Johnson County, TX
Sciens Consulting- SOMA Response Analysis

sciens
CONSULTING

Evaluator: Sciens Consulting
Date of Evaluation: 10/11/2022

	Expectation Score	Risk Level	Notes
Proposed Software Solution	**SOMA Global**		
1.0 Qualifications and Experience			
Experience	2	🔺	Fairly new company with few TX clients
Financial Resources & Stability	0	🔺	No financial information disclosed
System business relative to total	3	🔺	100% public safety software
Overall Requirements and Components	3	🔺	Good functional capabilities
Litigation & Violation of Laws Concerns	0	🔺	No lawsuit information disclosed
Initial References	2	🔺	No TX references, but large agencies
2.0 Functional Requirements			
General System	2	🔺	Strong general, but interfaces unknown
Computer Aided Dispatch	2	🔺	CAD mobile and reporting weak
Law Records Management	3	🔺	Strong RMS functionality
3.0 Infrastructure			
Hardware	3	🔺	No issues with hardware
Software	3	🔺	No issues with software
Hosting (SaaS)	1	🔺	Not specified if single or multi-tenant
Application Architecture	3	🔺	Able to meet the consortium's design
Data and Database	2	🔺	NoSQL database structure needs further clarity
Disaster Recovery (Vendor)	3	🔺	Strong vendor DR plan, multi-cloud recovery
Disaster Recovery (Consortium)	1	🔺	If internet goes down, system is unreachable
Identity Management	3	🔺	Single sign-on with Active Directory
Standards, Policies, and Regulatory Compliance	2	🔺	CJIS compliant, but not yet fully TLETS integrated
Security Management	4	🔺	Agencies are able to control their own records
Integrations and Interfaces	1	🔺	County will need to develop interfaces using tool
Reliability	3	🔺	Guaranteed uptimes for both CAD and RMS
Performance	2	🔺	Cannot guarantee 5 second response time
4.0 Support and Maintenance			
Support	3	🔺	24/7/365 support, good response time
Maintenance	2	🔺	Upgrades and patches are part of the SaaS fees
Updates and Enhancements	1	🔺	County has no control over updates

Johnson County, TX
Sciens Consulting- SOMA Response Analysis

System Administration	3	▲	Internal module for system admin functions
5.0 Acceptance Testing			
Acceptance Testing	0	▲	No acceptance plan or parameters provided
Post Go-Live	1	▲	No dedicated resource immediately post cutover
6.0 Implementation			
General Implementation	1	▲	County leading project with SOMA support
Project Management	1	▲	No assigned PM from SOMA given
Business Process Review	2	▲	Onsite for workflow review and best practices
Workflow Configuration	1	▲	County is responsible for configuring the system
Data Conversion	1	▲	Data will be converted to a separate solution
Integration Development	1	▲	Unsure if all interfaces are included
Training	1	▲	Did not provide details on training specifics
Implementation Plan	0	▲	No implementation plan or timeline provided

Further details can be found on pages 5-8.

QUICK VIEW	Soma Global
KEY POINTS	
Solution Type	Vendor Hosted
Software Solution	SOMA
Office	Tampa, FL
Employees in Firm	75
Annual Revenue	Private firm, not disclosed
Litigation	Not disclosed
Texas Systems	1
References	Orange County, CA; Polk County, FL; Charlotte County, VA
Software Warranty & 1st Year Maintenance	Annual SaaS subscription fees begin at contract signing
Software Help Line, Response Time	5 minute response time for all support calls, 24x7x365 support
Proposal Quality	Well written proposal with insightful answers, will need to dig further on some areas during demos
Data Conversion	Data will be converted into separate 3rd party online platform, County is responsible for extraction, cleanup, and matching
Estimated Project Duration	No Project Schedule provided
TOP 3 CONCERNS	
#1 Consortium Internet Connection Dependency	Even though the Vendor has a solid disaster recovery and backup remediation in place for their cloud solution, if the internet connection goes down within any of the agencies, the system will be unreachable. The vendor does not offer a local backup of the software, so agencies would have to operate to manual, paper, radio-based processes for their workflows.
#2 System Acceptance Process and Parameters	Still unsure about the system acceptance and testing process. Not all issues will be resolved by go-live and will need to wait on further releases of the software if it requires a major development effort. This could potentially leave the Consortium with a system that does not meet functional or technical requirements by go-live date.
#3 Implementation Responsibility of Consortium	The implementation process is poorly defined. The County is fully responsible with support from SOMA. The vendor will not have any onsite resources expect for one week for the initial discovery and one week for end user training. They are allocating 2,000 hours for the project, so the County could negotiate for more onsite support. No detailed project schedule/plan was given other than a 12 month estimate, this needs to be further defined.
HIGHLIGHTS & RED FLAGS	
1.0 QUALIFICATIONS AND REFERENCES	Years Experience: 5 (2017) Total Systems Installed: 110 Texas Systems: 1
2.0 FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS	
General System	
System	99%
Mobility	100%
Interfaces	45%
Computer Aided Dispatch	
General CAD	96%
CAD Workstation	91%
Events & Cases	100%
Inquiry-Search	96%
Alerts	100%
Mapping	100%
Call Taker	95%

sciens
CONSULTING

QUICK VIEW	Soma Global
Dispatcher	88%
CAD Mobile	88%
Management	87%
Law Records Management	
General LRMS	95%
FBR	99%
Shift Briefing	100%
Mugshots	100%
Property	100%
DEMS	89%
Warrants	100%
Case Management	99%
Reporting	99%
Crime Analysis	99%
Training	100%

3.0 INFRASTRUCTURE	• Cloud SaaS solution hosted by AWS GovCloud • Browser based software utilizing Jaspersoft for advanced report writing • Flexible architecture and design to accommodate the Consortium's needs, but all need to be configured independently • Strong disaster recovery measures on the vendors side, a private virtual cloud can be spun up in the event AWS goes down • Appears that integrations to County/City systems will need to be developed by County/City staff utilizing their Solutions Automations tool (API). Need to further clarify this and who will be responsible for integration development
4.0 SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE	• 5 minute response time for support calls; 24/7/365 support; 15 full time support staff; 3 levels of issues/resolutions • SOMA is able to remote into system and directly fix issues • Updates happen 26 times per year and are forced on the customer; the County will not have any say when an update will occur; updates happen system wide for entire consortium • Upgrades and patches are part of the annual SaaS fees, but any other changes to the system will need to be paid separately • Each agency will need to have their own System Administrators and SMEs after Go-live to communicate with vendor
5.0 ACCEPTANCE TESTING	• No acceptance plan or parameters provided; scenario based testing will be conducted with the County identifying acceptance parameters; some issues will be fixed during testing and others will be put into a backlog for future resolution (need to ensure that critical issues are fixed BEFORE go-live) • Vendor is committing to onsite persons but does not outline timeframe or hours • Post go-live support will be available through the normal help desk process. There is no dedicated resource proposed immediately post cutover to asset the County with any critical issues that arise.
6.0 IMPLEMENTATION	• Overall process seems to be very reliant on County resources with support from SOMA; 2,000 implementation hours from SOMA should be sufficient for the tasks they will be performing; Not many onsite days shows that SOMA will be on the backend support instead of leading the project • The vendor estimating the project timeline of 12 months start to finish; this needs to be further defined • Not specific on several items for implementation (e.g., data conversion, configuration, training) • No plans or schedule provided to the County for implementation • Unsure how the system will be tested and validated prior to go-live

Proposal Evaluation Section	Value	Score	Expectation Score	Risk Level	Notes
1.0 QUALIFICATIONS AND REFERENCES					
Experience			2 = Meets Most Expectations	2 = Medium Risk	Years Experience: 5 (2017) Total Systems Installed: 110 Texas Systems: 1
Financial Resources & Stability			1 = Meets Some Expectations	3 = High Risk	Financials were not disclosed; accepted venture capital money in 2021 but not sure for what purpose
System business relative to total			3 = Meets Expectations	1 = Low Risk	100% of SOMA is Public Safety software
Overall Requirements and Components			3 = Meets Expectations	1 = Low Risk	Scored well functionally and meets most functional requirements set by the Group
Litigation & Violation of Laws Concerns			0 = Does Not Meet Expectations	3 = High Risk	Lawsuit information was not disclosed
Initial References			2 = Meets Most Expectations	2 = Medium Risk	All references are of local County's, but none in Texas. Presents risk of understanding Texas specific requirements.
2.0 FUNCTIONAL SYSTEMS	100.00	93.52			
General System	16.23				
System	8.93	8.85	3 = Meets Expectations		
Mobility	2.70	2.70	3 = Meets Expectations		
Interfaces	4.59	2.05	0 = Does Not Meet Expectations		Only completed JC interfaces, unsure if other agency interfaces are included.
Computer Aided Dispatch	45.98				
General CAD	4.51	4.34	3 = Meets Expectations		
CAD Workstation	3.77	3.44	3 = Meets Expectations		
Events & Cases	2.87	2.87	3 = Meets Expectations		
Inquiry-Search	2.21	2.13	3 = Meets Expectations		
Alerts	1.15	1.15	3 = Meets Expectations		
Mapping	4.26	4.26	3 = Meets Expectations		
Call Taker	6.15	5.82	3 = Meets Expectations		
Dispatcher	9.92	8.77	2 = Meets Most Expectations		
CAD Mobile	9.26	8.20	2 = Meets Most Expectations		
Management	1.89	1.64	2 = Meets Most Expectations		
Law Records Management	37.79				
General LRMS	1.56	1.48	3 = Meets Expectations		
FBR	6.07	5.98	3 = Meets Expectations		
Shift Briefing	0.98	0.98	3 = Meets Expectations		
Mugshots	1.80	1.80	3 = Meets Expectations		
Property	2.70	2.70	3 = Meets Expectations		
DEMS	0.74	0.66	2 = Meets Most Expectations		
Warrants	2.21	2.21	3 = Meets Expectations		
Case Management	5.66	5.57	3 = Meets Expectations		
Reporting	8.36	8.28	3 = Meets Expectations		
Crime Analysis	5.66	5.57	3 = Meets Expectations		
Training	2.05	2.05	3 = Meets Expectations		

Proposal Evaluation Section	Value Score	Expectation Score	Risk Level	Notes
3.0 INFRASTRUCTURE				
Hardware		3 = Meets Expectations	1 = Low Risk	Standard desktop hardware; mobile supports both iOS and Android devices
Software		3 = Meets Expectations	1 = Low Risk	Browser based application for all modules, data with cache in the field for mobile, JavaScript, Jaspersoft for report writing outside of software capabilities In the event SOMA closes business, the software would be end-of-life; all data would be returned to the customer
Hosting (SaaS)		1 = Meets Some Expectations	2 = Medium Risk	AWS GovCloud with redundant locations, Mongo database storage Solution can either be single or multi tenant, not specified; although data will be stored in a separate database from the application; no data will be shared with other parties Not yet HIPAA compliant
Application Architecture		3 = Meets Expectations	1 = Low Risk	CAD: SOMA can provide a single CAD instance with user screen configurability GIS: GIS will be interfaced with the CAD, but will need to be manually updated, no automatic preplan data will flow to the CAD RMS: SOMA can provide separate RMS instances where data can be shared across other instances, control parameters are also in place MNI: separate MNI design and implementation for each tenant with common fields between all Document Management: Documents are stored in a sperate database in AWS and users need to click links to access files
Data and Database		2 = Meets Most Expectations	2 = Medium Risk	Two primary databases: Regional database for active events (CAD) and a NoSQL database for records; web-based tool for database queries CAD and RMS will be on separate databases; good architecture Data extraction: Data will be returned in the NoSQL format, no tables, just documents. This could be problematic for any future data conversion to a new system
Disaster Recovery (DR)		2 = Meets Most Expectations	1 = Low Risk on SOMA side 3 = High Risk on County network	Very good DR plan in place on the vendor side; If AWS server was to go down, SOMA can redeploy an entire virtual private cloud in 15 minutes; backups are executed several times per day; RTO and RPO times are very short. The only major risk is at the County level; if the network was to go down, there would be no way to continue system operation; SOMA does not offer a locally hosted backup in this event
Identity Management		3 = Meets Expectations	1 = Low Risk	Single sign-on with SAML and integration with Active Directory
Standards, Policies, and Regulatory Compliance		2 = Meets Most Expectations	2 = Medium Risk	CJIS compliant, supports SSAE 16 reporting, NBIRS compliant, but yet fully TLETS integrated, unsure when this will be complete
Security Management		4 = Exceeds Expectations	1 = Low Risk	Strong security parameters in the system where agencies can control who and what is viewable via Confidentiality Flagging; blocked fields will not appear on screen; audit trail is created for every transaction
Integrations and Interfaces		1 = Meets Some Expectations	2 = Medium Risk	It appears that the integrations to other County/City systems will need to be developed by County/City staff utilizing their Solutions Automations tool (API). Need to further clarify this and who will be responsible for integration development
Reliability		3 = Meets Expectations	1 = Low Risk	Guaranteed uptimes for both CAD and RMS; Maintenance will not disrupt service since the system exists as a distributed cluster of serverless containers across multiple availability zones
Performance		2 = Meets Most Expectations	2 = Medium Risk	Will not guarantee a 5 second response time for entire system, but will for CAD

Proposal Evaluation Section	Value Score	Expectation Score	Risk Level	Notes
4.0 SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE				
Support		3 = Meets Expectations	1 = Low Risk	5 minute response time for support calls; 24/7/365 support; 15 full time support staff; 3 levels of issues with good response times; SOMA is able to remote into system and directly fix issues
Maintenance		2 = Meets Most Expectations	1 = Low Risk	Upgrades and patches are part of the annual SaaS fees; System has a five-9 second uptime guarantee; SLA no provided
Updates and Enhancements		1 = Meets Some Expectations	3 = High Risk	Updates happen 26 times per year and are forced on the customer; the County will not have any say when an update will occur; updates happen system wide If the County wishes to change something in the system after go-live, a change order will be made and paid for by the County
System Administration		3 = Meets Expectations	1 = Low Risk	Ongoing Support: IT for hardware, 1 SME for each area, at least 1 system admin, inhouse trainer for new staff SOMA internally monitors the system and has a portal for customer viewability; Admin module built in software for internal system admin
5.0 ACCEPTANCE TESTING				
Acceptance Testing		0 = Does Not Meet Expectations	3 = High Risk	No acceptance plan or parameters provided; scenario based testing will be conducted with the County identifying acceptance parameters; not all problems will be fixed during testing and will be put into a backlog; committing to onsite persons but does not outline timeframe
Post Go-Live		1 = Meets Some Expectations	2 = Medium Risk	Post go-live support will be available for the duration of the contract, but there is no dedicated resource for a certain timeframe that will be assigned to the County, issues will most likely have to go through regular channels
6.0 IMPLEMENTATION				
General Implementation		1 = Meets Some Expectations	2 = Medium Risk	Overall process seems to be very reliant on County resources with support from SOMA. SOMA supports the County throughout the whole project. 2,000 implementation hours from SOMA should be sufficient for the tasks they will be performing. Not many onsite days shows that SOMA will be on the backend support instead of leading the project. Estimating a project timeline of 12 months start to finish, very aggressive for the complexity of the project.
Project Management		1 = Meets Some Expectations	2 = Medium Risk	400 hours of PM from SOMA, no resource assigned, roles and responsibilities will be shared between SOMA and County for all PM tasks.
Business Process Review		2 = Meets Most Expectations	1 = Low Risk	Vendor will be onsite for workflow review and mapping for 2-5 days at the beginning of the project. They promise to map current workflows and provide best practice recommendations for the configuration stage.
Workflow Configuration		1 = Meets Some Expectations	3 = High Risk	SOMA will NOT configure the system or any modules. They will train County staff to use their configuration tool and provide some preliminary templates. This will be an extensive effort on the County staff during the project and need to consider who will be devoted to completing this work. SOMA is estimating that workflow configuration will take approximately 30-60 weeks.
Data Conversion		1 = Meets Some Expectations	2 = Medium Risk	Data will be converted into separate 3rd party online platform called SOMA Hub where officers can access it outside of the system; if they want to bring it into the system, they can import files easily Not sure how quality control will work if officers can import whatever data they want into the main system; are there checks in place? County is responsible for data extraction of legacy software, any cleanup they wish to perform, and matching data fields to SOMA's templates

Proposal Evaluation Section	Value Score	Expectation Score	Risk Level	Notes
Integration Development		1 = Meets Some Expectations	3 = High Risk	Not all interfaces seem to be included in the scope as many interfaces were not answered. Need to verify if interfaces from non-county systems are a part of this project or are they just going to accept an import/export solution for these. SOMA is willing to develop fully automated interfaces for many of the County systems.
Training		1 = Meets Some Expectations	3 = High Risk	Very general about training process, number of days, and whether onsite/remote. Need to ask more questions about what they are going to provide as a part of training. Remote training for this type of system and end user is usually not a good idea.
Implementation Plan		0 = Does Not Meet Expectations	3 = High Risk	No implementation plan was provided in their response. No project schedule was provided

	Expectation Rating Scale
0	0 = Does Not Meet Expectations
1	1 = Meets Some Expectations
2	2 = Meets Most Expectations
3	3 = Meets Expectations
4	4 = Exceeds Expectations