/2013
A Project Planning and IR kickoff meeting with the primary goal to introduce the participants and discuss the IR process going forward.	Since BerryDunn conducted the initial Independent Review of the State of Vermont DOC OMS in 2012, the State participants and BerryDunn were acquainted. This SOW requirement was satisfied via email.	6/5/2013
Review of all pertinent materials, contracts, SOWs, project work plans and other documentation as necessary to establish an understanding of the project(s) and proposed work being reviewed.	Access to a secure website containing project materials was provided to BerryDunn by the EPMO. BerryDunn reviewed provided materials.	6/13/2013 6/13/2013 through 7/8/2013

SOW Requirement	Activity Performed	Date(s) Performed
On-site meetings: Approximately 2 to 3 days on-site at State offices in Vermont collecting information and interviewing stakeholders.	The following on-site meetings were held in Montpelier and Williston: • Project Overview and Background • Acquisition Cost Assessment and Cost Benefit Analysis • Technical Architecture Review • Proposed Vendor—All Topics • Functional Review • Procurement Process • IT Support and Readiness • Risks and Issues Management Plan	6/24/2013 and 6/25/2013
A teleconference call with the selected system vendor.	This task was completed as an on-site interview conducted in Montpelier.	6/25/2013
Identification of risks and cataloging them into a risk register.	BerryDunn cataloged risks in a Risk Matrix and issues in an Issues Log throughout the process of reviewing materials and interviewing key State and InterAct staff.	6/19/2013 through 7/2/2013
Facilitation of a discussion of strategies to mitigate risks with OPM, Project Sponsor and Stakeholders.	BerryDunn provided a preliminary version of the Risk Matrix and Issues Log to the State.	7/3/2013
Working with various stakeholders to develop specific responses to identified risks. It is our expectation that out of the risk analysis effort comes specific plans/strategies and actions that are taken or planned to be taken to address those risks (i.e. accept risk, mitigate risk, transfer risk, etc.).	The State provided responses to each risk and issue in the Risk Matrix and Issue Log to BerryDunn. BerryDunn facilitated a discussion with the State to clarify the responses.	7/8/2013 7/11/2013
Work with OPM to ensure the Risk Response Plan is finalized with Sponsor before final review with CIO.	BerryDunn submitted the draft OMS Independent Review Report, including the Risks & Issues Management Plan to the EPMO.	7/15/2013
Conduct meetings and collect other information as necessary to complete the deliverables.	Two additional meetings were scheduled and conducted during the week of 7/8/2013. Based on the on-site interviews the DOC IT Manager provided draft copies of contract and Cost Benefit Analysis documents via email.	Week of 7/8/2013

SOW Requirement	Activity Performed	Date(s) Performed
Create an Independent Review report according to the SOW, and deliver the draft document to the OPM at least 24 hours prior to the scheduled presentation of the information to the CIO.	BerryDunn cataloged risks and issues in the Risks & Issues Management Plan, incorporated our recommendations regarding risk and issue responses, and collaborated with State staff to develop an action plan for each risk and issue in the Plan. The OMS Independent Review Findings and Recommendations report, including the Risks & Issues Management Plan was delivered to the CIO.	7/3/2013 through 7/18/2013 7/18/2013, 12:00pm
Hold an on-site meeting to present the IR report to the CIO and answer any questions.	BerryDunn is prepared to conduct this presentation of the OMS Independent Review Findings and Recommendation report, including the Risks & Issues Management Plan to the State EPMO Director, DII Deputy Commissioner, the State CIO and other State Agency representatives, as appropriate.	Scheduled to be held on 7/19/2013
Update the IR report incorporating feedback received. OPM will "close" out IR with CIO once the IR report and all Risk response plans have satisfied the CIO.	BerryDunn will incorporate recommended changes resulting in the meeting with the CIO's office into the Independent Review Report.	Planned to occur between 7/19/2013 and 7/23/2013
Via the OPM, obtain CIO sign-off to signify the acceptance of the IR deliverables at the conclusion of the IR engagement.	The timing of this activity to be determined once the State Project Manager is identified and engaged.	Planned to occur immediately after 7/23/2013

Table 3 lists the documents provided to BerryDunn by the State for review during the Independent Review process.

Table 3 – Table of Documents Reviewed

Document Title	Source	Date Received
Original (Final) RFP	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
OMS Answers to Questions	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
InterAct (Original) Proposal	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
VT RFP Pricing (Separate Submittal)	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
OMS Vendor Proposal Rating Matrix Combined with Demo Testing	Martha Haley	6/13/2013

Document Title	Source	Date Received
OMS Projected Life Cycle Cost Analysis	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
Vermont Facility Case Management	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
Vermont Offender Case Planning	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
Vermont Risk Management Supervision	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
Vermont Interim Revision Memo	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
InterAct Training Session Follow-Up Questions from VT DOC and InterAct Answers	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
State of Vermont Follow-Up Questions and Answers	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
InterAct Cost Proposal	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
Vermont DOC OMS Hands-On Use InterAct Response	Martha Haley	6/13/2013
Draft-SOV-OMS Contract 06 25 2013 Clean	Lucas Herring	6/25/2013
Cost Benefit Analysis Spreadsheet	Lucas Herring	7/2/2013

Table 4 lists the interview sessions conducted by BerryDunn as part of the Independent Review process.

Table 4 – Table of Interview Sessions

Date	Location	Time	Topic Area(s)	Participants along with Doug Rowe & Evan Kohn
6/24/2013	Williston	10 AM - Noon	Project Overview, including review of Project Goals, Scope, and Major Tasks/Deliverables; Assessment of the preferred vendor's Proposed Implementation Plan; & Organizational Readiness	Lucas Herring, Barbara Cormier
6/24/2013	Williston	1 - 3 PM	Functional Review	Lucas Herring, Marc Bilodeau, Dale Crook, & Barbara Cormier
6/24/2013	Williston	3 – 4 PM	Acquisition Cost Assessment	Lucas Herring & Sarah Clarke
6/25/2013	Montpelier	8:30 – 10 AM	Proposed System Technical Architecture Review, including Data Migration and Security	Lucas Herring, Craig Benson, Steve Bentley, Darin Prail, Barbara Cormier
6/25/2013	Montpelier	10:30 AM – 11:30 AM	Procurement Process	Peter Kipp

Date	Location	Time	Topic Area(s)	Participants along with Doug Rowe & Evan Kohn
6/25/2013	Montpelier	12:00 PM – 2:30 PM	Preferred Vendor – All Topics	Kurt Jacobson, Mike McGarry, David Ogles, Garth Strandberg
6/25/2013	Montpelier	2:30 PM – 3:30 PM	IT Support and readiness	Tracey Harrington & Brenda Hudson
6/25/2013	Montpelier	3:30 PM – 4:00 PM	Discuss Risk & Issues Management Plan and Approach	Cheryl Burcham & Barbara Cormier
6/28/2013	Conference Call	10:30 AM	Procurement Process	John McIntyre
6/28/2013	Conference Call	11:00 AM	Project Hosting	Chris Tanguay
7/1/2013	Conference Call	1:00 PM	InterAct Proposal with Indiana Department of Corrections	Lucas Herring
7/11/2013	Conference Call	10:00 AM	Risk/Issue Mitigation Plans	Lucas Herring
7/12/2013	Conference Call	8:30 AM	Hosting and Cloud Solution Management	Barbara Cormier, Steve Bentley, Mike Morey, Darin Prail

BerryDunn would like to acknowledge the significant time afforded to our Independent Review team by a number of individuals including, but not limited to, the DOC, the EPMO, and key DII technical leads. We recognize that the State's bid review team has worked diligently in order to reach this point in the vendor selection process. The Independent Review process is critical in nature and does not address the strengths of the proposed solution, vendor or state participants.

2.3 OMS Project Historical Background

This section is intended to provide a brief historical perspective of the OMS project background, including a short history of the PAS system, and the most recent efforts to replace PAS with a modern OMS.

Table 5 – OMS Project Chronology

Timeframe	Activity
February 15, 2013	RFP for new OMS published
March 29, 2013	Proposals due
May 31, 2013	Finalist(s) Demonstration
June – July 2013	DII Independent Review of OMS procurement by BerryDunn
August - September, 2013	Proposed Contract Negotiation Period
October 1, 2013**	Proposed Contract start date

** - Subject to change

2.4 Project Cost Summary

Budget

- *The State has budgeted **$3,000,000** for this project (through the system go-live date, the budget is not expected to cover system maintenance and operations costs).*
- *The State (DOC) has budgeted an additional **$18,000** for hardware refresh activities, largely (but not exclusively) in support of this project.*

Hardware

- As a proposed hosted solution, the acquisition and deployment of JailTracker requires no hardware purchases from InterAct.
- The DOC expects to refresh monitors with a budget not to exceed **$18,000**.

Software

- The software license fees, design/development/implementation, and training are proposed as a flat fee of **$2,600,000**.

Anticipated Overtime and Project Management Costs

- The State anticipates leveraging the subject matter expertise of line staff (corrections officers) throughout this project. Additionally, an AHS PMO resource will be assigned to this project on a full-time basis and the State projects a 1.5% utilization of an EPMO Project Management resource for project oversight. The State estimates that internal costs associated with these resources is will be a total of **$394,934** for the project's duration.

Table 6 - Total Implementation Costs

	Software and Implementation	Hardware	Total
DOC Project Budget	$3,000,000	$18,000	**$3,018,000**
Hardware Refresh		$18,000	$18,000
Software	$2,600,000		$2,600,000
Project Management and State Staff Costs	$394,934		$394,934
Total			**$3,012,934**

Maintenance

Ongoing maintenance, support, and hosting fees are not included in a current budget figure. The DOC Finance Director has indicated that these ongoing fees will be budgeted as line items in upcoming fiscal year operational budgets:

- Annual Maintenance and Support: $250,000 increased based on CPI – capped at 3% annually
- Hosting Fees: $120,000 + 2% increase annually

2.5 Limitations of this Review

This Independent Review of the selected Offender Management System is limited by:

- Availability and schedules of key State staff members for interviews and follow-up clarifying conversations.
- Documentation provided to BerryDunn by the State (see Table 2).
- Throughout this Independent Review, BerryDunn has relied on the accuracy of the documents and interviews provided by the State EPMO, the DOC, the DII, and the InterAct team.

2.6 Proposal Review

2.6.1 Project Goal

AHS and the DOC recently solicited competitive, sealed, fixed price proposals to procure services and has selected InterAct to enter negotiations for the implementation of an OMS. The OMS is intended to take maximum advantage of the State's Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) infrastructure.

2.6.2 Project Scope

OMS Implementation Project Scope

The State is seeking an innovative, forward-thinking and qualified partner with a history of successful implementations to help achieve its strategy for a robust and innovative solution. The contractual agreement between the State and the Vendor will detail the expected outcome of providing the State with:

- Business process analysis and modeling of processes related to offender management
- An OMS that is flexible, scalable, adaptable, responsive, secure and effectively empowers staff to complete business tasks
- A system that meets the Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM) and National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) standards and conditions
- Data cleansing and migration of all active legacy data contained within the current OMS.
- A solution that meets all of the DOC's requirements (technical, business and information) detailed in Attachment D of the RFP.
- A proposed solution that may include but is not limited to a system created solely for the State, or a system that is currently in operation and can be utilized by many customers (using a perpetual license or subscription model) that can be configured for the State. The solution proposed may provide and/or consume web services and interoperate within a SOA environment. It may connect to the State's SOA components which the State procured from Oracle. At a minimum, the system should interoperate with the Agency's Identity Management Tool and the enterprise Master Person Index (eMPI).
- A proposed solution that may be installed in a State-hosted data center or a Software as a Service (SAAS) solution hosted by the vendor or another third party in the cloud. The State will give preference to a cloud-hosted solution.

Major Tasks and Deliverables

Based on InterAct's proposal documentation and subsequent contract vehicles, the following are the proposed major tasks and deliverables. This list was developed using the multiple sources of tasks and deliverables, and are evolving as this report is presented:

- **Preparation Phase**
  - Project kick-off and initiation (including Project Management Plan and Oversight)
  - Requirements gathering workshops resulting in requirements validation documents (including Security Plan, Risk Assessment, and Security Controls Document)
  - System Design
- **Construction**
  - Construction
    - Prioritize JailTracker to meet customer needs and timeline
    - Construction and configuration of JailTracker
    - Application unit testing
  - Data Migration and Configuration
    - Data extraction from legacy DOC system
    - Map data elements
    - Submit mapped data elements for review
    - Finalize data configuration
  - Integration and System Testing
    - Construction and unit test summary
    - Unit test results
    - Integration and system test plan
    - Documentation plan
    - User training plan
- **Inspection**
  - User Acceptance Testing and Operational Readiness Testing
  - Training
  - Pilot operations (at the option of the State)
  - Configure InterAct interfaces
  - Customize InterAct to accommodate the State's facilities and cells
  - Update and convert reports
  - Configure options
- **Implementation and Support**
  - Implementation
  - Provide on-site Go Live support
  - Documentation
  - Execute the warranty period
- **Ongoing System Maintenance and Operations**

2.6.3 Payment Terms

As of the Draft State of Vermont / InterAct OMS contract (dated 6/25/2013), the following payment terms were in place:

- Maximum Contract Amount: $6,311,090

- Initial term of contract: $2,050,000
- Support, Maintenance and Hosting: $4,261,090

- Contract Term: 10/1/2013 – 3/31/2026

It must be noted that the Draft State of Vermont / InterAct OMS contract (dated 6/25/2013) and InterAct's Cost Proposal amounts are not aligned. The DOC IT Manager has reported that it is the desire of the State to shift payments to later in the implementation process, providing the State with financial leverage in the form of payment hold backs. Even as this is the case, the total fee proposed by InterAct for the four implementation phases is $2,600,000. The total amount (before hold back) depicted by the Draft State of Vermont / InterAct OMS contract (dated 6/25/2013) is $2,050,000. This is a $550,000 difference that must be rectified during the negotiation process.

Tables 7 and 8 list the payment terms as defined in draft contract documents dated 6/25/2013. The contract documentation was provided to BerryDunn by the State for review during the Independent Review process, and is evolving as the negotiation process continues.

Table 7 – Payment Terms Tables
(Extracted from Contract Documents Dated 6/25/2013)

Deliverable	Cost	10% Retain $	Invoice $
Preparation	**$200,000**		
1. Project Kick-off and Initiation (including Project Plan and Oversight)	$50,000	$5,000	$45,000
2. Requirements Validation Documents (including Security Plan, Risk Assessment and Security Controls Document)	$50,000	$5,000	$45,000
3. System Implementation Design	$100,000	$10,000	$90,000
Construction	**$1,500,000**		
4. **Construction**	**$1,100,000**		
a. Prioritize Porting to meet customer needs and timeline	$200,000	$20,000	$180,000
b. Construction Milestone 2	$150,000	$15,000	$135,000
c. Construction Milestone 3	$150,000	$15,000	$135,000
d. Construction Milestone 4	$150,000	$15,000	$135,000
e. Construction Milestone 5	$150,000	$15,000	$135,000
f. Construction Milestone 6	$150,000	$15,000	$135,000
g. Unit Test Sign-off on Web-Based Solution	$150,000	$15,000	$135,000
5. **Data Migration and Configuration**	**$250,000**		
a. Data Extraction from Legacy DOC System	$200,000	$20,000	$180,000
b. Map Data Elements	$15,000	$1,500	$13,500
c. Submit Mapped Data Elements for review	$15,000	$1,500	$13,500
d. Finalize Data Configuration	$20,000	$2,000	$18,000
6. **Integration and System Testing** (to include bulk-load testing and System configuration)	**$150,000**		

Deliverable	Cost	10% Retain $	Invoice $
a. Construction and Unit Test Summary	$50,000	$5,000	$45,000
b. Unit Test Results	$50,000	$5,000	$45,000
c. Integration and System Test Plan	$20,000	$2,000	$18,000
d. Documentation Plan	$20,000	$2,000	$18,000
e. User Training Plan	$10,000	$1,000	$9,000
Inspection	**$100,000**		
7. User Acceptance Testing and Operational Readiness Testing (functional and workflow testing)	$50,000	$5,000	$45,000
8. Training	$50,000	$5,000	$45,000
9. Pilot Operations (At the option of the State)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
Implementation and Support	**$250,000**		
10. Implementation	$100,000	$10,000	$90,000
11. Documentation	$100,000	$10,000	$90,000
12. Post Implementation Evaluation and Certification	$50,000	$0.00	$50,000
13. Warranty and Retainage (10% holdback from each invoice above)	RETAINAGE TOTAL	$200,000	$200,000

Table 8 - Post Implementation Annual Support And Maintenance Fees Years 1-10 (Commences after expiration of one-year warranty period; reflective of year over year increase of 2.5%):

System Maintenance and Operations	Cost	Invoice	Payable Date
System Annual Support & Maintenance Year 1	$250,000	$250,000	Payable in full prior to the start of the current service term on the anniversary of the Go Live date
System Annual Support & Maintenance Year 2	$256,250	$256,250	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Annual Support & Maintenance Year 3	$262,656	$262,656	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Annual Support & Maintenance Year 4	$269,223	$269,223	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Annual Support & Maintenance Year 5	$275,953	$275,953	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Annual Support & Maintenance Year 6	$282,852	$282,852	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Annual Support & Maintenance Year 7	$289,923	$289,923	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Annual Support & Maintenance Year 8	$297,171	$297,171	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Annual Support & Maintenance Year 9	$304,601	$304,601	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Annual Support & Maintenance Year 10	$312,216	$312,216	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term

Table 9 - HOSTING FEES YEARS 1-11 (reflective of year-over-year increase of 2%): (Commences with start of one-year warranty period)

System Hosting Fees	Cost per year	Invoice per year	Payable Date
System Hosting Fees Year 1	$120,000	$120,000	Payable in full at implementation (Go Live date) of system
System Hosting Fees Year 2	$122,400	$122,400	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term on the anniversary of the Go Live date
System Hosting Fees Year 3	$124,848	$124,848	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Hosting Fees Year 4	$127,345	$127,345	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Hosting Fees Year 5	$129,892	$129,892	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Hosting Fees Year 6	$132,490	$132,490	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Hosting Fees Year 7	$135,139	$135,139	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Hosting Fees Year 8	$137,842	$137,842	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Hosting Fees Year 9	$140,599	$140,599	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Hosting Fees Year 10	$143,411	$143,411	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term
System Hosting Fees Year 11	$146,279	$146,279	Payable in full prior to the start of the Current Service Term

3.0 ACQUISITION COST ASSESSMENT

This section provides information and analysis on the costs of the proposed JailTracker OMS system. Specifically, it addresses the proposed costs, payment terms, cost assumptions, anticipated benefits, and a cost benefit summary.

Following is a summary of the costs associated with acquisition and initial deployment of the JailTracker OMS. This summary was derived through a review of State budget information, InterAct's proposal, and in collaboration between the DOC Finance Director and BerryDunn.

3.1 Project Cost Summary

Table 10 compares the State's project budget with estimated project costs.

Table 10 - Total Implementation Costs

	Software and Implementation	Hardware	Total
Budget	$3,000,000	$18,000	**$3,018,000**
Hardware Refresh		$18,000	$18,000
Software	$2,600,000		$2,600,000
Project Management and State Staff Costs	$394,934		$394,934
Total			**$3,012,934**

3.2 Cost of Hardware

This section describes the proposed hardware costs associated with the OMS acquisition, as well as the hardware costs estimated by the DOC for equipment refresh.

- As a proposed hosted solution, the acquisition and deployment of JailTracker requires no hardware purchases from InterAct.
- The DOC expects to refresh monitors with a budget not to exceed **$18,000**.

3.3 Cost of Software

This section describes the proposed software costs associated with the OMS acquisition.

- InterAct's Cost Proposal includes $0 for software license fees. All fees for acquisition and implementation of the JailTracker solution are included in the following 4 phases:
    - Preparation: $407,360
    - Construction: $1,244,810
    - Inspection: $109,840
    - Implementation and Support: $837,990
        - Total: **$2,600,000**

3.4 Cost of Services

This section describes the proposed services costs associated with the OMS acquisition.

- The Cost of Services is included in the Cost of Software values.

3.5 System Integration Costs

This section describes the proposed system integration costs associated with the OMS acquisition.

- The System Integration Costs is included in the Cost of Software values.

3.6 Additional Costs

Anticipated PM and Overtime Costs
The State anticipates leveraging the subject matter expertise of line staff (corrections officers) throughout this project. Additionally, an AHS PMO resource will be assigned to this project on a full-time basis and the State projects a 1.5% utilization of an EPMO Project Management resource for project oversight. The State estimates that internal costs associated with these resources is will be a total of **$394,934** for the project's duration.

Maintenance
Ongoing maintenance, support and hosting fees are not included in a current budget figure. The DOC Finance Director has indicated that these ongoing fees will be budgeted as line items in upcoming fiscal year operational budgets:

- Annual Maintenance and Support: **$250,000** increased based on CPI – capped at 3% annually
- Hosting Fees: **$120,000** + 2% increase annually

3.7 Independent Review Findings

Six of the 35 findings identified in this Independent Review are associated with Acquisition Costs.

Finding 1. InterAct has proposed a $0 perpetual license for the JailTracker solution. The implication of this was explored with DII, AHS, BGS, and InterAct. InterAct said they would structure the pricing however the State would prefer, expressing an openness to negotiate.

Finding 2. Implementation costs are budgeted under software—product license. The financial implications of this model were explored with the DOC Finance Director. No clear ramifications of this model were identified.

Finding 3. InterAct proposed a 2% flat percentage annual increase in hosting fees. The hosting component of InterAct's Cost Proposal included an annual flat 2% increase for using the hosting service NLETS. This annual fee increase is not tied to the actual value of the service being provided, which may include the addition of disk storage, increase in speed, or upgrades to network infrastructure within the NLETS facilities.

Finding 4. The change control process for the InterAct solution post-implementation does not clearly define software changes vs. software defects. Change requests could result in extra fees being paid by the State since InterAct is proposing a $1,500-per-day change request fee.

Finding 5. InterAct responded negatively to RFP Contract Provision #10 that required the State to serve as the intellectual property owner. During contract negotiations, the State expects to include language that recognizes InterAct as the IP property owner for the COTS solution and BGS legal representation is expected to weigh in on this.

Finding 6. The State does not have plans to use SafeTown or Interdex, though usage of the services is included in the proposal. Through discussions with InterAct, we confirmed that those two solutions are included as value-added components of the overall solutions and can be utilized by the State and DOC as long as maintenance is maintained; use of those two value-added components by State entities other than the DOC may require additional license fees.

4.0 TECHNICAL ARCHITECTURE REVIEW

This section provides information and analysis on the proposed OMS technical overview. It looks at how the proposed OMS vendor's system has the technical capacity to meet the needs of the State's DOC objectives.

Strategically, the design for the OMS is a modular, scalable, portable solution that leverages service-based open architecture standards. The State procured core infrastructure components as part of its SOA Infrastructure and the Vendor may leverage these components to the fullest extent possible. These components are part of an Oracle Suite consisting of: Oracle Policy Automation (OPA), Master Data Management (MDM), Identity Management (IDM), Enterprise Services Bus (ESB) and Workflow (see the full list of Agency licensed Oracle products in section 2.5.1 of the OMS RFP). At a minimum, the system should interoperate with the Agency's Identity Management Tool and the enterprise Master Person Index (eMPI). The requirements and goals of the OMS and SOA are in alignment with the strategic vision of the State to:

- Be built upon an integrated data model, using a relational database system
- Be built using state-of-the-art technology which can be leveraged in the future
- Employ an n-tier, component-based, application-computing architecture based on J2EE or .NET technology – no direct connections to the database from the user interface will be allowed under this methodology
- Be compliant with the NIEM and Justice Information
- Adhere to Exchange Model (JIEM) Justice Bureau System standards
- Be highly integrated, interoperable and flexible for use with internal and external systems

4.1 Support for the State's Strategic Enterprise Systems Direction

The proposed solution is InterAct's current legacy JailTracker application. It is a .NET, n-tier, client-server, SOA application, which complies with most of the current State strategic direction and existing policies and procedures. InterAct proposes that the State may upgrade the client-server version of this solution to the n-tier, web-based, SOA application when this solution become commercially available, at no additional cost. The web-based solution is expected to comply with the current strategic architecture direction, policies and procedures. InterAct's response to the NIEM-compliance and JIEM-compliance requirement is "Data exchanges are NIEM and JIEM compliant. As the proposed interfaces are being tested, InterAct will provide the audit test results, showing compliance."

Security Analysis

The JailTracker application includes a role-based security model. The default security setting is strict. Roles can be defined to provide access to otherwise restricted screens. Security is imposed at the screen level. Although this is helpful to understand, it is not clear that the re-architected web-based version of JailTracker will approach security in the same manner.

InterAct has not provided the State with results from a preliminary security audit. This audit is required by State policy prior to system deployment then quarterly after deployment of the JailTracker solution in a production environment. It is unclear whether the proposed security audit process includes data center-level security as well as application security reviews, or is

simply a security audit of the hosting site. Section D of the provided draft OMS contract includes requirements for InterAct to provide a Security Audit.

Disaster Recovery Plan

As of the writing of this Independent Review report, InterAct has not provided the State with a comprehensive Disaster Recovery Plan. Prior to executing the JailTracker contract with InterAct, BerryDunn recommends that the State fully analyze the NLETS Disaster Recovery Plan before agreeing to its terms. Section D of the provided draft OMS contract includes requirements for Disaster Recovery and integration with the State's Continuity of Operations plan.

State-wide WAN/LAN Impact

The solution proposed by InterAct is a hosted, client-server solution which requires desktop application components. No dedicated data connection is proposed between the State WAN and the NLETS site in which the JailTracker system is proposed to be hosted; however the State continues to increase network redundancy in their WAN and LAN environment. The single point of failure is the single connection between the DOC institutions and the central State data center environment. This single point of failure exists currently, and there is no immediate plan to develop redundancy in this regard. This is not a new risk to the Agency due to the proposed OMS solution, as this single point of failure exists today.

The current contract language describes SLAs associated with the proposed hosting environment, but does not describe transaction-level SLAs for the application. The State has reported that SLAs will be finalized during the negotiation process.

4.2 System Integration Requirements

A SOA model is used by InterAct to integrate internal and external applications with the JailTracker application. This provides a configurable integration portal through which all outgoing and incoming data will pass. This complies with the State's direction of service orientation, and enables a large degree of flexibility.

JailTracker includes a document management module used by some InterAct customers. This module is included in the State's acquisition of the JailTracker solution. The State has expressed a desire to leverage this document management solution.

CorrectCare is an electronic health records (EHR) solution that is used by C.C.S. (the DOC's health services provider) to manage the health records of State inmates. This solution is reported to reside in a remote facility, and is accessed remotely by C.C.S. staff. Interfaces have been identified by the State to exist between the CorrectCare system and the legacy PAS system. It is unclear if the CorrectCare system contains HIV or Personal Identifying Information (PII). It is also unclear how this system will interface with the proposed JailTracker system in the future. The proposed InterAct solution includes EHR capabilities, which may be leveraged by State of Vermont DOC staff.

4.3 Ability of the Technology to Support the Business Needs

The completed Vendor Scoring Form, provided as part of the documentation request conducted early in this independent review, indicated that the proposed JailTracker solution scored second highest with regard to required requirements and highest when the EHR requirement was included. Upon completion of the product demonstrations the State Bid Review Team selected the JailTracker solution because they felt that it represented the best user experience. Although the JailTracker solution is not currently installed in an environment as diverse as the DOC, it is clear that the State Bid Review Team has confidence that this solution is the closest fit for all disciplines, including booking, jail management, prison management and community supervision.

4.4 Vendor Compliance to Required Project Policies, Guidelines and Methodologies

By providing an authorized signature on the OMS proposal documents, InterAct has agreed to comply with the State's policies and procedures, including but not limited to the following statements in the RFP:

- "The system must conform to State security standards and protocols. A list of the Agency of Human Service security policies can be found at http://humanservices.vermont.gov/policylegislation/policies/05-information-technology-and-electroniccommunications-policies/ and a list of State of Vermont security policies can be found at http://dii.vermont.gov/Policy_Central."
- "The State shall work with the Contractor to ensure compliance with all applicable State and Agency of Human Services' policies and standards, especially those related to privacy and security. The State will advise the Contractor of any new policies, procedures, or protocols developed during the term of this agreement as they are issued and will work with the Contractor to implement any required."
- "The State reserves the right to periodically audit the bidder application infrastructure to ensure physical and network infrastructure meets the configuration and security standards and is in adherence to relevant state policies governing the system. Non-intrusive network audits (basic port scans, etc.) may be done randomly, without prior notice. More intrusive network and physical audits may be conducted on or off site with 24 hours' notice."

Through a series of interviews with key State staff and InterAct project team members, InterAct reported that they understand the State's existing policies and procedures, and intend to comply with them. One area of concern is that the State has reported that InterAct has not provided the State with results from a preliminary security audit. This audit is required by policy prior to system deployment in a production environment, then quarterly thereafter.

During a discussion with representatives of DII and AHSIT, it is clear that the State has not completed the development of infrastructural policies and procedures regarding deployment of enterprise-level applications in a "Cloud" environment. The lack of these policies and procedures increases the risk associated with deploying the selected solution in the "Cloud" (e.g. the proposed hosting site, NLETS). Although the State supports a robust "Private Cloud" environment, the policies and procedures referenced here should be addressed for a "Public Cloud" deployment. This risk is mitigated by the State's opinion that the proposed solution is not a "cloud-based" solution, but simply a client-server solution that is hosted at an off-site location.
.

4.5 Independent Review Findings

Six of the 35 findings identified in this Independent Review are associated with Technical Architecture.

Finding 7. InterAct is proposing a client-server based COTS solution, which will require configuration as well as some customization to be usable by the State. This is a stable, well-establish, mature solution currently deployed in multiple jurisdictions, providing little to no risk to the State. InterAct is proposing, at no additional cost, an upgrade to the web-based version of the solution once available to the market.

Finding 8. The State reported that they are confident that JailTracker sentence computation calculations will be accurate. DOC staff has reported that they are comfortable that JailTracker can be configured to manage the historical and future sentence computation calculations with little or no customization. During the demonstration of the JailTracker system to the State, InterAct used a sentence computation model for one of the counties in the State of Kentucky; the demonstration was not configured to address all or a portion of the State sentence computation algorithms based on current and historical statutes. JailTracker is not deployed at a state DOC, so there is no way to compare how JailTracker can be configured to address state-level sentence computations. Sentence computation is typically the most difficult aspect of most OMS and Jail Management System (JMS) implementations, often requiring some level of customization to accurately address all permutations of a state's sentencing statutes.

Finding 9. The State reported that they are confident in InterAct's ability to build effective field/case management modules. The ability to manage offenders on probation or parole via an integrated case management module does not currently exist in the JailTracker solution. However InterAct demonstrated this capability in their Juvenile Case Management system. InterAct's proposal clearly indicates that a case management module will be developed for the State within the scope and cost proposal provided therein. The DOC staff has reported that field case management is similar to management of cases for incarcerated offenders, and reports confidence in InterAct's ability to implement a field case management solution within JailTracker with minimal effort.

Finding 10. The State expressed concern about how JailTracker will accept legacy data, minimum and maximum sentences, and manipulation of legal statuses. Although the State expressed confidence in JailTracker's ability to be configured to support state statutes for sentence computation, they indicated concern about how legacy sentence computation may be migrated from the PAS system to JailTracker during the Data Conversion process.

Finding 11. No redundancy exists between the institutions and the central data center, which presents a single point of failure for network connectivity. The DII and AHS technical staff interviewed during this independent review indicated that all network traffic to and from the DOC facilities traveled to a central location prior to communicating with external resources. This situation currently exists for the PAS system.

Finding 12. InterAct's proposed plan for a Security Risk Assessment is not clear. A Security Risk Assessment has not been completed as of the writing of this Independent Review Report.

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

This section provides information and analysis on the InterAct implementation plan for the OMS system and services. Specifically, it addresses the proposed timeline, vendor and State staffing, project scope, implementation approach, the training methodology, and other considerations.

5.1 The Reality of the Timetable

The proposed implementation timetable to configure and deploy JailTracker for the State is 18 months, from contract execution through production deployment. This has increased from the proposed 12 month timeline agreed to by InterAct during the 2012 procurement process for the OMS. In the State of Vermont DOC OMS Independent Review report issued in 2012, BerryDunn indicated "this, along with BerryDunn's OMS deployment experience, leads BerryDunn to recommend that the State and InterAct consider increasing the proposed deployment timetable to 18 months from contract execution." The risks associated with this project now are much lower than the proposed solution in 2012, because the currently proposed solution is mature COTS solution with a significant install base. An 18 month timeline for configuration and deployment of JailTracker at the State is reasonable.

5.2 Adequacy of the Vendor's Proposed Risk Management Plan

As of the writing of this report, InterAct has not proposed a Risk Management Plan. It is the State's intent that the risks identified during this Independent Review, with risk response timing scheduled for after contract execution, would be included in InterAct's initial Risk Management Plan.

5.3 Adequacy of Design, Conversion, and Implementation Plans

After reviewing the provided documentation and interviewing key State staff, representatives of the EPMO, and InterAct resources, it was discovered that no formal Design Plan, Conversion Plan, or Implementation Plan exist. However, BerryDunn has reviewed the draft list of tasks and deliverables provided in the contract documentation and these tasks and deliverables are aligned with those that would be expected for an implementation of this type. As indicated in the Risk Register, provided in this report, a formal Training Plan was not included as a formal deliverable. The State has indicated that this deliverable would be added to the list of formal deliverables during the negotiation process.

5.4 Adequacy of Support for Conversion and Implementation Activities

The proposed Data Conversion Plan and Project Plan (including implementation activities) are not comprehensive as described in InterAct's proposal. However, these are considered to be formal deliverables as described in the draft version of the contract provided to BerryDunn by the DOC IT Manager. During the interview process it became clear that consensus regarding the data conversion process does not exist within the State as well as between the State and InterAct. The included Risk Register includes risks associated with this lack of consensus. Additionally, InterAct has indicated that they have no experience migrating data from a multi-

disciplinary legacy system (combination of jail/prison/probation & parole data) into the JailTracker application, since JailTracker has not been deployed in this environment previously.

The implementation activities and high level timeline for configuration and deployment of JailTracker for the State seem to be aligned with what would be expected for a project of this type.

5.5 Adequacy of the Vendor's Training Plan

A formal, detailed Training Plan does not yet exist. InterAct has presented a proposed approach to end user training. InterAct and the State agree that a Train-the-Trainer (TTT) model would work best in this environment. There is no agreement on the scope of the training effort, duration of the development of training materials, and the execution of the overall Training Plan. A Training Plan was not originally included as a formal deliverable in InterAct's proposal. The DOC IT Manager has indicated that this will be required of InterAct, and will be included as part of the ongoing negotiation process.

5.6 Adequacy of Planned Testing Procedures

Although a formal, detailed Testing Plan does not yet exist. InterAct has presented a proposed approach to unit testing, integration testing, and User Acceptance Testing (UAT). A Test Plan is included in the list of formal deliverables required during the execution of this project. During the interview process the State indicated that they were comfortable with the testing approach being discussed with InterAct, including the State resources required to participate in testing as various points throughout the project, including but not limited to UAT.

5.7 Independent Review Findings

Seventeen of the 35 findings identified in this Independent Review are associated with the Implementation Plan.

Finding 13. InterAct proposed a hybrid system deployment model, which includes the implementation of appliances at each of the DOC facilities; DII has indicated that this approach is not acceptable. In subsequent discussions with DII and InterAct, there is general agreement that Citrix or Terminal Services will meet the needs of the project. This will eliminate the need to load software on the State's 350-500 desktops and laptops. We recommend that the State and InterAct continue discussions around this element of the implementation.

Finding 14. The State and InterAct do not have a clear understanding of their respective roles and responsibilities for data cleansing. The DOC's understanding is that data cleansing will occur as a byproduct of data migration, whereas the Director of AHS Data Services indicated that a rigorous and disciplined approach to data cleansing is separate but concurrently executed along with data migration tasks. InterAct clearly articulated that data cleansing is the responsibility of the State and that they will play a consultative role in the process.

Finding 15. The State has clearly articulated expected procedures for performing data migration. InterAct is proposing an iterative process by which data migration will occur using

three iterations. The State's approach does not specify the number of iterations, but is focused on the number of data anomalies that they are willing to allow into the production environment regardless of the number of iterations it takes. The State expressed concern about how JailTracker will accept legacy data, minimum and maximum sentences, and manipulation of legal statuses.

Finding 16. The InterAct proposal describes multiple Service Level Agreement (SLA) models for the InterAct solution and hosting services. These separate SLA models are described in various areas of the InterAct Technical Proposal. The DOC IT Manager indicated that a single SLA will be negotiated during the contract negotiation process.

Finding 17. The State does not plan to migrate inmate biometric data to JailTracker. Inmate biometric data is not currently part of PAS. This biometric data is stored in other State systems.

Finding 18. The State does not plan to automate the migration of inmate photos to the JailTracker system. Photos are currently stored with a naming convention in a basic file system. The State plans to migrate the photos manually over time after the initial implementation of JailTracker into a production environment.

Finding 19. The State will implement the client-server program, JailTracker, first, and have the option of implementing the web version, InterAct OMS, a year afterward or later. This approach differs from the proposed approach of the last procurement, when interact proposed their web-based solution, which would have been an application development project for the State. This approach minimizes the need for application development since InterAct will initially implement a COTS solution. The State was given the impression by InterAct during the demo that Indiana DOC would be the first state DOC to implement the web version of JailTracker, InterAct OMS, though InterAct stated that this is not the case. ***It is not clear that InterAct OMS will have been implemented by another state DOC prior to the time the State wants to implement that web-based solution.***

Finding 20. State stakeholders have differing understandings of whether all or some data in PAS will be migrated to JailTracker. During the interview process is became clear that the various State stakeholders do not have consensus regarding the data migration process.

Finding 21. The State will use InterAct's document management system, not the AHS On-Base solution. AHS currently uses On-Base as its standard document management repository; however it was discovered during this Independent Review that AHS will be transitioning to an Oracle-based document management solution. InterAct is proposing a document management solution, so the State will use that solution until the AHS Oracle-based solution is in-place and mature.

Finding 22. InterAct has proposed the use of the InterAct EHR module as part of the overall solution at no-extra charge. The DOC indicated a preference to use this tool over the use of CorrectCare's EHR with integration to the CorrectCare EHR. The primary reason provided by DOC is the desire to maintain autonomy with regards to healthcare data. The DOC said the EHR module would be the first candidate for deferral in the event that scope deferral may be required during the implementation of JailTracker.

Finding 23. InterAct is proposing NLETS as the hosting services provider instead of Secure24, which was proposed during the last procurement. NLETS is CJIS-compliant, has been in business for 20 years, is owned by all 50 states, and is a 501c3. This hosting service appears to pose less risk than Secure24.

Finding 24. The DOC has identified a team of five key leaders to provide project oversight. This team may serve as the Change Control Board and steering committee. The team is considering allocating a full-time staff member to this project, and agrees that more resources are needed for successful implementation than previously believed. The team will assume collectively oversee organizational change management.

Finding 25. The proposed implementation approach does not have a clear training strategy. The InterAct proposal provides general guidance regarding how training will be conducted during the implementation of JailTracker for the DOC. During interviews with InterAct, they reported that training is a critical success factor for the implementation of all their solutions, and that the State will receive "as much training as they can stand" during the implementation. During independent review interviews with the DOC staff, they indicated an awareness that the training strategy will include a hybrid of hands-on training during elaboration iterations (during implementation), formal training for UAT testers and formal training for State staff that will train the remaining DOC staff through a TTT model. The InterAct proposal references a Training Plan within the context of the use of PMI best practices, but does not include a Training Plan as a formal deliverable.

Finding 26. The State expressed a desire to be heavily engaged during any project phases that include software customization. The DOC interviewed during this independent review indicated a desire to be engaged during all iterations of the elaboration of the JailTracker solution. DOC staff reported a commitment to providing sufficient resources to actively participate in these activities.

Finding 27. InterAct's help desk will accept calls from anyone in the State's DOC. During the interviews with the InterAct team, the InterAct JailTracker Product Manager indicated that any JailTracker user from the State could contact the InterAct help desk directly without requiring initial triage by a State support center.

Finding 28. It is not clear what resources will be needed from the AHS IT team during implementation and roll-out. The State has developed a preliminary resource plan for the implementation of JailTracker, however a final plan cannot be refined until the final project plan and schedule have been delivered by JailTracker (after contract execution). The DOC has indicated their willingness to apply the required resources to this project.

Finding 29. The InterAct proposal included a number of grammatical typos and formatting inconsistencies. The quality of the InterAct proposal may be reflective of the quality of the OMS implementation.

6.0 ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL READINESS

This section provides information and analysis on the readiness of the State and InterAct to implement the proposed OMS system.

6.1 General Project Acceptance / Readiness of Staff

A technology refresh project of this size requires sufficient support from the State and the vendor. This section provides a summary of the findings associated with the State's readiness and the vendor's readiness to conduct the project.

6.1.1 State Staffing

Although InterAct has not provided the State with a required State Staffing Plan, the DOC reports that staffing levels will be sufficient to support the implementation of the proposed OMS. The State acknowledges that some of the timing and levels of effort required of State staff are no yet known. The State has developed a preliminary resource plan including roles and some specific resources to participate in the following implementation stages:

- Fit-gap analysis
- Data Migration
  - Mapping of legacy PAS data into JailTracker data elements
  - Periodic audits of the data migration process
  - Data validation at the end of each data migration phase
- User Acceptance Testing
  - Iterative testing
  - Final UAT with Signoff
- End User Training
  - The State Trainers
  - DOC and other Staff to be trained

Each of these four stages involves significant unknowns in terms of the level of participation required of State staff.

Active participation of the State Bid Review Team, staffed primarily with DOC lead staff, in the implementation of the solution will significantly reduce the risk of scheduling DOC staff to participate in the project. These lead resources can authorize participation of staff on the project, as well as backfill of line staff with overtime staff in most situations.

6.1.2 InterAct Staffing

InterAct's proposal leverages the product expertise of the InterAct staff and the OMS system implementation expertise of their partner, Sierra Systems. This proposed approach is a significant improvement over the proposed implementation approach during the 2012 procurement process, reducing the risks associated with the configuration and implementation of the JailTracker solution for the State.

This report includes one risk associated with InterAct's proposed staffing model. That risk is related to the proposed InterAct Project Manager's experience implementing the JailTracker solution; however, InterAct is proposing a staffing model that combines the large system project

expertise of this proposed resource with the product expertise of the InterAct Product Management team, which reduces this risk.

6.2 Adequacy of Department and Partner Staff to Provide Project Management

The experience of the assigned project managers is a critical success factor for this project. This section provides a summary of the findings related to the EPMO, the Agency staff and the selected AHS PM as related to this project.

6.2.1 State EPMO Project Oversight Manager

A State EPMO Project Oversight Manager has been assigned to the OMS Implementation Project. She has indicated that her minimum commitment to the OMS Project is 1.5% of the DOC budget for the implementation phase (approximately $40,000). This resource will not provide direct project management on behalf of the State, but instead will conduct periodic reviews to ensure that the project is being managed using PMI best practices, and utilizing existing templates and procedures identified by the State EPMO.

6.2.2 State Implementation Project Manager

The need for a State Implementation Project Manager has been identified, and assuming that the State CIO approves this project to progress, will be assigned to the project in early October, 2013. The newly formed AHS PMO will provide this resource. This PM's role is to ensure that the project is on schedule and budget, and to work collaboratively with the InterAct PM to identify and respond to risks and issues identified throughout the project life cycle. The DOC reported that the State PM will be committed to the OMS Implementation Project 100% of the time. This report describes a risk associated with the AHS PMO PM's experience with Corrections and specifically OMS implementation. The State has acknowledged this risk and has developed a mitigation strategy to minimize this risk.

6.3 Ability of the User and Operational Staff to Integrate Solution into their Work

If the State decides to move forward with the proposed client-server, externally hosted solution, the need for operational staff will be minimal. The application will be accessed via end users' desktops. The proposed solution involves NLETS as the hosting company. The JailTracker application and database will reside at the NLETS location, with SLAs in place to ensure appropriate levels of service.

As with any legacy system replacement, the impact on the line staff will be significant. The proposed JailTracker solution is intended to be functionally richer than the existing PAS solution and the user experience will be significantly different. The likelihood exists for some DOC staff members to retire or change roles due to this computer system change. Others will embrace the new technology and the user interface that is common in today's modern solutions.

A detailed, well thought out Organizational Change Management Plan will be critically important to the success of this system change. The way staff performs their day-to-day business activities will likely change; some will change drastically. These business process changes, and the staff affected, must be identified early in the project. Transition plans must then be developed and executed for each affected staff person to ensure a successful transition to the new platform and way of doing business. Due to the integrated nature of the proposed JailTracker solution, business processes will likely be more collaborative, and the passing of paper reports from one unit to another (or from the institutions to the community for probation and parole) will significantly diminish. This may require staff to learn a new way of communicating with one another. The Organizational Change Management Plan must be developed in collaboration between the InterAct implementation staff (e.g. trainers) and State DOC leaders.

6.4 Independent Review Findings

Six of the 35 findings identified in this Independent Review are associated with Organizational Readiness.

Finding 30. The State is in the process of mapping the current PAS system data elements, with completion expected in July. This proactive approach to preparation will likely serve the State well in ensuring it is ready to take on the project.

Finding 31. The State's proposed Project Manager is currently allocated to this project part-time. Specifically, the State's PM is currently allocated 50% to this project and 50% to a Department of Mental Health Project. The PM stated that she saw the benefit of considering 100% allocation of a Project Manager to this project. Although the Project Manager does not have implementation experience in the corrections environment, she has large system implementation experience. The State has a mitigation strategy in place for the risk associated with this finding.

Finding 32. The proposed InterAct (Sierra Systems) Project Manager does not have experience with OMS implementation or JailTracker specifically. The proposed PM is a PMP residing in southern California. InterAct has indicated that the InterAct Product Manager for the InterAct OMS solution will play a critical role in supporting the proposed PM in providing InterAct OMS experience. InterAct has indicated that the proposed PM's on-site presence will

be a minimum of 50% and a maximum of 100% throughout the project. Sierra Systems has significant OMS implementation experience, and results in a significant decrease in implementation risk compared to the previous proposal.

Finding 33. The DII EPMO Project Oversight Manager's assignment and allocation to this project represents 1.5% of the project cost. This budgetary estimate is approximately $40,000 for the duration of the project.

Finding 34. InterAct plans to implement InterAct OMS (web version) with County jail systems with 300-800 beds, though it does not have existing plans in place to implement the solution in a statewide corrections environment; all of the company's future software development efforts will focus on InterAct OMS, the web version of their software. InterAct currently has no state-level customers using the JailTracker solution. The InterAct Product Manager reported that the InterAct OMS roadmap includes the deployment of InterAct OMS at many medium-sized County jails in the 2014 timeframe. The JailTracker solution is not deployed at any customer site to address the unique requirements of the DOC, including Community Supervision, Jail Management (intake/release and short-term "holds" prior to court) and Prison Management (post-adjudication offenders being held per court order). During the demonstration of the JailTracker solution, InterAct indicated that InterAct OMS (the web-based version of the JailTracker solution) would be fully implemented in the State of Indiana in 2014 or early 2015, reducing the DOC's risk of being the first state-level implementation of the web-based version of this solution. During the independent review interview with InterAct it became clear that there are no plans to implement InterAct OMS for the State of Indiana, DOC. Further research into Indiana's procurement process for an OMS revealed that InterAct did not propose a solution as a prime vendor during this procurement process, however they were proposed as a subcontractor by a prime vendor that was eliminated from consideration during the State of Indiana DOC OMS procurement process. It further revealed that a competing solution was selected by Indiana.

Finding 35. The Procurement Department did not appear to play an active role in the Evaluation Process, though it would be up to the Department to defend any challenges to the process. During interviews with DII and BGS procurement representatives, it became clear that their involvement in the DOC OMS procurement was related to review and approval of the RFP only, and not related to the analysis and evaluation of the proposals. There were specific questions asked during the interviews that could not be answered by these representatives; they indicated that they had no current knowledge of the topical area.

7.0 COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

This section provides costs and associated benefits associated with deployment of the proposed OMS system and services.

7.1 Costs

Please see the Acquisition Cost Assessment section above.

7.2 Benefits

Benefits associated with the acquisition and implementation of the proposed OMS were provided by InterAct and BerryDunn to the State. The State identified additional benefits. The benefits were categorized as Tangible and Intangible. The Tangible benefits are quantifiable, where a savings dollar value can be associated with each. The Intangible benefits are those that cannot be associated with specific dollar savings, but are important considerations for the replacement of the PAS system. Although the implementation does not support a positive Return on Investment (ROI) based on the identified Tangible Benefits, the Intangible Benefits likely support the justification of the solution acquisition.

7.2.1 Tangible (Quantifiable) Benefits

Below is a list of Tangible Benefits identified by the State. The estimated values (savings) associated with these Tangible Benefits can be found in Appendix B Cost / Benefit Analysis.

- Reduced need for AHS-IT staff to support network, hardware and software issues. (Cost Savings of 1 FTE @ $34.49/hr.)
- Increased availability for Corrections Line Staff to perform duties instead of keeping track of inmate issues on paper (Increase caseloads Cost avoidance of 1 FTE @ $34.49/hr.)
- Decreased risk of late release resulting in litigation costs
- Decreased risk that Medical Payments for Inmates Housed from other states will be paid with Vermont State funds
- Reduced transport run inefficiencies through the coordination of runs
- EHR acquisition cost avoidance by using JailTracker EHR features
- Reduced housing of inmates with minor offenses (decrease med costs and reduced offsite housing), instead supervising them in the community and monitoring them at a lower cost
- Reduced paper and other office costs in facilities
- Deferred or eliminated frivolous lawsuits (inmate wasn't allowed to go to recreation, receive visits, etc.) because of illegible handwriting by using the JailTracker ability to auto stamp time and date
- System would maintain documentation needed as part of efforts and directives to re-integrate offenders into the community, decreasing DOC and other agency staff time

7.2.2 Intangible (Non-quantifiable) Benefits

Below is a list of Intangible Benefits identified by the State. These benefits have no quantifiable value, but are important considerations when determining when to conduct a technology refresh such as this project.

- Decreased risk of early release resulting in a public safety issue
- Increased accuracy of eMAR dosages
- Decreased correctional officer duty errors through the use of the JailTracker virtual grease board
- Decreased booking time using JailTracker
- Decreased hours spent by Central Office Staff preparing state bill for housing inmates
- Reduced time needed for DOC staff to create and run reports compared to PAS

8.0 RISKS AND ISSUES MANAGEMENT PLAN

This Section provides information and analysis on the InterAct implementation plan for the OMS system and services. Specifically, it addresses the proposed timeline, vendor and State staffing, project scope, implementation approach, the training methodology, and other considerations.

The Risk and Issues Management Plan is the primary deliverable of this Independent Review (Independent Review) of the State's OMS selection. As a result of the interviews conducted, BerryDunn identified findings in each of the following topic areas:

- Acquisition Costs
- Technical Architecture
- Implementation Plan
- Organizational Readiness

The findings were then analyzed to determine if they result in Risks, Issues or neither. If the findings resulted in Risks or Issues, they were included in the Risk Register or Issue Log respectively. The Risk Register and Issue Log are provided in this section.

8.1 Definitions: Findings, Risks, Issues

BerryDunn identifies both Risks and Issues as a result of this Independent Review. The PMI provides an important distinction between the two, and BerryDunn believes that this section must include a narrative regarding issues in addition to risks.

Finding: A relevant fact discovered during the execution of this Independent Review that may lead to one or more Risks and/or Issues.

Risk: Uncertain events or conditions which, if they occur, have a negative effect on the project's objectives. Risks are events or conditions that may occur in the future.

Issue: An Issue is a situation which has occurred or will definitely occur, as opposed to a Risk which is a potential event.

8.2 Independent Review Risk Register

This section includes two sets of tables that document the identified risks (Risk Register) and the relative importance of the risks using the potential impact and probability of the identified risks (Risk Scatter Diagrams). Two Risk Scatter Diagrams are used in this report to indicate that Risks that must be addressed ***Prior to Contract Execution*** and ***Subsequent to Contract Execution***. The Risks are positioned on each diagram to enable the user to quickly determine the level of risk impact, as well as the probability of each risk occurring.

Table 11 – Risk Scatter Diagrams

Prior to Contract Execution

		Probability		
		High	**Medium**	**Low**
Impact	**High**			
	Medium	R7	R4 R5 R6 R11 R13	R1 R8
	Low	R10	R12	

Subsequent to Contract Execution

		Probability		
		High	**Medium**	**Low**
Impact	**High**			
	Medium		R2 R3 R5 R9	
	Low			

The following table defines the elements of the Risk Register:

Table 12 – Risk Register Element Definitions

Data Element	Description
Risk #	This is a sequential number assigned to each risk to be used when referring to the risk.
Risk Description	This is a brief narrative description of the identified Risk.
Finding Reference	This is a cross-reference to the Finding from which the Risk was determined.
Risk Impact / Probability	This is a two-value indicator of the potential impact of the Risk if it were to occur, along with an indicator of the probability of the risk occurring. Values: Impact (High, Medium, Low); Probability (High, Medium, Low).
Risk Impact Description	This is a narrative description of the potential impact of the risk.
Risk Response Recommendation	This field includes BerryDunn's recommendation on how the State should address the risk.
Recommended Risk Response Timing	This is value used to indicate whether the Risk is likely to occur Prior to contract execution or Subsequent to contract execution (e.g. the DDI phase). Values: Prior / Subsequent
Risk Management Plan	This field includes the results of discussions between State staff and BerryDunn regarding how the State plans to address the risk. This includes the State staff person responsible for managing the risk, the action plan to mitigate the risk and the timing of the action plan.

Table 13 – Risk Register

Risk #: R1	**Finding Reference:** F16	**Risk Impact/Probability:** MEDIUM/LOW	**Recommended Risk Response Timing:** Prior to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**The InterAct technical proposal describes multiple Service Level Agreement (SLA) models for the InterAct solution and hosting services.** Proposal sections D.2.8 and Attachment L include tables that describe SLAs that are inconsistent with one another. This may lead to confusion or future contract disputes regarding the levels of service required vs. those delivered.	
Risk Impact Description:		The solution as implemented at the hosting site may not meet the service requirements of the State, and may lead to confusion or future contract disputes.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		The State should negotiate a single SLA to include all aspects of the proposed solution that InterAct and their vendor partners control. This would include the InterAct software, help desk, and the NLETS data center.	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		The State's approach to negotiations has been to address items in Attachments A-F first. The remaining attachments, including one with the SLA, will be negotiated after to ensure that any documentation for the SLA can use language from the Attachments A-F. The Contract also states the order of precedent for each Attachment, which should alleviate any disputes that arise regarding the levels of service required.	

Risk #: R2	**Finding Reference:** F10, F15	**Risk Impact/Probability:** MEDIUM/MEDIUM	**Recommended Risk Response Timing:** Subsequent to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**InterAct's proposed data migration strategy may not adequately address the State's unique requirements.** Representatives of the State DOC report that a successful data migration strategy for legacy PAS data into JailTracker will need to consider complex data and business rules, including minimum/maximum sentences and legal statuses that are unique to the State of Vermont. A failed data migration may result in data not being accurately reflected in the target system, or not conducive to the complex business rules configured within the target system.	
Risk Impact Description:		Without proper configuration of the InterAct modules, data could be left without a proper location, resulting in a slower data migration process and an increased need for change requests upon implementation. A failed data migration may result in data not being accurately reflected in the target system, or not conducive to the complex business rules configured within the target system.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		1. The AHS Director of Data Services should oversee and be closely involved in all aspects of the migration of data from PAS into the JailTracker system; 2. The business rules associated with sentence computation statutes must be configured within JailTracker prior to legacy data being migrated to it, enabling the data conversion process to leverage those business rules during migration.	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		The State has already addressed data migration assumptions at the start of Contract Negotiations. It is the intent of the State to have the AHS Director of Data Services oversee the migration process. Concerning business rules, the data migration is intended to go through several iterations in order to ensure all the necessary data is available in the new system. All business rules, including those for sentence computation, are in the timeline to be created at the beginning of the contract. Prior to data conversion and migration sign-off, all of these requirements would need to be met.	

Risk #: R3	Finding Reference: F14	Risk Impact/Probability: MEDIUM/MEDIUM	Recommended Risk Response Timing: Subsequent to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**State of Vermont OMS stakeholders may have differing opinions and expectations for data migration from PAS into JailTracker.** Some State stakeholders said they expect all PAS data to be migrated while others either expected some data to be left behind or were unaware of any plans regarding the data migration process.	
Risk Impact Description:		Unless all State stakeholders understand the process for deciding what data to migrate, confusion and a lack of alignment could delay implementation and result in inconsistent migration of data or lost data that State stakeholders may need to access in the InterAct solution in the future.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		DOC, BGS, DII and AHS should all agree to a documented data migration approach for this project via a formal Data Migration Plan deliverable to be produced by InterAct, and approved by the State.	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		Although it may currently be true that staff have differing opinions and expectations for data migration from PAS to JailTracker, it is due to their knowledge of the system. AHS-IT staff are analyzing the current PAS system in order to determine the data that can and should be migrated. This process started on a decision of the DOC IT Review team to ensure that staff were knowledgeable of the current system and should be completed prior to contract signing and the Data Migration Plan being delivered from InterAct. State staff involved with the data migration process will be informed of the outcome of the data analysis and be able to provide input on the data to be migrated.	

Risk #: R4	**Finding Reference:** F31	**Risk Impact/Probability:** MEDIUM/MEDIUM	**Recommended Risk Response Timing:** Prior to Contract Execution or immediately Subsequent to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**The AHS Project Manager (PM) assigned to the DOC OMS implementation project is currently part-time and has no DOC or Offender Management System Implementation experience.** The State's proposed PM is currently allocated to this project part-time: 50% of her time is allocated to this project and 50% is allocated to a Department of Mental Health (DMH) Project. AHS has reported that a second PMO resource is likely to be hired soon. It is unclear whether the currently assigned PM will provide full-time support of the VT DOC OMS Implementation project, full-time support of the DMH project, or part-time support for both projects. While the PM does not have implementation experience in the corrections environment, she has large system implementation experience and would be supported by strong DOC leadership involved in this project. The PM stated that she saw a potential benefit of considering 100% allocation of a PM to this project.	
Risk Impact Description:		This high-impact project will require significant project management and oversight in order to ensure it meets the State's requirements and effectively serves the State's unique corrections environment. The implementation of OMS in a State DOC environment requires a unique skill set as a critical success factor. A part-time project management approach may result in incomplete or delayed implementation tasks, increased vendor autonomy for making implementation decisions, decreased project communications and reduced management of the OMS Implementation Project Schedule. The lack of OMS Implementation experience may result in increased vendor autonomy for making configuration and customization design decisions.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		1) Confirm that the assigned resource will play a full-time role on the VT DOC OMS Implementation project for the duration of the project and augment the assigned PM's skillset with a resource with OMS implementation experience; or 2) Identify a full-time PM resource with OMS implementation and DOC experience.	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		AHS-IT has confirmed that a full-time PM has been assigned as a resource for this project from its newly formed AHS-PMO office. The current make-up of the State's PMO does not consist of staff with OMS implementation; however, with strong DOC leadership involvement in this project, the State accepts this risk with a full-time PM allocation. This State PM will also be working with a PM and vendor team that has several years of JMS implementation experience.	

Risk #: R5	**Finding Reference:** F32	**Risk Impact/Probability:** MEDIUM/MEDIUM	**Recommended Risk Response Timing:** Prior to Contract Execution and Subsequent to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**InterAct's proposed PM (provided by partner Sierra Systems) does not have OMS or JailTracker implementation experience.** Although InterAct's proposed PM is a PMP and has significant experience in implementing large scale systems in the integrated justice discipline, his resume shows no experience in the implementation of OMS or JMS at the state, county, provincial, or local level. This risk was identified during the 2012 independent review of the OMS procurement and is also present during this one. InterAct is proposing a team approach to the implementation of JailTracker for the State of Vermont, DOC. This team includes members of the Sierra Systems team as well as key members of the InterAct Product Management team. Although the proposed PM does not have specific OMS implementation experience, Sierra Systems has significant experience in this arena. Additionally, the InterAct team is proposing that the InterAct JailTracker Product Manager – David Ogles – will augment the proposed PM's experience with those of his JailTracker experience. This team approach positively impacts the impact of this risk.	
Risk Impact Description:		Utilizing a PM that lacks experience with JailTracker and State Corrections business practices could result in a missed opportunity to leverage "lessons learned" gained from previous JailTracker implementations. Utilizing other InterAct staff, such as the JailTracker Product Manager as is currently proposed by InterAct, to offset the lack of experience with the PM may be negatively impacted by communication challenges, both within the InterAct organization, and between InterAct and the State. Weak InterAct project management could lead to an unplanned increase in involvement from the State EPMO, State DOC IT Manager and the assigned AHS PM. This combined with the lack of DOC and OMS implementation experience by the AHS PM could result in missed opportunities for efficiencies and delays in the project schedule.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		It is recommended that InterAct's partner, Sierra Systems, identify a PM that has attained the PMP designation and has significant OMS implementation experience.	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		The State requires a team approach to the OMS implementation. By bringing in Sierra Systems, InterAct has shown that they are providing an experienced and certified staff. The State has stated in the contract that the State must sign-off on staff assigned to this project as part of the staffing plan deliverable and that the PM has a PMP designation.	

Risk #: R6	**Finding Reference:** F8	**Risk Impact/Probability:** MEDIUM/MEDIUM	**Recommended Risk Response Timing:** Prior to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**It is unclear if the proposed JailTracker system can accurately reflect all required State statutory sentence computation algorithms through configuration alone (with little or no customization required).** While State stakeholders expressed confidence in InterAct's capability on this front, the State's statutory sentence computation algorithms have not been implemented in a new system for decades. JailTracker has been successfully implemented at the county level, including configuration for county sentence computations. Implementation of sentence computation algorithms in a jail setting may be less complex than those in a state DOC environment because of the short time that jailed offenders spend in a jail environment compared to that of a State DOC environment.	
Risk Impact Description:		Customization may be required if the JailTracker system Is unable to reflect all required State statutory computation algorithms through configuration.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		1. Require InterAct to conduct a follow-up demonstration of the JailTracker system that is configured to address three to five State sentence computation scenarios without requiring customization; 2. Include a clause in the contract that requires all State sentence computation scenarios to be addressed in JailTracker without the need for customization or future change requests, with financial consideration if this is not possible.	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		The State is willing to accept this risk. It is a requirement of the contract that the JMS system be able to complete sentence computation algorithms and these calculations have been configured for several organizations in the current JMS system. InterAct has demonstrated calculations similar to those in the State of Vermont during the Demonstration Session as part of the contract process. InterAct has stated and it is in the contract that any State Laws and DOC directives that cause a change to the system is work that InterAct it to perform for free and not subject to an out-of-scope change request. Also, DOC has staff that has been involved with sentence computation and one of these staff members is a member of the Change Review Board. These staff will be available as needed to help aid in Vermont Statutory requirements.	

Risk #: R7	Finding Reference: F9	Risk Impact/Probability: MEDIUM/HIGH	Recommended Risk Response Timing: Prior to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**A field-level case management module does not currently exist in the proposed JailTracker solution.** InterAct proposes the development of this module within the scope and cost of this implementation. A member of the DOC's leadership team recognized the importance of ensuring that this module be highly functional. This team member expressed confidence in InterAct's ability to develop this module.	
Risk Impact Description:		If the DOC's conceptual design of this module differs significantly from InterAct's, additional costs may be incurred, functionality may be compromised or the project schedule may be negatively impacted.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		Require InterAct to provide the State with a high-level design specification for a field-level case management module prior to contract execution. Ensure that the negotiated contract includes language that provides for a highly functional case management module for no additional cost and within the proposed project implementation schedule. Ensure that DII and key project team members recognize that the State will be implementing this portion of the JailTracker solution as a national first, and focus attention on this aspect of the project as it will require more resources on the vendor side to ensure it goes smoothly.	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		The State is willing to accept this risk. Any system would require some development as Vermont's Correctional System is unique. Most of the information needed for the new module is already contained within other existing modules of the JMS system. InterAct demonstrated a second system, which was a Juvenile Case Management System, that demonstrated the companies' ability to create a module similar to what the State is looking for. The Case Management module is referenced in several of the requirements for the project in the contract as part of the negotiated price. This risk was presented to DII CIO Richard Boes a year ago, so all staff are aware of the need for some development by any vendor and that DOC has confidence in InterAct to provide this development.	

Risk #: R8	**Finding Reference:** F25	**Risk Impact/Probability:** MEDIUM/LOW	**Recommended Risk Response Timing:** Prior to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**A formal Training Plan is not referenced in the InterAct Technical Proposal as a formal deliverable.** The InterAct proposal references a Training Plan within the context PMI best practices, but does not include a Training Plan as a formal deliverable. InterAct expressed a willingness to provide extensive training, including Train the Trainer training. The State has indicated that HRD may serve as trainers, but that no formal plan exists.	
Risk Impact Description:		An unstructured training plan could result in the wrong trainers getting trained, a delayed roll-out, and an inefficient overreliance on helpdesk assistance.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		Require InterAct to include a Training Plan as a formal deliverable, with contract language to reflect this deliverable.	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		The State has required that a formal Training Plan be given as a deliverable as part of the contract.	

Risk #: R9	Finding Reference: F24, F26, F28	Risk Impact/Probability: MEDIUM/MEDIUM	Recommended Risk Response Timing: Subsequent to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**The State DOC may not apply sufficient resources to the JailTracker implementation project.** The State expressed a desire to be heavily engaged during development iterations, but it is not clear what resources the State will allocate toward multiple other phases, such as data cleansing, training, and overall project management.	
Risk Impact Description:		Without the allocation of adequate staff resources, project delays, increased change requests, or poorly designed requirements and design may occur.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		The DOC and InterAct should develop a resource plan as one of the initial artifacts of the implementation project. The DOC should clearly articulate the percent availability of DOC staff to this project, and identify where gaps may exist.	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		The State has already developed a staff resource document to be included as part of this process. This document included different resources that will need to be allocated from the State side during different parts of the project. This plan will be combined with the InterAct Staff plan in order to outline the resources for the OMS project. The senior leadership team, who also represents the Change Review Board, oversee the DOC staff needed for project implementation and will be able to delegate this staff as needed.	

Risk #: R10	Finding Reference: F11	Risk Impact/Probability: LOW/HIGH	Recommended Risk Response Timing: Prior to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**Access to the JailTracker solution by DOC staff is dependent on a single network connection.** The State has one portal, which presents a single point of failure for network connectivity. The DII and AHS technical staff that were interviewed during this independent review indicated that all network traffic to and from the DOC facilities traveled to a central location (and backup location) prior to communicating with external resources. This situation also currently exists for the PAS system, so it is not a new risk inherent with the proposed solution.	
Risk Impact Description:		If a network connection is unavailable for accessing the JailTracker solution at the proposed hosting facility, that facility has no mechanism for jail operations using the JailTracker solution.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		DII and AHS should implement redundancy for the DOC institutions where this risk is highest.	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		The State agrees that a single network connection may be a risk. With regard to Internet redundancy, the State will have two separate Internet pipes when the new data center in Williston is completed. This will provide Internet fail-over capability for connectivity to the server hosting the JailTracker solution. As part of mitigating this and other risks, InterAct met with the DII Enterprise Architecture group to ensure the proposed client-server solution was acceptable.	

Risk #: R11	Finding Reference: F19, F34	Risk Impact/Probability: MEDIUM/MEDIUM	Recommended Risk Response Timing: Prior to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**The web-based InterAct OMS may not be deployed at another state DOC prior to DOC's desire to migrate from the client-server JailTracker solution to the InterAct OMS solution.** InterAct plans to implement InterAct OMS (web version) with County jail systems with 300-800 beds. The InterAct JailTracker Product manager indicated that all of the company's internal JailTracker development resources are focused on the web version. However, InterAct does not have existing plans in place to implement it in a statewide corrections environment. Also, InterAct currently has no state-level customers using the JailTracker solution. Although the InterAct Product Manager reported that the InterAct OMS roadmap includes the deployment of InterAct OMS at many medium sized county jails in the 2014 timeframe, this solution is not deployed at any customer site to address the unique requirements of the DOC, including Community Supervision, Jail Management (intake/release and short-term "holds" prior to court) and Prison Management (post-adjudication offenders being held per court order). During the May 31 demonstration of the JailTracker solution, InterAct indicated that InterAct OMS would be fully implemented at the State of Indiana in 2014 or early 2015, reducing the DOC's risk of being the first state-level implementation of the web-based version of this solution. During the independent review interview with InterAct it became clear that there are no plans to implement InterAct OMS at the State of Indiana, DOC. Further research into Indiana's procurement process for an OMS revealed that InterAct proposed a solution as a subcontracting vendor during this procurement process in which the award recommendation for a competing selection was made April 18, 2013. This occurred before the May 31 demonstration to the DOC.	
Risk Impact Description:		A delay in InterAct's ability to provide the InterAct OMS could prevent the State from moving to a web-based system when it deems itself ready. If the State requires the web-based solution before InterAct has deployed it within a state environment, the State may be the first state DOC to adopt this solution, thus increasing the risk of deployment. This is not unlike the risk described during the 2012 independent review of the proposed JailTracker implementation.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		1. Contact the State of Indiana DOC to discuss their procurement of an OMS; 2. The negotiated contract with InterAct should require that the InterAct OMS be deployed at a state DOC prior to the implementation of InterAct OMS at the State of Vermont; 3. The negotiated contract should include a timeline for deployment of InterAct OMS in the State, and a financial remedy if InterAct OMS is not deployed at a state DOC prior to that date.	

Risk #: R11	Finding Reference: F19, F34	Risk Impact/Probability: MEDIUM/MEDIUM	Recommended Risk Response Timing: Prior to Contract Execution
Risk Mitigation Plan:	The State has followed up on the Indiana procurement and Indiana is not implementing a statewide solution with InterAct. InterAct was a sub-vendor in this process. InterAct is currently in negations with other states about implementation of a web-based solution, which means that Vermont may not be the first statewide implementation. The contract language currently states a deliverable for the state to be upgraded to a web-based system within a year and there are financial impacts for the vendor if they do not comply, but language can be modified if deemed necessary by DII.		

Risk #: R12	Finding Reference: F29	Risk Impact/Probability: LOW/MEDIUM	Recommended Risk Response Timing: Prior to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**The quality of the InterAct proposal may be reflective of the quality of the OMS implementation.** Numerous spelling and grammatical errors and formatting inconsistencies were found throughout the InterAct Technical Proposal.	
Risk Impact Description:		Without quality assurance, the State could need to reject multiple deliverables to the vendor for revisions, taking up valuable State resources and delaying the implementation of the solution. Additionally, the quality of the implementation, communications, and project management artifacts may result in a lower quality implementation.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		1. The DOC should contact the references provided in the proposal before finalizing the contract; 2. The DOC should request 1-3 “negative references” from InterAct and contact those jurisdictions to proactively identify where or if quality issues may occur. (“Negative references” may include jurisdictions that had specific difficulty or challenges implementing the JailTracker solution, or have abandoned the JailTracker solution for another JMS or OMS.)	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		The State will contact the references in the proposal before finalizing the contract. The State has also requested 3 negative contacts for a “negative reference” list.	

Risk #: R13	Finding Reference: F35	Risk Impact/Probability: MEDIUM/MEDIUM	Recommended Risk Response Timing: Prior to Contract Execution
Risk Description:		**The State of Vermont Procurement Department did not play an active role in the Evaluation Process, though it would be the Department's job to defend any challenges to that process.** During independent review interviews with DII and BGS procurement representatives, it became clear that their involvement in this OMS procurement was sporadic and inconsistent. Stakeholders from BGS and DII could not speak to how scoring were conducted, who attended demos, and who participated in the evaluation process.	
Risk Impact Description:		The State may be open to challenges by participating vendors that were not selected if a consistent procurement process for evaluation and selection is not documented.	
Risk Response Recommendation:		The State should ensure that the process by which it performed evaluation and selection of the vendors is well-documented and consistent with State requirements.	
Risk Mitigation Plan:		The State accepts this risk. The process by which the evaluation and selection were conducted is well documented using similar templates as other AHS IT projects. Members of DII were in the process including the drafting of the RFP and approving bids received from vendors. BGS reviewed the initial RFP, was informed of the progress of the project similar to other DOC procurements, and was notified when the vendor selection was made. The PM documented the entire selection process and included notes as to why this vendor was selected over the others. DII, DOC and AHS-IT staff have been involved in reviewing contract language as necessary and the DOC Attorney General has been a part of contract negotiations to review all suggested language changes.	

8.3 Independent Review Issue Log

This section includes a table that documents the identified issues (Issue Log). The following table defines the elements of the Issue Log:

Table 14 – Issue Log Element Definitions

Data Element	Description
Issue #	This is a sequential number assigned to each issue to be used when referring to the issue.
Issue Description	This is a brief narrative description of the identified issue.
Finding Reference	This is a cross-reference to the Finding from which the issue was determined.
Issue Impact	This is an indicator of the impact of the issue. Values: High, Medium, Low.
Potential Impact Description	This is a narrative description of the impact of the issue.
Issue Recommendation	This field includes BerryDunn's recommendation on how the State should address the issue.
Recommended Issue Response Timing	This is value used to indicate whether the Issue should be addressed Prior to contract execution or Subsequent to contract execution (e.g., the DDI phase). Values: Prior / Subsequent
Issue Mitigation Plan	This field includes the results of discussions between State staff and BerryDunn regarding how the State plans to address the issue. This includes the State staff person responsible for managing the issue, the action plan to mitigate the issue and the timing of the action plan.

This section includes two sets of tables that document the identified issues (Issue Log) and the relative impact of each of the issues (Issue Impact Diagrams). One Issue Impact Diagram is used in this report to indicate the Issues that must be addressed ***Prior to Contract Execution***. The Issues is positioned on the diagram to enable the user to quickly determine the level of issue impact. This diagram differs from the Risk Scatter Diagrams, since by definition an issue has a 100% probability of occurring so probability is not a parameter.

Table 15 – Issue Impact Diagrams

Prior to Contract Execution

Impact		
High	**Medium**	**Low**
	I1	

Table 16 – Issue Log

Issue #: I1	**Finding Reference:** F3	**Issue Impact:** MEDIUM	**Recommended Issue Response Timing:** Prior to Contract Execution
Issue Description:	**InterAct proposed a 2% flat percentage annual increase in hosting fees.** The hosting component of InterAct's Cost Proposal included an annual flat 2% increase for using the hosting service NLETS. This annual fee increase is not tied to the actual value of the service being provided, which may include the addition of disk storage, increase in speed or upgrades to network infrastructure within the NLETS facilities.		
Potential Impact Description:	Over time the State may not be receiving from InterAct for hosting of the InterAct JailTracker or InterAct OMS solution may not be aligned with the cost.		
Issue Recommendation:	During contract negotiations require InterAct to provide a flat mark-up % over the **actual** NLETS invoice. In this way InterAct is covered for inevitable NLETS price increases, and the State is not charged for services that are inconsistent with the invoice price. Under this recommended approach, NLETS will invoice InterAct for the hosting services provided for the State's OMS implementation. InterAct will then invoice the DOC at a rate equal to the NLETS invoice price plus an agreed to markup %.		
Issue Mitigation Plan:	During Contract Negotiations, the State has asked InterAct to provide a flat markup % over the actual NLETS invoice and that InterAct provide an invoice for the State to review. Please note that this request differs from the bid proposal from InterAct, but the State believes that a better agreement can be obtained by using this recommendation during negotiations.		

APPENDIX A – PROJECT COST DETAILS

Please see the Identified Costs component of the Cost / Benefit Analysis table in Appendix B.

APPENDIX B – COST / BENEFIT ANALYSIS

Estimated Contract Project Costs and Benefits		FY 2013	FY2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	Totals
Identified Costs	**Total Cost**	**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 5**	**Year 6**	**Year 7**	**Year 8**	**Year 9**	**Year 10**	**Year 11**	**Year 12**	**Year 13**	**Contract Projection**
Hardware		$0	$18,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$18,000**
Software Costs		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
Network Cost		$69,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$69,000**
Preparation		$0	$407,360	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$407,360**
Construction		$0	$1,244,810	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$1,244,810**
Inspection		$0	$0	$109,840	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$109,840**
Implementation and Support		$0	$0	$837,990	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$837,990**
Subscription and Support Service Costs (Assume 1 year warranty)		PreImplementation	Implementation	$62,500	$250,000	$257,500	$265,225	$273,182	$281,377	$289,819	$298,513	$307,468	$316,693	$326,193	**$2,928,470**
Hosting Fees (@$10k/month)		PreImplementation	Implementation	$30,000	$120,000	$122,400	$124,848	$127,345	$129,892	$132,490	$135,139	$137,842	$140,599	$143,411	**$1,343,967**
Project Overhead Costs (Vermont Staff Resources & PM Cost)		$0	$245,986	$148,948	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$394,934**
Independent Review		$15,920	$15,900	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$31,820**
Change Requests				$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	**$1,320,000**
Unanticipated Project Costs (T&M)		$0	$50,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	**$325,000**
Total Costs:		**$84,920**	**$1,982,056**	**$1,334,278**	**$515,000**	**$524,900**	**$535,073**	**$545,527**	**$556,269**	**$567,308**	**$578,653**	**$590,311**	**$602,292**	**$614,604**	**$9,031,190**
Cumulative Costs:		**$84,920**	**$2,066,976**	**$3,401,254**	**$3,916,254**	**$4,441,154**	**$4,976,227**	**$5,521,754**	**$6,078,023**	**$6,645,331**	**$7,223,984**	**$7,814,294**	**$8,416,586**	**$9,031,190**	
Identified Savings		**Year 1**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 5**	**Year 6**	**Year 7**	**Year 8**	**Year 9**	**Year 10**	**Year 11**	**Year 12**	**Year 13**	**Contract Projection**
1. Reduced need for AHS-IT staff to support network, hardware and software issues. (Cost Savins of 1 FTE @34.49/hr)	T	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$71,739	$73,891	$76,108	$78,391	$80,743	$83,165	$85,660	$88,230	$90,877	$93,603	**$822,407**
2. Increased availability for Corrections Line Staff to perform duties instead of keeping track of inmate issues on paper (Increase caseloads Cost avoidance of 1 FTE @34.49/hr)	T	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$71,739	$73,891	$76,108	$78,391	$80,743	$83,165	$85,660	$88,230	$90,877	$93,603	**$822,407**
3. Decreased risk of early release resulting in a public safety issue.	I	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
4. Decreased risk of late release resulting in litigation costs.	T	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$50,000	$51,500	$53,045	$54,636	$56,275	$57,964	$59,703	$61,494	$63,339	$65,239	**$573,194**
5. Decrease the risk for Medical Payments for Inmates Housed from other states to be paid with Vermont State funds.	T	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$100,000	$103,000	$106,090	$109,273	$112,551	$115,927	$119,405	$122,987	$126,677	$130,477	**$1,146,388**
6. Reduction of inappropriate transport runs (coordination of runs).	T	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$5,000	$5,150	$5,305	$5,464	$5,628	$5,796	$5,970	$6,149	$6,334	$6,524	**$57,319**
7. Correct eMAR dosages.	I	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
8. Electronic Health Record acqisition cost avoidance.	T	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$200,000	$20,000	$20,600	$21,218	$21,855	$22,510	$23,185	$23,881	$24,597	$25,335	**$403,182**
9. Virtual greaseboard to decrease errors in Correctional Officer duties.	I	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
10. Reduction of housing of inmates with minor offenses (decrease med costs; reduced offsite housing) and monitoring them at a lower cost.	T	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$200,000	$257,500	$318,270	$376,991	$427,131	$461,942	$490,074	$514,872	$540,924	$568,295	**$4,155,998**
11. Reduced paper and other office costs in facilities (extra mailings)	T	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$12,000	$12,360	$12,731	$13,113	$13,506	$13,911	$14,329	$14,758	$15,201	$15,657	**$137,567**
12. Defer several lawsuits for frivolous reasons (inmate wasn't allowed to go to recreation, receive visits, etc) because handwriting vs. ability	T	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$10,000	$10,300	$10,609	$10,927	$11,255	$11,593	$11,941	$12,299	$12,668	$13,048	**$114,639**
13. Decreased booking time using OMS	I	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
14. Central Office Staff save hours per month preparing state bill for housing inmates	I	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
15. Reduce the time needed for DOC staff to create and run reports compared to Legacy System	I	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$0**
16. System would maintain documentation needed as part of efforts and directives to re-intergrate offenders into the community, decreasing DOC and other agency staff time.	T	PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$71,739	$73,891	$76,108	$78,391	$80,743	$83,165	$85,660	$88,230	$90,877	$93,603	**$822,407**
Total Savings		PreImplementation	Implementation	Implementation	$792,217	$681,484	$754,973	$826,795	$890,429	$939,139	$981,587	$1,021,130	$1,062,370	$1,105,385	$9,055,509

	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	FY 2023	FY 2023
	Year 1	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Year 5**	**Year 6**	**Year 7**	**Year 8**	**Year 9**	**Year 10**	**Year 11**	**Year 12**	**Year 13**
Total Project Cost:	$84,920	$2,066,976	$3,401,254	$3,916,254	$4,441,154	$4,976,227	$5,521,754	$6,078,023	$6,645,331	$7,223,984	$7,814,294	$8,416,586	$9,031,190
Total Projected Tangible Cost Savings:	$0	$0	$0	$792,217	$1,473,701	$2,228,674	$3,055,468	$3,945,897	$4,885,036	$5,866,623	$6,887,753	$7,950,124	$9,055,509
Net Cost:	$84,920	$2,066,976	$3,401,254	$3,124,037	$2,967,454	$2,747,554	$2,466,285	$2,132,126	$1,760,295	$1,357,360	$926,541	$466,462	-$24,318

Assumptions:

- 18 month implementation schedule
- Software maintenance payments due after 1 year warranty period
- 1 year warranty period begins after 18th month.
- Project Overhead Costs:
- Overtime costs for COS for Training ($60,512.64) (328 CO1s * 4 hours * $31.50/hr + 128 CO2s * 4 hours * $37.47/hr)

- Overtime costs for COS for UAT ($115,869.60) (7 COs * 8 hours * 60 days * average salary CO1 and CO2 ($34.49/hr)

- Overtime costs for COS for DDI ($551.84) (2 COs * 8 hours ** average salary CO1 and CO2 ($34.49/hr)

- PM Costs: $80,000 year 1, $60,000 year 2

- Hardware: Monitors required for facilities to take full advantage of the software
- Change Requests: T&M costs for features not included in agreed to requirements

- Unanticipated Costs: Unknown
- Hosting fees increase by 2%, although cost of bill model is proposed
- Maintenance (Subscription and Support Service Costs) increase 3% year over year

Identified Savings; I = Intangible; T = Tangible

APPENDIX C – RISKS SUMMARY

Risk #	Risk Description	Findings Category	Risk Impact / Probability	Recommended Risk Response Timing
R1	The InterAct technical proposal describes multiple Service Level Agreement (SLA) models for the InterAct solution and hosting services.	Implementation Plan	Medium/Low	Prior to Contract Execution
R2	InterAct's proposed data migration strategy may not adequately address the State's unique requirements.	Technical Architecture Implementation Plan	Medium/Medium	Subsequent to Contract Execution
R3	State OMS stakeholders may have differing opinions and expectations for data migration from PAS into JailTracker.	Implementation Plan	Medium/Medium	Subsequent to Contract Execution
R4	The AHS PM assigned to the DOC OMS implementation project OMS Management System Implementation experience.	Implementation Plan Organizational Readiness	Medium/Medium	Prior to Contract Execution
R5	InterAct's proposed PM (provided by partner Sierra Systems) does not have OMS or JailTracker implementation experience.	Implementation Plan Organizational Readiness	Medium/Medium	Prior to Contract Execution and Subsequent to Contract Execution
R6	It is unclear if the proposed JailTracker system can accurately reflect all required State statutory sentence computation algorithms through configuration alone (with little or no customization required).	Technical Architecture Organizational Readiness	Medium/Medium	Prior to Contract Execution
R7	A field-level case management module does not currently exist in the proposed JailTracker solution.	Technical Architecture Implementation Plan	Medium/High	Prior to Contract Execution
R8	A formal Training Plan is not referenced in the InterAct Technical Proposal as a formal deliverable.	Implementation Plan	Medium / Low	Prior to Contract Execution
R9	The DOC may not apply sufficient resources to the JailTracker implementation project.	Organizational Readiness	Medium/Medium	Subsequent to Contract Execution
R10	Access to the JailTracker solution by DOC staff is dependent on a single network connection.	Technical Architecture Organizational Readiness	Low/High	Prior to Contract Execution
R11	The web-based InterAct OMS may not be deployed at another state DOC prior to DOC's desire to migrate from the client-server JailTracker solution to the InterAct OMS solution.	Implementation Plan Organizational Readiness	Medium/Medium	Prior to Contract Execution
R12	The quality of the InterAct proposal may be reflective of the quality of the OMS implementation.	Organizational Readiness	Low/Medium	Prior to Contract Execution
R13	The State's Procurement Department did not play an active role in the Evaluation Process, though it would be the Department's job to defend any challenges to that process.	Implementation Plan Organizational Readiness	Medium/Medium	Prior to Contract Execution

APPENDIX D – ISSUES SUMMARY

Issue #	Issue Description	Findings Category	Issue Impact	Recommended Issue Response Timing
I1	InterAct proposed a 2% flat percentage annual increase in hosting fees.	Acquisition Cost Assessment	Medium	Prior to Contract Execution

APPENDIX E – SUMMARY OF FINDINGS WITH CROSS REFERENCE TO RISKS AND ISSUES

Finding #	Finding Description	Risk/Issue #	Risk/Issue Short Description
F1	InterAct has proposed a $0 perpetual license for the JailTracker solution.		
F2	Implementation costs are budgeted under software—product license.		
F3	InterAct proposed a 2% flat percentage annual increase in hosting fees.	I1	InterAct proposed a 2% flat percentage annual increase in hosting fees.
F4	The change control process for the InterAct solution post-implementation does not clearly define software changes vs. software defects.		
F5	InterAct responded negatively to RFP Contract Provision #10 that required the State to serve as the intellectual property owner.		
F6	The State does not have plans to use SafeTown or Interdex, though usage of the services is included in the proposal.		
F7	InterAct is proposing a client-server based COTS solution, which will require configuration as well as some customization to be usable by the State of Vermont.		
F8	The State reported that they are confident that JailTracker sentence computation calculations will be accurate.	R6	It is unclear if the proposed JailTracker system can accurately reflect all required State statutory sentence computation algorithms through configuration alone (with little or no customization required).
F9	The State reported that they are confident in InterAct's ability to build effective field/case management modules.		
F10	The State expressed concern about how JailTracker will accept legacy data, minimum and maximum sentences, and manipulation of legal statuses.	R2	InterAct's proposed data migration strategy may not adequately address the State's unique requirements.

Finding #	Finding Description	Risk/Issue #	Risk/Issue Short Description
F11	No redundancy exists between the institutions and the central data center, which presents a single point of failure for network connectivity.	R10	Access to the JailTracker solution by DOC staff is dependent on a single network connection.
F12	InterAct's proposed plan for a Security Risk Assessment is not clear.		
F13	InterAct proposed a hybrid system deployment model, which includes the implementation of appliances at each of the DOC facilities; DII has indicated that this approach is not acceptable. In subsequent discussions with DII and InterAct, there is general agreement that Citrix or Terminal Services will meet the needs of the project.		
F14	The State and InterAct do not have a clear understanding of their respective roles and responsibilities for data cleansing.	R3	State of Vermont OMS stakeholders may have differing opinions and expectations for data migration from PAS into JailTracker.
F15	The State has clearly articulated expected procedures for performing data migration.	R2	InterAct's proposed data migration strategy may not adequately address the State's unique requirements.
F16	The InterAct proposal describes multiple SLA models for the InterAct solution and hosting services.	R1	The InterAct technical proposal describes multiple Service Level Agreement (SLA) models for the InterAct solution and hosting services.
F17	The State does not plan to migrate inmate biometric data to JailTracker.		
F18	The State does not plan to automate the migration of inmate photos to the JailTracker system.		
F19	The State will implement the client-server program, JailTracker, first, and have the option of implementing the web version, InterAct OMS, a year afterward or later. It is not clear that InterAct OMS will have been implemented by another state DOC prior to the time the State wants to implement.	R11	The web-based InterAct OMS may not be deployed at another state DOC prior to VT DOC's desire to migrate from the client-server JailTracker solution to the InterAct OMS solution.
F20	State stakeholders have differing understandings of whether all or some data in PAS will be migrated to JailTracker.		
F21	The State will use InterAct's document management		

Finding #	Finding Description	Risk/Issue #	Risk/Issue Short Description
	system, not the AHS On-Base solution.		
F22	InterAct has proposed the use of the InterAct EHR module as part of the overall solution at no-extra charge.		
F23	InterAct is proposing NLETS as the hosting services provider instead of Secure24, which was proposed during the last procurement.		
F24	The DOC has identified a team of five key leaders to provide project oversight.	R9	The State DOC may not apply sufficient resources to the JailTracker implementation project.
F25	The proposed implementation approach does not have a clear training strategy.	R8	A formal Training Plan is not referenced in the InterAct Technical Proposal as a formal deliverable.
F26	The State expressed a desire to be heavily engaged during any project phases that include software customization.	R9	The State DOC may not apply sufficient resources to the JailTracker implementation project.
F27	InterAct's help desk will accept calls from anyone in the State's DOC.		
F28	It is not clear what resources will be needed from the AHS IT team during implementation and roll-out.	R9	The State DOC may not apply sufficient resources to the JailTracker implementation project.
F29	The InterAct proposal included a number of grammatical typos and formatting inconsistencies.	R12	The quality of the InterAct proposal may be reflective of the quality of the OMS implementation.
F30	The State is in the process of mapping the current PAS system data elements, with completion expected in July.		
F31	The State's proposed Project Manager is currently allocated to this project part-time.	R4	The AHS Project Manager (PM) assigned to the DOC OMS implementation project is part-time and has no DOC or Offender Management System Implementation experience.
F32	The proposed InterAct (Sierra Systems) Project Manager does not have experience with OMS implementation or JailTracker specifically.	R5	InterAct's proposed PM (provided by partner Sierra Systems) does not have OMS or JailTracker implementation experience.
F33	The DII EPMO Project Oversight Manager's assignment and allocation to this project represents 1.5% of the project cost.		
F34	InterAct plans to implement InterAct OMS (web	R11	The web-based InterAct OMS may not be deployed at another state

Finding #	Finding Description	Risk/Issue #	Risk/Issue Short Description
	version) with County jail systems with 300-800 beds, though it does not have existing plans in place to implement the solution in a statewide corrections environment; all of the company's future software development efforts will focus on InterAct OMS, the web version of their software.		DOC prior to VT DOC's desire to migrate from the client-server JailTracker solution to the InterAct OMS solution.
F35	The Procurement Department did not appear to play an active role in the Evaluation Process, though it would be the Department to defend any challenges to the process.	R13	The State of Vermont Procurement Department did not play an active role in the Evaluation Process, though it would be the Department's job to defend any challenges to that process.

APPENDIX F – PROJECT ORGANIZATION

Name	Title	Project Role	Agency / Dept
Andrew Pallito	Commissioner	Project Sponsor	AHS/DOC
Lisa Menard	Deputy Commissioner	Project Sponsor	AHS/DOC
Richard Boes	Chief Information Officer	Executive Sponsor	DII
Darwin Thompson	Deputy Commissioner	Executive Project Management Director	DII
Barbara Cormier	Project Manager	Executive Project Management Oversight	DII
Darin Prail	Deputy CIO; IT Security		AHS
Lucas Herring	IT Manager	Bid Review Team	AHS/IT
Sarah Clarke	Finance Director	Bid Review Team	AHS/DOC
Dale Crook	Director of Operations	Bid Review Team	AHS/DOC
Mary Jane (“MJ”) Ainsworth	Operations	Bid Review Team	AHS/DOC
Brenda Hudson	Supervisor – System Development	Reviewed Vendor Demos	AHS/IT
Craig Benson	Data Services Director	IT Review Team; Data Migration Team; Reviewed Vendor Demos	DII
Steve Bentley	IT Manager – Architecture	IT Review Team; Reviewed Vendor Demos	AHS/DOC
Tracey Tapley	IT Support	Data Migration Team; Reviewed Vendor Demos	AHS/IT
Doug Bickford	IT Support	Data Migration Team	AHS/IT
Mike Morey	IT Architecture Manager	Infrastructure Audit	DII
John McIntyre	Purchasing Manager	Proposal Management	BGS
Bob LaRose	Attorney	Contract Review	DOC
Kurt Jacobson	Account Manager	Primary Contact	InterAct
Dominic Damato	Facilities Representative	Reviewed Vendor Demos	AHS/DOC
Matthew Spille	Financial Administrator II	Manager – Keefe Commissary Interface; Reviewed Vendor Demos	DOC
Cheryl Burcham	Project Manager	Lead PM for DOC	AHS/PMO