



CITY OF HOUSTON

Administration and Regulatory Affairs Department
Strategic Purchasing Division

Annis D. Parker
Mayor

Calvin D. Wells, Deputy Director
City Purchasing Agent
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

F. 832.393.8755
<https://purchasing.houstontx.gov>

June 18, 2013

SUBJECT: Letter of Clarification No. 1 Software Performance Testing
and Review for the Houston Information Technology Services (HITS)

REFERENCE: Request for Proposal No. S29-Q24620

TO: All Prospective Proposers:

This Letter of Clarification is issued for the following reasons:

• **To revise the above referenced solicitation as follows:**

1. Page 1, Paragraph 3, Article pertaining to STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS DUE DATE/TIME: shall be revised and extended to read as follows:

Please review the Statement of Work below. If you believe that your consultancy/firm meets the minimum requirements as outlined in the Statement of Work of the RFQ, please submit your Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) to Douglas Moore, via one of the methods listed below by June 25, 2013 June 27, 2013 at 12:00 PM CDT. No SOQ's will be accepted after deadline. Remove Page 1 and replace with attached Page 1 marked Revised – June 18, 2013.

2. Page 1, Article 1.0 OVERVIEW: shall be revised to add the following provision:

1.3 Statement of Qualification from Offerors and/or its affiliates that are currently involved/engaged in the CSMART project will not be considered for award to provide this third party software performance testing and review for this project. Remove Page 1 and replace with attached Page 1 marked Revised – June 18, 2013.

• **The following questions and City of Houston responses are hereby incorporated and made a part of the Request for Qualifications:**

1. Testing Technology/License/Current landscape: Assuming you're current with HP SW Support. What is current version of HP LoadRunner in house?

Answer: Performance Center 11.5

2. Testing Technology/License/Current landscape: What kind of protocols do you have?
 - a. Could you specify more on the following protocols (if you have yes/no; and number of users)
 - i. Web, **No**
 - ii. GUI, **No**
 - iii. Web 2.0 Bundle (Web Services, AJAXTrueClient, Silverlight) **Yes**
 - iv. MS SQL, **Yes**
 - v. Citrix or RDP, **No**

Answer: Ajax (HTML/Javascript), Silverlight and MS SQL.

Partnering to better serve Houston

**LETTER OF CLARIFICATION 1
SOFTWARE PERFORMANCE TESTING AND REVIEW
SOLICITATION NO. S29-Q24620**

3. **Testing Technology/License/Current landscape:** Is it safe to assume that LoadRunner testing environment will be available to consultant/vendor during the project and don't have to share with anyone else?

Answer: *It is anticipated that consultant/vendor will coordinate use of the development or QA environment while developing scripts prior to full implementation of the Production environment. Performance testing will then focus on the production environment using the previously developed scripts.*

4. **Testing Technology/License/Current landscape:** Will you be looking any assistance with additional virtual users via rental or perpetual purchase from the consultant/vendor?

Answer: *Possibly. The City currently has access to licenses but if the project requires additional licenses we may seek assistance with these licenses.*

5. **Testing Technology/License/Current landscape:** Do you own HP LoadRunner Diagnostics currently or expect vendor/consultant to leverage if there are deeper issues?

Answer: *The City currently owns licenses for Loderunner Performance Center 11.5 and UFT 11.5 (formerly QTP). Any performance testing diagnostics tools will be found in these licenses.*

6. **Testing Technology/License/Current landscape:** What kind of internal expertise do you have to conduct the testing?

Answer: *We have staff who are familiar with the use of these tools, but minimal expertise.*

7. **Application under test:** What are the measures of success for the performance testing?

Answer: *The specific measures of success are defined within existing project documentation which will be made available to the selected vendor. Broadly, performance testing will have failed if tests indicate that the system will perform adequately and after go-live and it does not.*

8. **Application under test:** What is the peak load user volume for the application?

Answer: *50 – 300 users.*

9. **Application under test:** Would you deploy internal users or internet based users via Citrix, VDI or RDP client to centralize the maintenance? Can you break down the user count based on their access mechanism?

Answer: *Not planning to use Citrix, VDI or RDP.*

10. **Application under test:** Would How many key processes will be required that help generate the load on the system (top 20% process that contribute 80% or higher load)? Please use following table to help answer if possible?

	Business Function Name	Insert/Add Update/Change Delete/Remove Get/Search/Inquiry (Specify one of the above)	# of Steps Per Business	Typical time taken to complete this process by an average users
1	Ex: Create a user profile	Add	7 Steps	1.5 minutes

Partnering to better serve Houston

**LETTER OF CLARIFICATION 1
SOFTWARE PERFORMANCE TESTING AND REVIEW
SOLICITATION NO. S29-Q24620**

2	Ex: Update a user profile	Update	4 Steps	1 minute

Answer: *Key processes for testing have not been fully defined. We currently estimate approximately 50 processes with steps ranging between 10 and 50. Typical time for a user to complete ranges between 30 seconds to 2 minutes.*

11. **Application under test:** Would you consider load testing from the data-center and then load test from realistic points of presence to establish the real user experience/SLA?

Answer: *Yes.*

12. **Application under test:** Will external application services (hosted by PWE) be out of scope?

Answer: *The iNovah application service hosted by PWE is within scope.*

13. **Application under test:** Since its newly written application, what other legacy applications it's going to replace?

Answer: *CourtView, plus associated applications including: Visiflow, HyperCourt and IJIS Broker.*

14. **Application under test:** What kind of backend data that will be moved over to the new application database to baseline/benchmark the application?

Answer: *The City has a migration plan for both data and documents to be imported into the new system. This information may be used for testing purposes as well as being part of the production data after go-live.*

15. **Application under test:** What is the go live timeline and how many weeks application under test will be available for scripting/base lining/optimization?

Answer: *Though subject to change, it is currently anticipated that the contractor/vendor will have 8 to 16 weeks for scripting/base lining/optimization preparing for an estimated go-live of June, 2014.*

16. **Application under test:** Since it's a multi-tier system, have you identified business processes mapping/affecting components/sub-systems or layers?

Answer: *Yes. This information will be provided to the winning vendor.*

17. **Execution Timelines:** (Please provide the estimated dates for the following activities): Stable version of the application is available for performance testing/scripting?

Answer: *Accepted development releases are available now. New releases occur every 5-8 weeks, with each release having a 60-90 day cycle.*

18. **Execution Timelines:** (Please provide the estimated dates for the following activities): Stable Business function test cases will be provided to Vendor/Consultant?

Answer: *At each release cycle.*

19. **Execution Timelines:** (Please provide the estimated dates for the following activities): Current planned dates for system testing?

Partnering to better serve Houston

LETTER OF CLARIFICATION 1
SOFTWARE PERFORMANCE TESTING AND REVIEW
SOLICITATION NO. S29-Q24620

Answer: *TBD. See the time frames discussed in questions 17 & 18.*

20. **Execution Timelines:** (Please provide the estimated dates for the following activities): Current planned dates for user acceptance testing?

Answer: *User Acceptance Testing (UAT) activities are currently anticipated to occur in January through March, 2014 though these dates are subject to change.*

21. **Execution Timelines:** (Please provide the estimated dates for the following activities): Date that you would like performance testing to begin?

Answer: *Upon successful award of contract through go-live.*

22. **Execution Timelines:** (Please provide the estimated dates for the following activities): Go live Go/No Go decision will be made on?

Answer: *Though subject to change, we are currently working towards a go-live date of June, 2014.*

23. **Execution Timelines:** (Please provide the estimated dates for the following activities): Performance test results needed?

Answer: *Upon testing of each release.*

24. **Execution Timelines:** (Please provide the estimated dates for the following activities): Application will be implemented in production?

Answer: *TBD, See question 15.*

25. **Execution Timelines:** (Please provide the estimated dates for the following activities): Post go live hyper care duration?

Answer: *Unknown.*

26. **Performance Tuning Services:** What is the typical turnaround time on 'changes' on a pre-production frozen code base?

Answer: *During the release testing, changes to code base (if required) may be made if such changes are necessary for signoff. However, after signoff, usually code bases are frozen unless another new/add-on feature impacts the code base to be altered. However, development is still ongoing with a separate fork. Enhancements follow based on prioritization via the "sprint" methodology.*

27. **Performance Tuning Services:** iDeliver will use native monitors under load? What kind monitoring Solutions City of Houston users today?

Answer: *Currently, our monitoring systems are used more for alerting purposes than performance. However, we are in the process of implementing more performance monitoring tools. We currently use SolarWinds Orion product for monitoring the network layer (switches, routers, etc.). It also provides both alerting & performance measures. Within the servers, we are transitioning from NetIQ to Microsoft System Center Operations Manager (SCOM).*

28a. **Performance Tuning Services:** Will there be third party or outside vendor involved for performance test identified change(s)?

Partnering to better serve Houston

**LETTER OF CLARIFICATION 1
SOFTWARE PERFORMANCE TESTING AND REVIEW
SOLICITATION NO. S29-Q24620**

Answer: Yes.

28b. **Performance Tuning Services:** What can be a predictable 'change management' turnaround time in that case?

Answer: *Undetermined at this time, though it will likely follow the release schedule discussed in question 17.*

29. **Resources/Logistics:** Can iDeliver assume that City allows workers that can work legally in the US (US Citizen, Permanent Resident and workers on the visa such as H1-B or TN visa); are there any limitations that we should be aware of?

Answer: *The selected vendor must meet all City standard Terms & Conditions regarding staffing.*

30. **Resources/Logistics:** Does city allow consultants/vendors to operate remotely using VPN connections?

Answer: *Yes, with a signed security form on a per user basis.*

31. **Resources/Logistics:** Does city allow 10X4 operating hours for traveling consultants such as Mon-Thurs or standard Mon-Fri for 40 hours?

Answer: *Open to negotiation.*

32. Will the City of Houston provide licensed installations of LoadRunner and QuickTest Professional (QTP) for any projects, or will these be provided by the vendor?

Answer: *The City will provide, See question 4.*

33. Will external load generation from the Internet to the system under test be required during performance tests?

Answer: *No.*

34. Can work be done remotely via virtual private network (VPN), or is there a requirement it be done onsite?

Answer: *See question 30.*

35. Does the City require any HP technical certifications in the LoadRunner or QTP tools for staff to be considered qualified?

Answer: *Technical certifications will be strongly considered during the evaluation process.*

36. Will the LoadRunner installation be required to use the Diagnostics module to collect application performance metrics, or can standard LoadRunner monitors be used?

Answer: *Whatever tools are required to provide the necessary information.*

37. Will the City supply any needed hardware systems, such as Windows PC, for internal load generation or monitoring?

Answer: *Yes.*

38. Is there a specific timeframe in which the project must be completed?

Partnering to better serve Houston

**LETTER OF CLARIFICATION 1
SOFTWARE PERFORMANCE TESTING AND REVIEW
SOLICITATION NO. S29-Q24620**

Answer: *Yes. See question 37.*

39. Is there an estimated number of business processes to be scripted for the LoadRunner performance tests?

Answer: *Yes, See question 10.*

40. Are there an estimated number of test cases to be scripted for the QTP functional testing?

Answer: *The scope of this engagement is performance testing, all of which will be scripted within LodeRunner Performance Center 11.5.*

41. Who will perform manual functional testing for scripts that are not suited for QTP?

Answer: *The scope of this engagement is performance testing, all of which will be scripted within LodeRunner Performance Center 11.5.*

42. Is there a test management repository such as Application Lifecycle Management (ALM)/Quality Center that will be used or required from the vendor?

Answer: *No.*

43. What is the estimated highest concurrent user count expected during performance testing?

Answer: *200-300 users.*

44. What licensing for HP LoadRunner and HP QTP does the city already own?

Answer: *Loderunner Performance Center 11.5 and UFT 11.5 (formerly QTP). It is not anticipated that performance testing will use UFT for testing.*

45. Is the respondent expected to provide additional HP licenses as part of our solution offering for this project?

Answer: *See question 4.*

46. Approximately how many transactions, business processes, and user use case scenarios are anticipated to be the target of testing?

Answer: *See question 10.*

47. Approximately how many concurrent users are expected to be simulated during "Load Testing" as described in 5.1.3?

Answer: *200-300 users.*

48. Approximately how many concurrent users are expected to be simulated during "Spike Testing" as described in 5.1.6?

Answer: *300-500 users.*

49. To what degree will the User Acceptance Testing environment resemble the targeted Production environment?

Partnering to better serve Houston

**LETTER OF CLARIFICATION 1
SOFTWARE PERFORMANCE TESTING AND REVIEW
SOLICITATION NO. S29-Q24620**

Answer: *As close as can be arranged, but we anticipate transitioning acceptance and performance testing to the production environment as it is finalized.*

50. What is the projected start date for the first round of performance testing?

Answer: *A few months following the awarding of this solicitation.*

51. Will the interfaces to the external financial, CRM and document management systems be operational when performance testing is expected to begin?

Answer: *Probably yes. However, if they are not they will be included as additional functionality is provided with each release.*

52. How many releases are expected for the duration of this initiative?

Answer: *3 to 5 releases.*

53. What is the target date for this system to be fully implemented in Production?

Answer: *See question 15.*

54. Will there be any performance testing expected in the Production environment?

Answer: *Yes, See question 49.*

55. Is any formal Production monitoring expected after the system is fully implemented as part of this initiative?

Answer: *Possibly; can be negotiated.*

56. Can any of the scripting or test execution be done remotely?

Answer: *Yes, as long as the scripts themselves are executed within the City's network against the system.*

57. Will all of the testing be done during normal business hours?

Answer: *Performance testing will need to be coordinated with the development team and some performance testing will likely occur outside normal business hours. The mix between normal business hours testing and non-business hours testing has not been established.*

58. Is a baseline of the current Court Management System (ICMS / CourtView with HyperCourt) going to be done? If not why not especially since this would ensure similar issues faced in previous application no longer exist.

Answer: *Open for discussion. Baselineing the time to complete existing business processes within the ICMS environment for those processes identified for performance testing to enable comparison with CSMART may be helpful. However, we do not anticipate the development of scripts or automation of testing for the existing environment.*

59. Have QTP and/or Loadrunner been purchased by the City of Houston or Sogeti for this project? If so, when and what was the purchase price broken down by software and services?

Answer: *UTF (formerly QTP) and LoadRunner are available for the project.*

Partnering to better serve Houston

**LETTER OF CLARIFICATION 1
SOFTWARE PERFORMANCE TESTING AND REVIEW
SOLICITATION NO. S29-Q24620**

60. Have QTP and/or Loadrunner been used by the City of Houston for any projects? If so, what department(s), what project, when and what was the purchase price broken down by software and services.

Answer: UTF (formerly QTP) and LoadRunner are available for the project.

61. Has a Service Level Agreement been established for this application? If so what are the specific parameters as it relates to the performance of the key transactions?

Answer: Service level expectations have been identified for key processes. These expectations will be shared with the successful consultant/vendor.

62. During the Performance Test will the infrastructure be monitored and if so what tool will be used?

Answer: See question 27.

63. Who will be doing the Performance Test, City of Houston employees or Sogeti or both?

Answer: Initial performance testing will be completed by the CSMART team outside the scope of this solicitation. This testing will occur prior to the Performance Testing performed in accordance with this solicitation. This Performance Testing will be completed the successful vendor and possibly City of Houston employees.

64. Is the application performance going to be measured from both an Active (synthetic user) and Passive (actual user) perspective?

Answer: Probably yes, but this will finalized as the scripts are produced.

65. Were any other testing tools considered before HP was selected, if so what were they, who participated in the evaluation and why were they excluded?

Answer: The HP suite was selected due to: 1) its reputation as industry standard testing software, 2) the software developers experience using the HP suite and their efforts to create performance testing scripts using the HP suite. The HP suite selection allows for the leveraging of scripts created by the software developer, and 3) the availability of experienced HP testing suite resources within the Houston market.

66. Was the eBusiness 1 suite of Testing Tools evaluated as a possible Testing Tool? If so, why was it excluded?

- We ask this question since this suite of testing tools was the one that successfully recognized the performance deficiencies of the Maximus/CourtView Court Application and helped the City of Houston retrieve \$5,000,000 from Maximus. Also because it the same tool that is currently being used by the Houston Police Department to ensure that their Records Management System meets pre-defined performance goals.

Answer: See question 65.

67. In reference to this RFQ and specifically to Section 3.0, my firm, eBusiness 1, would like to formally request that this language be more inclusive by either option listed below:

Partnering to better serve Houston

**LETTER OF CLARIFICATION 1
SOFTWARE PERFORMANCE TESTING AND REVIEW
SOLICITATION NO. S29-Q24620**

- A) Expanded to allow all Testing Tools that can fulfill the requirements listed in Sections 5.0 and 6.0
- B) Specifically include the eBusiness 1 Testing Tools (just as the Testing Tools for HP have been included) that have been in use at the City of Houston since 2004 (see past and present projects below). As it reads right now, this RFQ has the perception of being steered to a vendor (HP) that to our knowledge does not have a track record of providing Performance Testing at the City of Houston while excluding a vendor that actually has provided this service successfully at the City of Houston (Municipal Courts in particular) on several occasions quite successfully.

While I understand that organizations have their "favorite" tools, it seems odd that the tool that helped the City prove that the last Court Management System (Maximus / CourtView) was a failure and consequently receive 5 million dollars back from Maximus would be excluded. We have had our products and services on a DIR contract for several years and have a few resellers/integrators who are City of Houston MWBE certified firms available to assist in this project.

Answer: See question 65. The solicitation requests a vendor/consultant with experience performance testing with the HP suite. Additional tools and experience may be evaluated if proposed, but the foundation of the solicitation is experience with the HP Testing Suite.

68. May the winning vendor's delivery team perform the requested services remotely?

Answer: See question 56.

69. Will City of Houston provide the required Quick Test Pro and Load Runner licenses?

Answer: Yes

70. Does the project plan provided in response to 8.1.4 need to include phases for 60 day or 90 day release cycles as stated in 4.1?

Answer: Yes

71. How many of the 60-90 day releases are currently anticipated in the development schedule?

Answer: 3 to 5 releases.

72. Can City of Houston set expectations for where in the release cycle referenced in 4.1 the requested performance testing will occur? Will it be part of the release activities before migration to the UAT environment, or will it be conducted in the UAT environment after release?

Answer: It is not anticipated that performance testing in the development environment. Rather, performance testing will occur either in UAT or Production environment. However, the development environment may be used initially to verify the usability of scripts.

73. Will City of Houston allow modifications to specific Network switches to provide a copy of network traffic (SPAN) to a device installed in City of Houston data center provided by vendor?

Answer: Possibly. Please provide additional detail in your proposal and we will consider it.

74. We understand that answers will be posted on the City's e-bidding website. We would like to receive these answers by email, as well. Does our submission of questions register us for automatic notification, or is that a separate step?

Partnering to better serve Houston

**LETTER OF CLARIFICATION 1
SOFTWARE PERFORMANCE TESTING AND REVIEW
SOLICITATION NO. S29-Q24620**

Answer: ***When you registered to download a copy of this RFQ from the City of Houston SPD E-bid website, at that juncture the e-bid system automatically registered your firm, therefore you will automatically receive notifications from the e-bid system of any updates as it pertains to this RFQ inclusive of Letter of Clarification(s).***

When issued, Letter(s) of Clarification shall automatically become a part of the proposal documents and shall supersede any previous specification(s) and/or provision(s) in conflict with the Letter(s) of Clarification. All revisions, responses, and answers incorporated into the Letter(s) of Clarification are collaboratively from both the Strategic Purchasing Division and the applicable City Department(s). It is the responsibility of the proposers to ensure that it has obtained all such letter(s). By submitting a proposal on this project, proposers shall be deemed to have received all Letter(s) of Clarification and to have incorporated them into their proposal.

If you have any questions or if further clarification is needed regarding this Request for Qualifications, please contact me.

Douglas Moore

Douglas Moore
Deputy Assistant Director
Strategic Purchasing Division
832-393-8724

Attachment: Revised Page 1

Partnering to better serve Houston

**LETTER OF CLARIFICATION 1
SOFTWARE PERFORMANCE TESTING AND REVIEW
SOLICITATION NO. S29-Q24620**

	<p>CITY OF HOUSTON HOUSTON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES S29- Q24620 NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION</p>	<p>STRATEGIC PURCHASING DIVISION 901 Bagby Street, Concourse Level Houston, Texas 77002</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS, TERMS & CONDITIONS

The City of Houston's Information Technologies Services is soliciting services from qualified consultancies/contractor(s) to perform the following services as described in the Statement of Work for **Software Performance Testing and Review**.

Prospective consultancies/contractor(s) needing additional information/clarification to this Request for Qualification (RFQ) are requested to e-mail questions to Douglas Moore at douglas.moore@houstontx.gov. The deadline for submitting questions is **June 12, 2013 at 12:00 PM CDT. No questions will be accepted after deadline.** All questions will be answered via letter of clarification to this RFQ and posted on the City's e-bidding website and automatically e-mailed to all who registered to receive this RFQ.

Please review the Statement of Work below. If you believe that your consultancy/firm meets the minimum requirements as outlined in the Statement of Work of the RFQ, please submit your Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) to Douglas Moore, via one of the methods listed below by **June 25, 2013 June 27, 2013 at 12:00 PM CDT. No SOQ's will be accepted after deadline.**

E-mail: (Preferred Method): douglas.moore@houstontx.gov
Mail: City of Houston
Strategic Purchasing Division (Suite B500)
901 Bagby Street
Houston, Texas 77002

STATEMENT OF WORK

1.0 Overview

- 1.1 The City of Houston is publishing a Request for Qualifications from all qualified vendors for independent software review and performance testing services. The application system to be tested is a large, custom developed software system with a browser-based front end user interface for Internet users, and a rich client front end for internal users. The solution utilizes Microsoft .NET/WFC technologies, with a Microsoft SQL Server (2008 R2) database backend. To qualify to submit a Statement of Qualifications (SOQ), interested vendors must demonstrate experience in the specific technologies used in the system to be tested, specifically HP QTP and LoadRunner.
- 1.2 The system is currently under development and not in production. A large code base has been implemented, however. At this time, the City is focusing this RFQ on performance testing and not functional testing.

1.3 [Statement of Qualification from Offerors and/or its affiliates that are currently involved/engaged in the CSMART project will not be considered for award to provide this third party software performance testing and review for this project.](#)

2.0 System Architecture

- 2.1 The system architecture consists of multiple tiers with a variety of interfaces connecting to external

END OF LETTER OF CLARIFICATION 1

Partnering to better serve Houston