CITY OF DAHLONEGA
465 Riley Road
Dahlonega, Georgia 30533
Phone: 706-864-6133 • Fax: 706-864-4837

ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM #2022-016

ADDENDUM 1

Addendum Issue Date: Friday, August 18th, 2022
Addendum Subject: Questions and Answers
Addendum Page Numbers: 10

Proposers must take due notice and be governed accordingly. The addendum must be acknowledged as indicated in the Request for Proposal or your Proposal may not be considered.

Questions and Answers

1. In terms of user licensing, how many internal users will need access into the system in full user capacity (scan, import, update, delete, etc.)? Two, City Clerk and Court Clerk.

2. Is this just a repository for all records or divided by department? If by department, what is the number of departments? Repository for all records.

3. How many boxes in storage? How many paper documents? Of those paper documents, are any of them stapled or bound? Approx. 552 banker box boxes. Amount of paper documents vary by box. Total number of documents could be up to 87,000. Yes, some have staples and bounds.

4. Is there any additional workflow needed other than what is noted in the RFP? If so, then please describe the additional workflow needs. No other workflow is needed.

5. What are the RFP submission requirements? Are there any additional details on format? The RFP requirements are listed on the Proper's Checklist located on page 14 of the RFP.

6. What are the key objectives that the city is hoping to accomplish with a new Electronic Content Management System and why the need for it now? We would like to modernize our record retention process.

7. Was this RFP created with the help of any vendor(s) or consultant(s) and, if yes, whom? No. This RFP was created by City staff with some references to similar RFPs released by other municipalities.

8. Has the City seen any presentations/demonstration from any vendor(s) or consultant(s) and, if yes, whom? No.

9. Does the City use a Document Management or Electronic Content Management System today? If yes, which one, is it an on-premise or cloud-based application, how long has it been in use and how large is the data set (number & size of files/folders)? No.

10. If applicable, what does the city pay the current vendor on a monthly or annual basis? n/a

11. Does the City need to go out for procurement for the maintenance or contract renewal of the existing System? n/a

12. Can you detail to what extent is the existing Legacy Document Management or Electronic Content Management System built out with electronic forms and workflows? n/a

13. How large is the data set size of documents currently stored in the City's warehouse and shared drives that the city wants migrated? Approximately 25,000 pages

14. How many departments would be using the system? Two, City Clerk's office and Municipal Court.

15. Regarding the number of users, can you please provide a breakdown of the total numbers of users that would be accessing the new system and how many of those individuals would be accessing the system on a monthly basis? Two, City Clerk and Court Clerk.

16. Can you confirm that the city desires to be fully trained to build out workflows and digital forms yourselves? Yes, the city desires staff to be fully trained.

17. Can the City detail the volumes and number of rolls and images of other media (paper, fiche, survey and design maps and blueprints) that the city wants converted? Paper, plans, and design maps.

18. Other than Tyler/New World and GIS, what other enterprise systems does the city have for future integrations with the new Electronic Content Management System? The City does not use Tyler/New World. This was mistakenly added to the RFP. Please disregard any reference to Tyler/New World. Our Community Development Department does use GIS. We do not use any other enterprise systems that need to be integrated into the ECMS.

19. Does Tyler/New World and GIS have an open API? Can the data be exported out on an automated schedule from both systems? And, what specific indexing/metadata values is the city looking to be pulled from those systems? The City does not use Tyler/New World. This was mistakenly added to the RFP. Please disregard any reference to Tyler/New World.

20. Can the City provide a copy of the City's Records Management Retention Schedule? We follow the state of Georgia's record retention schedule.

21. Is the City looking for a public portal, where the public can access documents stored in the ECM System or specifically to publish documents to the City's website for public access? No. ECM will be for internal use only.

22. Does the City have any Digital Signature requirement for internal and external users? We do not have a requirement, but we do utilize DocuSign.

23. In terms of the evaluation criteria, can the City provide a breakdown of the 75 maximum points of the technical qualifications? The technical qualification criteria is listed on page 7 of the RFP

24. Are there any Veteran or MWBE requirements or set aside for this project? No.

25. Due to Covid, many municipalities have resorted to accepting electronic submissions via email or their online systems. Is the City open to this? No. The City is does not have a way to securely receive electronic sealed proposals.

26. Due to the upcoming 8/30/2022 deadline and questions only being responded to on 8/19/2022 and physical mail delivery requiring additional time, is it possible to receive an extension until 9/13 to allow us to provide a more thorough response? No.

27. Are we required to do Data migration? Or will Drop and Drag capabilities be sufficient. We would prefer to have both but drop and drag will be sufficient.

28. Do you have sample workflows you can provide? No.

29. Do you know the number of workflows your organization will need? Two workflows. One for the City Clerk's office and one for the Municipal Court Clerk. These workflows will be completely separate from one another.

30. Can you provide additional details on "publishing to site":
    #E. "Ability to publish documents to the City's website for public access"
    a) From the ECM they want to publish to the City's website. We would need to know what is being used for the City and the integration to do this (e.g., API, file transfer…) We would no longer like the ECM to be published or accessed from the City's website. Internal use only.

31. Can you provide additional details on "Tyler/New World and GIS":
    #F. "Ability to "pull" data to auto-populate indexing/metadata values from other systems, including Tyler/New World and GIS"
    a) Are there interfaces exposed from the systems (Tyler/New World, GIS) e.g. (APIs, database access, file transfers)
       The City does not use Tyler/New World. This was mistakenly added to the RFP. Please disregard any reference to Tyler/New World.
    b) Is this a one-time pull or an ongoing basis?
       n/a
    c) If ongoing, is this going to be a batch process or real-time?
       n/a

32. Will there be any requirements to come onsite for meetings or any work? No.

33. Objective: To enable seamless workflow capabilities between staff and patrons
    a) Patrons – are they different users from the organization (i.e., customers, clients) No. Staff Only.
    b) Is a separate website from the ECM ok? This is to ensure that there is a "separation of concerns". The patrons will not be able to go into ECM and do damage. Not applicable.

34. When does the City expect to make an award and/or complete contracting with the selected vendor? We will award after City Council approves the contract and vendor.

35. Could you provide a link or copy of the record retention document processes referenced in point 1 of the Scope of Work? We do not have an official process. Users scan and save documents to Adobe.

36. Could we have more information on the other enterprise applications currently used? Referenced in point 4 under the objectives of the project. No enterprise applications or currently used.

37. Are there any migration of documents included as part of the project scope of work? If so, how many documents are currently stored, and do they contain indexing metadata? What resources will the City assign to support implementation and ongoing administration of the system? Yes, we would prefer to have documents migrated. But, if line item in the proposal pushes us over budget, we will exclude migration.

38. Does the city use any cloud hosting solution, e.g., AWS, MicroSoft, Google, for document storage today for day-to-day use? We use Contract Safe for City Contracts.

39. Under 2.1 Scope of Work, #2, the RFP mentions complying with industry-recognized standards, is it a requirement to be ISO 27001 and FedRAMP? No.

40. For records management, is the City looking for a configurable platform where the City can configure their file plan with retention schedules or is the City looking for the vendor to configure the file plan with retention and disposition policies? If the later, can the City provide a copy of their records schedule? Neither. We will follow our record retention schedule.

41. For sizing purposes, can you provide the number of documents and size of the shared drives and other media that will get migrated into the repository? Approx. 600GB of data. 87,000 documents.

42. Can you provide the process diagrams for any workflows that need to be implemented as part of the initial implementation? We do not have any current workflows to share. We are asking the vendor to provide two workflows that are compatible with our record retention schedule.

43. Has the City defined a budget for this project that you can share? Not at this time

44. We would like to clarify if the Tyler/ New World system is on Premise or Cloud Based. The City does not use Tyler/New World. This was mistakenly added to the RFP. Please disregard any reference to Tyler/New World.

45. Can you provide the number of users that would be trained under the "train the trainer" model? Two.

46. Will all users need to have full system capability (scan, etc.) or will some only need "Read Only" access? 7 users.

47. Will this RFP include the chosen vendor to scan existing paper documents housed at the city? Yes, if the line item for this service does not push the project over budget. If it is too expensive staff will perform this duty.

48. If so, do you have an inventory of the backfiles (and other media forms) needed to be converted to digital? Yes.

49. Do you want your initial system to include a complete Records Management implementation or will this be phased in at a later date? We would like our initial system to include a Records Management implementation.

50. You want your new system "To enable seamless workflow capabilities between staff and patrons." Do you have paper or pdf forms that you want digitized into automated forms processes? No.

51. How Many users will be working in the solution?
Two.

52. What is the size of your current document storage?
We do not have any.

53. What is the timeframe for decision/implementation?
We do not have a set timeline for this project.

54. Would training be in person or via Zoom? Vendor's preference – Zoom is fine.

55. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like,from India or Canada) No.

56. Whether we need to come over there for meetings? No.

57. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada) No.

58. Can we submit the proposals via email? No.

59. The implementation of software solutions can vary widely depending on project budget. Our firm has successfully delivered projects across various budget ranges. To help us best meet the goals of your RFI, can you please approximate the *anticipated* budget range for this project? For example, is the anticipated initial budget range   Less than $50,000
     a) Less than $50,000
     b) $50,000 - $75,000
     c) $75,000 - $100,000
     d) $100,000 - $150,000
     e) $150,000+

60. On a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents a Commercial Off The Shelf (COTS) solution with minimal configuration but less flexibility, and 5 represents a platform-based solution requiring some professional services, which can be customized to your specific needs, what best represents the *desired* solution on this continuum? 1. We are municipality and do not need customization at this time.

61. Remote solution delivery typically enables us to reduce project duration and costs. Most of the solutions can be delivered 100% remotely however, we some customers prefer parts of the delivery to be onsite. Considering the potential effect on project duration, resource availability, and cost on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents "100% **onsite** solution delivery" and 5 represents "100% **remote** solution delivery", what are your requirements on this continuum? 5. 100% remote

62. Did any contractor or vendor assist with the development of this solicitation or provide you with an initial evaluation, proof of concept, demonstration, pricing, or any other analysis related to this procurement? If so: No.
    a) Please provide the name of all contractors and vendors n/a
    b) Are these contractors and/or vendors eligible to bid on this project? n/a

63. How many *total* users should we account for as it relates to product pricing, implementation services scoping, etc.? Two.

64. Approximately how many business units (i.e. departments or more granular working groups) will use the solution? We need an approximate number for pricing purposes. Two departments, one person each.

65. How many record categories/series/types does the solution need to support? Seven categories.

66. Regarding requirement 2.1.3 stated as "Provide tools and features to enable workflow efficiencies": Is the development of specific workflows in scope for the project or just a required feature/capability of the solution? Development of workflows is in the scope of work for this project.
    a) If workflow development is in scope: Are the required workflows centered on document approval and/or records management or do they include process workflows to automate line of business functions? The workflow will be centered on records management.

    b) Can we assume that the workflows are very simple in nature (e.g. document approval)? Yes.

    c) How many workflows are to be built as part of this solicitation? Two.

    d) If available, can you please provide an outline of the steps or flow diagrams that represent a typical workflow? We currently do not have a workflow.

    e) If you have knowledge and experience with Power Automate, do you anticipate that the required workflows can be addressed with using Power Automate? We do not have experience with Power Automate.

67. Regarding the Objective stated as "enable the migration of documents from shared drives and other media (paper, fiche, survey and design maps and blueprints) to the new system": Approximately how many documents need to be migrated? Approximately 87,000
    a) What is the approximate total size in GB/TB of the data to be migrated? 600 GB

    b) Is the intent to ensure that the ability to migrate this content exists or is the actual migration within the scope of this solicitation? The ability to migrate this content is essential, we would prefer the vendor to perform the mitigation if it is within the budget.

    c) Given the unknowns and potential complexity related to this task, is it acceptable to provide an estimate for discovery, analysis, and planning related to this task in lieu of an estimate for the actual migration? Yes.

68. Regarding document scanning, OCR, etc. requirements:
   a) What, if any, document imaging/scanning software is currently in use?
   We use SnapScan scanners with their program, and Contract Safe.

   a) Is it able to store scanned documents and metadata in SharePoint Online?
   No.

   b) Do you desire to continue to use this software or in the intent to move to a more modern scanning solution?
   n/a

   c) How many *documents* do you anticipate scanning *per year*?
   Approx. 5,000-10,000 documents per year.

   d) What is the anticipated *growth rate* in documents scanned per year over the next 3 years (e.g. 5% growth in each of years 2 and 3)? We do not expect to grow in the next 3 years. Less than 2%

77. Can you please provide use cases and additional details regarding the requirement stated as "Options for cloud-based storage and hybrid-based storage" (e.g. under what conditions would you want to store documents locally vs. in the cloud)? We want all documents cloud based.

78. We are a SharePoint and Microsoft 365 (M365) focused consultancy and have successfully combined these platforms with best of breed third party software products (as needed) to implement comprehensive enterprise document, content and records management solutions; given what you know about SharePoint/M365, including any as-needed 3rd-party add-ons, on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents "Will not meet our requirements" and 5 represents "We believe SharePoint/M365 is the best platform for our needs", what represents your view on the continuum? 1

79. Regarding your current experience with SharePoint and/or M365 if you are using either:
   a) What version(s) are you currently licensed for (e.g. SharePoint 2019, SharePoint Online G3/E3, etc.)?
   We do not use SharePoint.

   b) Do you already have the requisite licensing for the number of anticipated users of the solution being contemplated in this RFI?
   Two.

   c) What is the current breath of usage in terms of number of:
   Departments: Seven
   Users: Two

   d) For what workloads are you currently using SharePoint/M365 (e.g. collaboration portals, Intranet, etc.)? We are not using SharePoint

   e) What, if any, problems or dissatisfaction have you experienced with SharePoint/M365?
   n/a

f) Do you already own any SharePoint-related products (e.g. ShareGate) and if so, which ones?
n/a

g) On a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 represents "None" and 5 represents "Expert", can you please indicate what SharePoint/M365 skills you currently have in house in terms of: n/a
   o Infrastructure, Administration and Maintenance
   o Information Architecture Design and Implementation
   o Content Owner/Authorship
   o PowerShell and C# Development

80. The General Functionality table includes a requirement stated as "*County* retains ownership of the data stored on the platform with the ability to extract it in full at any time":
   a) In what way is the County involved with this solicitation or the chosen EDMS solution?
   The County is not involved in this solicitation. This was a clerical error and County should be replaced with City.

   b) Was this solicitation developed using requirements/content from a prior County solicitation and if so, can you please provide information about that solicitation including what vendor was selected, as applicable? No. We used examples from other cities and counties. We do not know what vendors were selected for this projects.

81. Regarding the notarization of various solicitation package forms, due to the cost/effort, will signature by an Authorized Representative along with the Corporate Seal suffice in lieu of notarized forms, understanding that notarized forms will be required upon shortlist or award?
No, for a proposal package to be considered complete and responsive, all forms requiring notarization must be notarized. If the documents are not notarized, the vendor will be disqualified.

82. As an environment-conscious organization, we strive to reduce our consumption of paper and pollution, as well as printing and shipping costs, etc.; to that end, can respondents please submit proposals electronically via email in lieu of hard-copy proposals?
No. The City is does not have a way to securely receive electronic sealed proposals.

83. We typically conduct the majority of our solution delivery via virtual meetings using Microsoft Teams because this:
o Reduces the cost of the project in terms of both travel time and expenses
o Enables us to record the sessions for review by anyone who could not attend and/or for future reference
o Enables participants from multiple customer locations to participate independent of their location
o Enables us to have the most qualified resource on our team conduct the session, independent of location
   Will this way of conducting project delivery meet your requirements? Yes.

84. When does the City expect to make an award and/or complete contracting with the selected vendor? Award timeline is subject to City Council approval.

85. Could you provide a link or copy of the record retention document processes referenced in point of the Scope of Work? We do not have an official record retention document process.

86. Could we have more information on the other enterprise applications currently used? Referenced in point 4 under the objectives of the project. We do not use enterprise applications.

87. What is the need or priority on the points listed under Electronic Content Management and Records Management? These do not fully line up with the General Functionality and Reporting and Management sections where the Need is listed next to each point. These points are suggestions and what the City would like to see. Some are essential and some are desired as listed.

88. Are there any migration of documents included as part of the project scope of work? If so, how many documents are currently stored, and do they contain indexing metadata? Yes. Approx. 87,000 documents. They do not contain indexing metadata.

89. What resources will the City assign to support implementation and ongoing administration of the system? Designated staff to use the system, access to documents. Vendors can request support needed from the City for this project. Requests may be approved or denied.

90. Number of pages of transcripts/documents to be converted to Microfilm? None to our knowledge.

91. What size of microfilm does the organization currently use? We do not use microfilm.

92. Estimate of number boxes for back file conversion? Size of boxes? and/or File cabinets? 5 Approx. 552 standard size banker boxes.

93. Any document sizes larger than 11"x17"? Yes, planning and zoning documents may be 11"x17" or larger. We do not have a specific number a this time.

94. Will the manilla folders be required to be scanned? (i.e. student records, employee records) No.

95. How many pages per folder? Varies by folder.

96. How many files per box? Varies by box.

97. Will the folders need to prepped? (i.e. remove stables, paperclips) Yes.

98. Will the vendor required to box up files and transport files to scan location? No.

99. Will your organization need boxes to be provided? No.

100. Are the documents located in 1 central location for pick up? Yes.

101. Will loading docks be available at pickup staging area(s)? Yes, but vendor will not be responsible for moving the documents.

102. Will your organization allow secure offsite scanning facility?
On-site scanning only.

103. What is your organization's security compliance requirements? (i.e. SOC II compliance, 24/7 surveillance, FBI background checks) SOC II Compliance

104. Will the files be destroyed or returned to organization?
We will decide this at a later date.

105. What are the index fields required for scanning?
Unknown at this time.

106. Will the scanned archived documents be stored as 1 full text searchable file or break out documents? Breakout documents.

107. What are the average age and condition of the files?
Condition is good to well. The oldest documents known are 60 years old.

108. How many users will require access to Document management system?
Two users to manage data, 7 for read only access.

109. Is the district looking for a cloud-hosted solution or on-premise solution?
Cloud hosted solution.

110. What are your organization's current software applications and that our solution will be required to integrate with? Please include versions
Contract Safe and DocuSign.

111. Please provide the more detail on the other media
- Fiche (what type?, Size?, How many?) Not known at this time.
- Surveys and Designs maps blueprints (What Size?, How many?) Not known at this time.
- Numbers of boxes of documents 11"x17" and below? Not known at this time.
- After scanned documents, will the document be destroyed, return, or stored? How long will they need to be stored? Will pages need to be reassembled? (ie stabled) Certain documents will need to be destroyed, others stored and return. We will have to determine that at a later time.

112. Ability to publish documents to the City's website for public access (Platform? Desired experience?) We no longer desire to publish to the City's website.

113. What information will be pulled from the Tyler/New World GIS system? None. We do not use this system and was listed by mistake in the original RFP

114. Are you looking for a dashboard or a report distributed to email users?
No, only for the two active users. This will be city staff.

115. What is the timeframe for your document conversion project?
We do not currently have a deadline or designated timeline for this project.