

August 16, 2019

ADDENDUM NO. 2

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 17 Questions Submitted for Clarification of 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 23, 2019 (pursuant to the Addendum No. 1 advertised August 7, 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. 2 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 16, 2019

ADDENDUM NO. 2

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 23, 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 30, 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 RFP

1. **Question:** Is it OK if we have our key resources available in Chicago only for Kickoff, Requirements, Training, and Deployment?

Answer:

Yes.

2. **Question:** Do you need any additional support from the software for the City Council meeting? Example: recording meeting notes on pc/ipad.

Answer: No - The System would make all City Council and Committee meeting related documents available (e.g., time, date, location, agenda, ordinances, notice, video link, meeting report, summary).

3. **Question:** Is your active directory hosted on cloud or on premise?

Answer: Active directory is hosted on premise.

4. **Question:** Do you want the submission emails to be sent to your domain or can it be routed to a custom domain like submissions.chiclerk.org?

Answer: If required for the System's solution, either can be made available.

5. **Question:** Do you want the workflow to be based on the type of document or can the document have multiple workflows?

5a. Would the Ordinance follow the same workflow path for any document or would the path change based on the attributes in the document? Do you want users outside city's network to be able to submit/review legislative documents?

5b. If so, should there be a user registration/approval module?

Answer:

5a. A specific ordinance type could have the same workflow with many user specific starting points and mid points (e.g. approvals). A more generic document could have various workflows which would be determined by the attributes (e.g., document type, user's office). Workflows should be based on the subject of the document.

5b. Users, who are granted the appropriate access, would be able to submit, review and/or modify their submissions. The public would be able to review all publicly accessible legislative documents.

6. **Question:** Can you provide a sample use case for the "Cognitive document automation"?

Answer: One use case would be the automatic taxonomy construction of any submitted document (e.g., hardcopy, digital Word file) to reduce the manual data entry required.

7. **Question:** Do you want the system to be designed to support a single standard format that the third party system must follow or should the application import third party systems' format and convert into standard format?

7a. How many third party applications are there to be integrated with?

Answer: An initial version of the data consumption feature would not be expected until Q4 of the first year. By Q2 of the second year, the System should sync with 1-3 third party systems. The information may be provided in the format that is available via the 3rd party system - the System should then structure it to the System's standard format.

7a. One third party system has been identified for initial data import by Q4 of year 1. By Q2 of year 2, the System should be tied fully to 1 to 3 third party systems.

8. **Question:** Would we get a list of web forms to be created (if yes, how many?) or do you want the ability to create web forms using the system?

Answer: Based on the Contractor's analysis of the current documents and the City's workflows, the Contractor will prioritize and provide at least 3 web forms for the introduction of ordinances by Q3 and up to 10 web forms by Q4 of year one. These web forms type (e.g., ordinances) should automatically populate information when possible (e.g., Ward, Alderman

Info, etc.). Based on the adoption of these web forms, the ability to create web forms using the System should be provided by Q2 of year two.

9. **Question:** How many types of voting profiles should be implemented?

Answer: One voting profile should be created for each voter (e.g., 50 aldermen). Every alderman should be accounted for - votes can be applied individually per item or by block. In addition, there should be a vote tally.

10. **Question:** Can you provide a couple of examples for ML generated Taxonomies?

Answer: The Contractor should analyze the available document information to inform their recommendation of the ML taxonomy to be used. This taxonomy should be improved over time.

11. **Question:** How far do you want to go back to migrate the data? Do you have all the old records in a common data structure or multiple? What is your database vendor/version?

Example:

2005 to 2007 on MDB

2004 – 2005 on Excel files

2001 – 2002 on micro fiche

Answer: The migration of all information from the current system Legistar is required - This information (e.g. documents, meetings, videos) dates back to 2011.

12. **Question:** What is the file type of these documents? Do you want to do any conversion eg: to a pdf file. Are texts in all old documents indexed?

Answer: The formats that are available are described in the Addendum No.1. Descriptive information about each document is available but the text in these documents has not been indexed.

13. **Question:** Do you need versioning of documents?

Answer: Yes.

14. **Question:** What is the project timeline?

Answer: The project timeline for the 1st year is available in the Addendum No.1. Additional project timeline guidance is provided in this addendum.

15. **Question:** What is the project budget?

Answer: The Office of the City Clerk seeks a comprehensive solution at competitive proposal pricing.

16. **Question:** Do you have a preference of the technology stack?

Answer: A preferred technology stack has not been identified. For guidance, please see the City's preferred technology: <https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/depts/doi.html> - More information can be provided by DoIT.

17. **Question:** Can you provide a list of reports you would need on the administration side as well as on the public side?

Answer: Examples of public facing documents/reports: meeting notice, meeting agendas, meeting notice/agendas, meeting minutes, committee activity reports, legislation reports (by status, type, sponsor committee) attendance and voting, legislation (history, status), Journal Index, Journal, Annual Index. Examples of internal interfaces: Document portal submission report interface (for document submissions), flagged documents interface (for OCC QA), Traffic Statistics.

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

August 16, 2019
ADDENDUM NO. 2
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. 2 RECEIPT ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I hereby acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 2 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