ADDENDUM NO. 2

Date: June 4, 2021	Bid Date: June 9, 2021 at 3:00 P.M. (Local Time)
Bid Name RFP for Agenda and Meeting Management System	Bid No.: CCLK-210044-MS

NOTE: This Addendum has been issued only to the holders of record of the specifications and to the attendees of the non-mandatory pre-bid conference held on May 26, 2021.

The original Specifications remain in full force and effect except as revised by the following changes which shall take precedence over anything to the contrary:

1. Please find attached:

    a. Copy of the blackout period information (Financial Procedures Manual Section 41-424 Prohibition of lobbying in procurement matters).

    CORRECTION NOTE: The pre-bid conference held on May 26, 2021 was **Non**-Mandatory.

    Addendum No. 1 stated:
    This Addendum has been issued only to the holders of record of the specifications and to the attendees of the <u>mandatory</u> pre-bid conference held on May 26, 2021.

    Correction:
    This Addendum has been issued only to the holders of record of the specifications and to the attendees of the **non**-mandatory pre-bid conference held on May 26, 2021.

    The following are answers/clarifications to questions received after the non-mandatory pre-bid conference:

2. Question: If possible, could you provide an answer on to this question as soon as possible, please?
    a. Please describe the format of the data that will be returned by Granicus to the City and how the City intends to make it available to the selected vendor, for migration into the new system.
    Answer: The City does not know how the data would be received from Granicus for migration into a new system.

3. Question: There are 25+ boards to manage. How many separate application processes/forms are there from that list of boards. For example: a certain number may be standard and there may be others that need to be specific based on the board.
    Answer: Each of the City's boards has an application that includes standard questions along with customized questions specific to the board's subject matter and requirements.

4. Question: Do you have specifics around what functionality you require through the CRM integration? Can you provide a use case?

    Answer: The City's goals for this integration are to promote interoperability between the platforms, reduce staff effort for manual input, and eliminate duplicate data and data conflicts. The City seeks to understand what integration capabilities are available from bidder's Agenda Management Systems proposals. Commonly this involves application programming interfaces (API's) that may optionally utilize a RESTful architecture. An integration scenario for CRM might involve synchronizing new board membership applicants to kickoff follow-up & tracking within CRM. Another integration need is content syndication to other platforms such as the official City site, Facebook, or other social media platforms. For example, Clerk's office staff currently have a cumbersome manual process to syndicate the official notice of meetings (http://www.cityofgainesville.org/ClerkOfTheCommission/NoticeofMeetings.aspx) through the Tockify service. Another use case would be to use the CRM ID As A Service functionality so citizen users can use their myGNV username and account to log into the agenda management system for any features they need to access.

5. Question: Given that the City's CRM solution (Rock Solid) has recently acquired a Meeting Management system in PrimeGov, does that not give that vendor an advantage in this RFP process?

    Answer: Same as the response from the question asked during the pre-bid meeting. See Question #8 in Addendum No. 1.

6. Question Regarding the requirement for "Data sharing capabilities" on page 11 of the RFP document, could you expand on the desired functionality?

    Answer: Similar to question and answer for #4, the City seeks to understand how the Agenda management system proposal can interface with other systems used by City staff such as Rock Solid CRM and content management systems such as OpenCities. It is most helpful if bidders can describe:

    - What interfaces are available in solution?
    - Do the specific interfaces support data import, data export, or both (if not explicitly named & defined)?
    - What mechanism is used to convey the interface? RESTful API's are one example but other might include SOAP, XML-RPC, JSON-RPC, Webhooks, etc.

7. Question: Please provide the current version of the City's Laserfiche install, and indicate if it is customer-premised or cloud-based.

    Answer: The City uses a Laserfiche Cloud system that was implemented in 2020.

8. Question: Regarding the requirement for "Ability to create and store images of documents using non-proprietary image formats" on page 13, can you provide examples of such formats and/or use cases?

    Answer: Examples of these formats include .JPEG (.jpg), Portable Network Graphics (.png), Portable Document Format (.pdf), and MPEG-4 (mp4).

9. Question: Regarding the requirement for "Ability to archive and hide user accounts and meeting types from view while allowing them to remain searchable" on page 13, could you please expand on the use case and/or reasoning for hiding/archiving a meeting type? How often does this scenario occur?

    Answer: The City's agenda management users change regularly as employees join or leave the organization. The City would like the ability to archive or remove, but not delete, user accounts from view so that they may be restored if an employee rejoins the organizations or changes positions. Similarly, the City would like to be able to remove/archive meeting types when not currently in use but retain them in the system if possible.

10. Question: Regarding the requirement for "Ability to archive and retrieve agenda items and associated documents (hide from view, but not remove from system)" on page 14, could you please expand on the use case and/or reasoning for hiding/archiving an agenda item? How often does this scenario occur?

    Answer: The City desires the ability to archive drafts or old versions of agendas, agenda items and associated back-up. We would like to be able to remove these items from user view but to retain the option to restore them without deleting them permanently.

11. Question: The RFP states "Offer a Board and Committee management module that can be linked to the City's website." It also states "Module must integrate with City's website." Proposer is seeking clarification from the City of Gainesville regarding the two separately listed requirements for integrating/and or linking the Boards and Committees Management module to the City's website.

    Answer: At a minimum, the bidder's Board and Committee management module must be capable of linking to the City's website. The City also seeks to understand what integration capabilities are available from bidder's Agenda Management Systems proposals. Also reference Questions #4 and #6 above.

12. Question: The RFP states "video and audio files stored securely on private networks." Proposer is seeking further information regarding this requirement. Is the City wishing to securely store video and audio files on the City's private networks or asking if the Proposer will provide secure storage of video and audio files?

    Answer: The City is requesting that the proposer (bidder) store video/audio files on their private networks (servers), not the City's.

13. Question: The RFP states "Support single sign-on for end users (to connect with City's CRM system)." Proposer is seeking to understand if this requirement is meant to apply to citizen users or internal users (staff)?

    Answer: The City seeks to understand the capability of the proposed solution to support single sign-on (SSO) for external citizen users and for internal staff users. The authentication provider working behind the scenes is Microsoft's Active Directory (AD) service which synchronizes with Azure Active Directory (AAD). This Agenda Management RFP seeks to understand if the proposed solutions support SSO for external and internal end users using AD/AAD and how solutions fulfill this general access requirement.

14. Question: The RFP states "Provide access to live HD meeting videos and make video archives available for search on-demand in multiple web browsers." Provider is seeking to understand what the City

desires for search related to video. Are you looking for users to be able to search the video bookmarks ("timestamps", closed captions, or both?)

Answer: Users should be able to search the videos by clicking on the time stamps and using closed captions. We need to be able to search both ways.

15. Question: The RFP states "Ability to link related agenda items." Can more information be provided on what is meant by linking items/desired use-case?

Answer: This specification refers to the ability to tag or create associations between related agenda items to facilitate cross-referencing and maintaining legislative history. For example, creating an association between agenda items related to a proposed development that would be easily searchable by internal staff and external citizen users.

16. Question: Is there a timeframe of when you will be posting a response to these questions?

Answer: Hopefully, by June 4.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Each Proposer shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 2 by his or her signature below, **and a copy of this Addendum to be returned with proposal.**

CERTIFICATION BY PROPOSER

The undersigned acknowledges receipt of this Addendum No. 2 and the Proposal submitted is in accordance with information, instructions, and stipulations set forth herein.

PROPOSER: _____

BY: _____

DATE: _____

CITY OF_____ FINANCIAL SERVICES
GAINESVILLE PROCEDURES MANUAL

41-424 <u>**Prohibition of lobbying in procurement matters**</u>

Except as expressly set forth in Resolution 170116, Section 9, during the Cone of Silence as defined herein no person may lobby, on behalf of a competing party in a particular procurement process, City Officials or employees, except the Procurement Division or the procurement designated staff contact person. Violation of this provision shall result in disqualification of the party on whose behalf the lobbying occurred.

Cone of Silence period means the period between the issue date which allows for immediate submittals to the City of Gainesville Procurement Division in response to an invitation to bid, or a request for proposal, or qualifications, or information, or an invitation to negotiate, as applicable, and the time that City Officials or the Procurement Division, or City Department awards the contract.

Lobbying means when a person seeks to influence or attempt to influence City Officials or employees with respect to a decision of the City, except as authorized by procurement procedures.