



## **Addendum No. 1**

City of Coquitlam

**RFP No. 25-033**

### **Electronic Agenda and Meeting Management Software**

Issue Date: March 27, 2025

Total Page Count: 5

Proponents shall note the following amendments to the RFP documents:

#### **QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS**

Q1. How many total users will need access to the new Agenda Management system?

**A1. The total number of users will depend on the system's access levels and functionality. Specifically:**

- **Admin Rights: 3 users**
- **Edit Rights: 4-6 users (if limited to Clerks Office staff for Agenda development)**
- **Read-Only Access: This depends on whether it includes the website portal. Potential users may include Clerks, Council, staff, and the public..**

Q2. Does the City of Coquitlam prefer named or concurrent licensing?

**A2. The Proponent should present both options if available, along with the constraints to the license agreement and system access functions.**

Q3. Is the City of Coquitlam currently using an agenda management solution? If so, could you confirm which system is in place? The RFP documentation suggests that Granicus and/or CivicPlus may currently be in use.

**A3. Currently, Granicus and CivicPlus are in use to manage the Council agendas (posting to website, live-streaming and archival recordings of meetings), along with various manual processes managed by City staff (compilation of Agenda materials and creation of Agenda packages done manually).**

Q4. Is the intent of this RFP to fully replace the existing agenda management system, or is the City primarily seeking a solution that integrates with existing tools such as Granicus for video streaming and CivicPlus for your website platform?

**A4. The City would prefer a comprehensive solution that would address all the requirements listed in the RFP. However, is open to integration with current tools if not all requirements can be met. Proponents should clearly present in their proposal requirements covered and not covered along with any proposed integrations to existing or new tools.**

Q5. Do Staff reports originate within departments by staff or are they started by agenda preparers and then assigned.

**A5. Staff reports originate within departments and, once finalized, are submitted to the CAO for approval and sign-off. Following approval, the reports are forwarded to the City Clerk's Office, where they are scanned to PDF and added to the agenda. The process may vary depending on system capabilities and operational needs.**

Q6. Please describe a standard approval review for a staff report prior to being approved or finalized for the agenda (generic descriptions are fine, for example Staff>Dept Head>Legal>city administrator>clerk etc.)

**A6. Staff > Director > Finance / Legal / Other > General Manager > CAO > Clerks Office \*the order of these reviews may be different depending on the circumstance (e.g., Post finance review it could go back to the staff writer and director prior to being sent to the GM).**

Q7. Considering the example workflow above how many variations might your organization need (Where a different Dept head for the various depts isn't a variation)

**A7. Hard to say at this point but estimate 3-4. There also needs to be the ability to switch out reviewers during vacations, absences, etc.**

Q8. Do you have staff using Mac's to draft staff reports?

**A8. The City utilizes a handful of Mac technology for Council to access agenda documents, which were not accessible with the current toolset. The City is not looking to increase the current amount and would be open to replacing this technology provided there is support from the Proposal tool.**

Q9. How many meeting bodies (council, planning etc.) plan to use the software to prepare agendas?

**A9. The City Clerk's Office will be the sole administrator of the software, using it to prepare agendas for all Council and Committee meetings, including Council-in-Committee, Strategic Priorities, and Finance. While there is potential to extend its use to Advisory Committee agendas in the future, the initial focus will be on agendas for Council-related meetings..**

Q10. Would the City consider granting a 1-week extension to 7 April?

**A10. At this time the City will not be extending the closing date.**

Q11. When is the targeted contract award timeline and desired contract execution date?

**A11. The estimated contract award is anticipated for June or July 2025.**

Q12. What are the cities targeted implementation timelines/go-live dates with the awarded vendor?

**A12. Estimated mid-2026.**

Q13. Contract Template - is the City open to potentially using the awarded vendor's agreement template, being that it is specific to the commitments made to the City regarding the initiative, and security, privacy, and support commitments?

**A13. No, the City prefers its own Terms and Conditions. However, if the Proponent has a Service Level Agreement (SLA), it can be submitted for review. The PIA and PPS will still apply as per City requirements.**

Q14. Contract Template - if the City is not open to utilizing the awarded vendor's agreement template, is the City open to negotiation of the terms provided? If so, must requests for consideration be submitted with the proposal or can terms be negotiated after the vendor has been selected?

**A14. Any exceptions or changes should be clearly stated in the departures section of the Proposal Submission Form.**

Q15. What technology is provided to meeting participants such as council, if any? Ie iPads, Windows Tablets, PCs, Macbooks, otherwise?

**A15. Currently, Council and leadership team members access meeting information and participate on iPads, Laptops with Windows 10 and Macbooks.**

Q16. Migration of existing agendas, minutes, and video - approximately how far back in time would the City like to have documents and videos migrated from?

**A16. The extent of migration has not been determined and will be discussed with the successful Proponent. Proposals should outline the costs and level of effort associated with migrating existing agendas, minutes, and videos, including options for different timeframes..**

#### **Technical Section Questions (from Proposal Submission Form)**

Q17. Section G Ability to automatically purge or delete data in compliance with the City's records retention policy and privacy legislation If the platform does not have the ability to automatically purge data based on a timeline, is it acceptable to have the ability to purge records at any time?

**A17. Proponents should describe the process and level of effort required for the City to purge data, particularly if the system does not support automatic purging based on a predefined timeline.**

- Q18. Section P Ability to convert documents into PDF and resize. Regarding resizing documents, what is the desired challenge to address? Please provide an example use case if possible.
- A18. This requirement pertains to access control, system performance, and document management. The City requires the ability to convert large planning maps and diagrams into 8.5x11 or 8.5x14 formats while maintaining image quality..**
- Q19. Section Q Ability to collect metadata in documentation. In which document types would the City like to be able to collect metadata, and what is the City trying to accomplish by doing so? Please provide an example use case if possible.
- A19. This requirement addresses document control and search functionality for the tool, Proponents should note this is a preferred and not a required Technical Requirement.**
- Q20. Section Z Accepting of large file sizes with multiple layers, customizable security, and varying document sizes (minimum: greater than 2000 MB). How often will files larger than 250MB be required to be accepted in the selected platform, and in what formats are files greater than 250MB?
- A20. To date, the City has not encountered files exceeding 250MB.**

### **Functional Section Questions (from Proposal Submission Form)**

- Q21. Section D Automated report creation (digital, customizable templates, various meeting types, formatting tools, security control functions, and navigable full/partial packages) in multiple formats (i.e. Word, PDF, etc.). When reports are to be created in multiple formats for partial packages, what is the use case?
- A21. The meaning of "partial package" is unclear. However, there are instances where certain sections of an agenda are designated as "limited distribution." In such cases, these sections must either be separated from the main agenda and sent independently or be accessible only to authorized users within the agenda system. Proponents should identify any file type limitations for documents published to the website or platform..**

- Q22. Section E Live and on-demand video streaming and recording (integrated with existing streaming hardware – i.e. cameras, microphones) Will the City be livestreaming from more than one location, or only chambers? If so, what is the A/V setup for additional locations, and is closed captioning desired for these additional locations?
- A22. At this time, the City intends to livestream only from the Council Chambers. Future considerations may include enabling streaming from additional meeting rooms, but that decision will be made at a later date**
- Q23. Section G Automated web posting (integrated with existing web platform) and ability to index agenda items with internal and external formats What is meant by internal and external formats? Assuming internal may be closed session/confidential agendas, please confirm or advise if otherwise and provide example of internal use case.
- A23. The City seeks to ensure that the system can manage both internal formats (data stored within the system) and external formats (documents uploaded into the system), with full searchability across all content.**
- Q24. Section X Ability to support and facilitate digital/electronic signatures and/or approval indicators On which document types are digital signatures desired? Are any of the document types desired to have signatures preferred rather than required?
- A24. General Managers (GMs) and the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) must apply digital signatures to reports, while the CAO must sign the agenda cover page. However, the City is open to exploring alternative methods for indicating approval.**
- 

***End of Addendum No. 1***

Proponents take into account the content of this Addendum in the preparation and submission of the Proposal which will form part of the Contract and should be acknowledged on the Proposal Submission Form.

Upon submitting a Proposal, Proponents are deemed to have received all addenda that are issued and posted on the City's website and considered the information for inclusion in the Proposal Submission.

*Issued by:*

Chris Overes  
Senior Procurement Specialist [bid@coquitlam.ca](mailto:bid@coquitlam.ca)