

August 7, 2019

ADDENDUM NO. 1

SPECIFICATION NO. 984153

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (“RFP”)

FOR

**TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES RELATING TO THE LEGISLATIVE MANAGEMENT
DOCUMENT INTAKE SYSTEM WITH ONGOING UPDATES, MAINTENANCE AND
SUPPORT**

This document contains:

- I. Notice of Proposal Due Date Postponement**
- II. Answers to 21 Questions Submitted for Clarification to the RFP; and**
- III. Addendum Receipt Acknowledgement**

For which Proposals are scheduled to be received no later than 4:00 p.m., Central Time August 14, 2019 (pursuant to the Request for Proposal advertised July 11, 2019) in the Department of Procurement Services, Bid & Bond Room (Room 103 of City Hall).

Required for use by:

**CITY OF CHICAGO
Office of the City Clerk**



This Addendum is distributed by:

**CITY OF CHICAGO
Department of Procurement Services**

**Respondent must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1 in its Proposal AND
should complete and return the attached Acknowledgment by email to:**

Magdalena.Toussaint@cityofchicago.org

Attn: Maggie Toussaint , Senior Procurement Specialist

Phone: 312-744-1681

**LORI E. LIGHTFOOT
MAYOR**

**SHANNON E. ANDREWS
CHIEF PROCUREMENT OFFICER**

August 7, 2019

ADDENDUM NO. 1

FOR

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (“RFP”)

FOR

TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES RELATING TO THE LEGISLATIVE MANAGEMENT DOCUMENT INTAKE SYSTEM WITH ONGOING UPDATES, MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT

SPECIFICATION NO. 984153

FOR WHICH PROPOSALS ARE DUE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES, BID & BOND ROOM 103, CITY HALL, 121 N. LASALLE STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60602, AT 4:00 P.M., CENTRAL TIME ON AUGUST 14, 2019.

The following revisions will be incorporated in the above-referenced Request for Proposal. All other provisions and requirements are as originally set forth remain in full force and are binding.

RESPONDENT MUST ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS ADDENDUM # 1 IN THE COVER LETTER SUBMITTED WITH YOUR PROPOSAL.

SECTION I: NOTICE OF PROPOSAL DUE DATE POSTPONEMENT

The previously advertised proposed due date has been postponed. PROPOSALS ARE NOW DUE NO LATER THAN 4:00 P.M. CENTRAL TIME ON AUGUST 23, 2019, IN THE BID AND BOND ROOM (ROOM 103), CITY HALL, 121 NORTH LASALLE STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60602.

SECTION II: QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE SPECIFICATION

1. **Question:** On page 26 of the RFP states “The City's goal is to have a non-proprietary legislative document management system”;
 - 1a. Please clarify and/or provide a definition of what the City considers to be a non-proprietary system?
 - 1b. Are you specifically referring to open-source platforms? If so, does the city have any preferred open source platforms?
 - 1c. The document only points to the document management system as non-proprietary. However, there are several other parts of the final solution that are not part of the document management system. Is it correct to assume that the non-proprietary goal only applies to the document management part of the solution?
 - 1d. Is the city is flexible on this goal? Can technologies from Microsoft or other commercial vendors be proposed as part of the final solution?

Answer:

- 1a. The use of the term "non-proprietary" is intended to dissuade the submission of a solution which is limited to one proprietary system and that may not meet the requirements of this RFP. The Office of the City Clerk seeks a comprehensive solution at one price point.
 - 1b. The use of open-source platforms are welcome.
 - 1c. In the context of a legislative/document management system, a preferred platform has not been identified. See answer for "non-proprietary" above.
 - 1d. Technologies from Microsoft/other commercial vendors can be proposed as part of the final solution.
2. **Question:** On Page 31 – Venues Currently Streamed; we understand both Committee and Council meetings are currently streaming meetings. Please confirm how many venues are required for this RFP?

Answer: Video streaming and archiving support for meetings in both the City Council Chamber & Room 201A are required (the A/V streaming solution not to exceed \$50k per year).

3. **Question:** On Page 31 - Audio Video Channels; based on our research of the existing solutions digital encoders, there is maximum of four audio channels for use. Can you please confirm if each venue has more than one audio channel?

Answer: Each venue will have a right and left audio channel available (the A/V streaming solution not to exceed \$50k per year).

4. **Question:** On Page 31 - Availability Timeframe of CC; currently it is noted on www.chicityclerk.com that "Captions not available until 24-48 hours after posting." Can you please confirm if any captions are available live in the streamed video?

Answer: Closed captioning, at about 80% accuracy is available during live streaming. The original closed captions are then edited further following each meeting for improved accuracy and completeness. These improved captions are made available following 24 - 48 hours after the posting (the A/V streaming solution not to exceed \$50k per year).

5. **Question:** Page 31 - Import of Existing Video Related Archives; we understand there is a need for archive functionality in terms of video streaming. Can you please provide some information regarding the existing archives?
- 5a. Size of content library (gigabytes or terabytes)?
 - 5b. Approximate number of files in library?
 - 5c. Metadata such as indexes or scheduling data tied to the video file?
 - 5d. Format of archived files?

Answer:

- 5a. The video archive contains about 346 videos at approximately .5GB each ~ 173 GB. In addition there are approximately 14,400 documents (e.g., ordinances, agendas) of varying file sizes.
- 5b. The Library includes both video and documents. Although there are approximately 150k documents that have been populated into the system since 2011, in some instances redacted (publicly shared) and non-redacted versions are also required. Since both .rtf and .pdf formats are available for each document submitted, there are approximately 350k total documents available in the current system.
- 5c. Every meeting video is currently tied to its corresponding meeting via the Legistar Minutes interface by entering its Media Manager video ID number in its field. The

Minutes interface also includes fields for additional information (e.g., meeting location, date, time, minutes, actions, votes).

5d. The archived video format is mp4. The archive documents are in both .rtf and .pdf formats.

6. **Question:** On Page 31 – AV Signal Used; we understand encoders currently use SDI with embedded audio. Please confirm what connection will be given to the new encoder and the format?

Answer: An SDI connection is available (the A/V streaming solution not to exceed \$50k per year).

7. **Question:** On Page 31 – Meeting Schedule; please confirm on average how many meetings a year are captured/streamed and how many hours of archived content is generated as a result?

Answer: The City anticipates streaming approximately 223 meetings per year w/ a total of 511.50 Hrs. of generated archived content (the A/V streaming solution not to exceed \$50k per year).

8. **Question:** On Page 42 - Staffing Skill Requirements; there is a role for "AI Deep Learning Specialist" listed in the Staffing Skill Requirements table, but there is no other mention of AI (Artificial Intelligence) or Machine Learning in the Scope of Services. Is this role essential in order to complete the requirements for this specification?

Answer: The guidance of an AI subject matter expert may be useful in analyzing the data available in the current platform and may be essential in order to provide a System that can automatically generate and tie descriptive meta data to every document. These enhancements would allow for improved search capabilities (e.g., narrow terms, broad terms, semantic – intent based search).

9. **Question:** Does the City have an anticipated or desired "go-live" date for the new Document Intake System? Are there any timing considerations?

Answer: The System's "go-live" date which included improved hard copy submission and search features is Q2 2020. In Q3 the document submission User interface with select legislation types and submitter specific reports would be made available. In Q4 the document submission User interface would expand/enhance submission options. Following the first year additional enhancements to the System would be specified and implemented on an ongoing basis.

10. **Question:** We would like more information on the calendar requirement (page 23);
- 10a. Are you looking for a tool to display calendars or a mechanism to create data for displaying in existing calendars?
 - 10b. What tools do you currently use for calendaring?
 - 10c. Where is calendar data currently stored?

Answer:

- 10a. Yes - There should be a management tool and public view of every scheduled meeting (e.g. City Council meetings, committee meetings and special meetings) and the meeting's related documents (e.g., notice, agenda, ordinances, video link, closed captioned text). See the current platforms public interface: <https://chicago.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>.
- 10b. The City currently uses Legistar which is a product of Granicus.

10c. Meeting management/calendar information is stored in Legistar by using their Meeting and Agenda Management interface.

11. **Question:** On Page 23, item 1, what are the redundant and non-essential tasks you are seeking to eliminate?

Answer: The current system requires that a document be submitted in hard copy format. Currently, given the monthly document volume and the adopted practices, when a digital document is available for submission, the current system requires its hard copy equivalent and hard copy tracking sheet in order to populate the system. The current system also requires that the same descriptive information (e.g. meta data) be re-entered in various places/fields for the same document.

12. **Question:** On Page 24, item 2, what is the City of Chicago's definition of "hands-free"?

Answer: The use of the term "hands-free" is intended to describe the reduction of any manual processes currently required for document submissions.

It may include the following:

- auto categorization of all document submissions with staff intervention,
- the pre-population of information (e.g., web forms),
- auto generated reports (e.g., notices, agendas, notice and agendas, submission reports),
- the elimination of redundant manually entered descriptive information,
- improved submission methods/workflows for select ordinance types,
- elimination of hard copy sheet (w/ tracking code) required for tracking hard copy submissions,
- information sharing via the System's API, and
- Information ingestion via external System APIs.

13. **Question:** On page 24, item 3 "ensure adherence to automatic enforcement of the elimination of paper";

13a. Does this mean that you would like us to propose a solution that forces users to eliminate paper (no scanning moving forward), to gradually force behavior changes until scanning is eliminated (reducing scanning moving forward), or something else?

13b. Is human intervention acceptable for reading scans that fall below the confidence threshold?

Answer:

13a. The System should provide a User friendly means to submit, share, and re-purpose information. The scanning submission option should be improved while more easy to use digital submission options are made available for multiple document types and formats (e.g., structured and unstructured ordinances). Propose a human centered design based solution that incentivizes users to gradually change behaviors to reduce scanning moving forward.

13b. Human intervention is expected for submissions (e.g., reading scans) that fall below the confidences threshold. These interventions should improve the System's ability to accurately categorize submissions over time.

14. **Question:** On page 24, item 4, what are the current challenges with aldermanic submissions that you are seeking to remedy?

Answer: Given the limitations of the current system, all stakeholder submissions are submitted as unstructured, unstandardized hard copy documents requiring time consuming manual processing and data entry of document descriptive data.

15. **Question:** Is there a public portal today? If so, what is the technology and what can visitors do today (e.g. search for content, contact the city, etc.)?

Answer: Yes. The public portal can be viewed here: <https://chicago.legistar.com>. Please review to see what visitors have access to and what they can do. A major pain point is the ability for a visitor to find a document of interest (e.g., visitors must use very specific terms via search).

16. **Question:** How many audio and video files are expected to be cataloged and stored, and how many new audio and video files will be created each month?

Answer: Please see answer for Question 5. An average of 19 videos will be streamed and archived every month.

17. **Question:** Are you currently using any closed captioning software and what are the limitations of that software?

Answer: Granicus uses 3rd party captioning software. The drawback is the inconsistency in the accuracy of the captions produced on an ongoing basis. This is due, in part, to the manual process involved.

18. **Question:** What software is currently used for scan ingesting?

Answer: Two (2) Fujitsu fi-5900c scanner software with Kofax Capture v 10.0 and a Legistar auto uploader are currently used for scan ingestion.

19. **Question:** There is mention in a few different places about existing and legacy system(s). What are they and is it possible to see systems prior to response?

Answer: With regard to the mention of "migration of legacy documents and data", the City's current version of Legistar can be considered the legacy system. With regard to the mention of "integrating with both legacy systems and network infrastructure", platforms in use by other City departments can be considered legacy systems. Please see an example of the system's editing UI which is available online:

<https://support.granicus.com/s/article/Navigating-the-Files-Module?ui-force-components-controllers-recordGlobalValueProvider.RecordGvp.getRecord=1&r=2>

At this time there will not be any site visits available prior to the proposal due date.

20. **Question:** RFP mentions that there are 110,000 documents which need to be migrated to the new solution. Where are they stored today? What is the technology of the current solution?

Answer: They are stored on Legistar. The current legislative management technology solution is Legistar.

21. **Question:** Page 13 of RFP states "For each proposed key personnel, describe previous related experience and provide references including: name, address, and telephone number of contact

person and brief description of work history”. Many of the proposed resources have worked within our organization for many years and references from other employers may not be available. Please advise as to whether you will accept proposed key personnel with only the Prime or Subcontractor as a reference.

Answer: Yes. Please describe work history within your organization.

**CITY OF CHICAGO – DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES
SHANNON E. ANDREWS, CHIEF PROCUREMENT OFFICER**

August 7, 2019
ADDENDUM NO. 1
SPECIFICATION NO. 984153
FOR
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (“RFP”)
FOR
TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES RELATING TO THE LEGISLATIVE MANAGEMENT
DOCUMENT INTAKE SYSTEM WITH ONGOING UPDATES, MAINTENANCE AND
SUPPORT

Required by:



CITY OF CHICAGO
Office of the City Clerk

Consisting of Sections I, II and III including this Acknowledgment.

III. ADDENDUM NO. 1 RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I hereby acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 1 to the Specification named above and further state that I am authorized to execute this Acknowledgment on behalf of the company listed below.

Signature of Authorized Individual

Title

Name of Authorized Individual (Type or Print)

Company Name

Business Telephone Number

Complete and Return this Acknowledgment by email to:
Magdalena.Toussaint@cityofchicago.org
Attention: Maggie Toussaint, Senior Procurement Specialist