



CITY OF HOUSTON

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Strategic Procurement Division

Sylvester Turner

Mayor

Carolyn Hanahan
Acting Chief Procurement Officer
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

T. 832.393.9127
F. 832.393.8755
<https://purchasing.houstontx.gov>

January 4, 2016

Subject: Enterprise Legal Management (ELM) Software – Addendum No. 2

Reference: Request for Proposal (RFP) No. S67-T25606

To: All Prospective Proposers

Please see the responses to questions from prospective proposers.

1. Can you please provide ELM Requirements Table (Appendix 1) as soon as possible; we would like to begin working. [The ELM Requirements Table \(Appendix 1\), along with the Sample Contract and Contract Exception Chart were posted on 12/14/15 and they are available at \[http://purchasing.houstontx.gov/Bid_Display.aspx?id=T25606\]\(http://purchasing.houstontx.gov/Bid_Display.aspx?id=T25606\)](#)
2. I want to confirm that the City would like the total proposed cost in the Executive Summary that is submitted in the technical proposal, per the requirement on page 36 (not only in the Pricing volume) [Yes, the City desires the total proposed cost in the Executive summary. This should include cost for all items such as software, implementation services, training, etc.](#)
3. On page 46, Part VII, Item E. Assuming that we have exceptions to the contract, are we only to submit the exceptions in the City's format, and would NOT be required to submit two (2) originals of the completed and signed Contract? [You do not need to submit two original of the completed and signed contract if you are taking exception to any item in the contract. If you have exceptions to the contract, you must submit a redline of the Sample Contract and a summary of changes using the Contract Exception Chart, both of which must be submitted in an unlocked Microsoft Word document.](#)
4. On page 4, the City notes "invoicing features and mechanisms to verify and ensure budget conformity." Does the City require invoice generation or invoice tracking? [No, the City does not require invoice generation or invoice tracking.](#)
5. What is the preference for the Department and City to host the solution on premise or through a provider? [The City prefers an on premise solution, hosted by the City.](#)

6. Besides administrative users do users work with multiple sections within the Department or is each section segmented? Besides administrative users, about 25 users work with multiple sections in the department. These users would be personnel, such as the City Attorney and his/her staff and First City Assistant attorneys and their staff.

Additionally, several attorneys and paralegals in the General Counsel section require access to view and copy the files open in different sections and access the documents saved to the file. These permissions allow the General Counsel section to search for matters that may be related to TPIA requests and print out background documents for Attorney General letters (e.g., copy of petition, claim letter, etc.).

8. Are the files attached to the legacy system stored in their native format (Word, PDF, etc.)? Yes, the files attached to the legacy system are stored in their native format.

9. Is the expectation of the Department that the TPIA database be converted into the new solution? It is not a requirement that the TPIA Access database be ingested into the new solution, but we need the same fields in the new solution that we have in the Access database. A file is separately created in our legacy system for each logged request, however, those files do not contain all the necessary fields from our Access database that we would need in the new system.

10. The reports that are expected to be written by the vendor for the department are they on Page 10 and 11 of the RFP? The reports on page 10 and 11 are commonly used reports, but they are not an exhaustive list. The City expects that the user can run these reports using the out of the box functionality of the software and not that custom reports need to be written by the vendor.

11. On page 13 the RFP refers to a schedule and states that the project will be a 30-45 day project, is that what the expectation is? To have all deliverables by that time is not even realistic will the City be open to a different timeline? If the 30-45 day timeline for project implementation is not feasible or realistic, provide the vendor's proposed timeline as required in various portions of the RFP, such as the Executive Summary and Proposed Plan of Action.

12. Will demonstrations of the software be provided before the pilot test period? Proposers will be required to provide training before the pilot test period begins as further explained in Section K (page 26 of the RFP). In that regard, the training will serve as a demonstration of the software.

13. Is the goal of the pilot test to be conducted to the highest scoring vendor or does the Department expect to conduct a pilot test of multiple vendors? The Department expects to conduct a pilot test of one or more vendors. The pilot test is not limited to only the highest scoring vendor. However, scoring and the City's capacity to conduct pilot tests with multiple vendors will be taken into account to determine the number of vendors that will be asked to participate in the pilot test.

14. Since the pilot test will not have time spent to be configured for the Departments business needs, is the main goal of the pilot test to make sure the product can handle the workload from a technical perspective? Is the City open to other ideas for pilot testing? The pilot test has multiple goals, such as testing workload for a technical perspective, ensuring compatibility with the City's existing systems, evaluating the suitability of the software for each of our different Section's needs and the user-friendliness of the software. The City is open to other ideas for pilot testing that meet the description set forth in the RFP and are available within the time constraints and at no cost to the City. The City is not interested in "proof of concept" demos.

15. Our company does not use subcontractors for the implementation, training and support of our product does the contract have to have M/WBE participation? If so and we don't satisfy that requirement will we be eliminated? M/WBE participation is a goal and is evaluated based on the Proposer's good faith

efforts. For more detail on how to demonstrate good faith efforts, please contact OBO Representative, Will Norwood at (832) 393-0935 or Will.Norwood@houstontx.gov. Additional information concerning the City's Good Faith Efforts policy is also available at http://www.houstontx.gov/obo/contract_compliance.html. Please also note that M/WBE participation may be satisfied in a variety of ways and is not limited to implementation, training, and support. Will Norwood can also assist you in identifying other areas where subcontracting opportunities may exist and explaining the process for requesting an evaluation of the Proposer's good faith efforts if viable subcontracting opportunities are not identified. As stated in the RFP (page 32) M/WBE participation (which includes good faith efforts) is evaluated on a pass/fail basis.

16. Cust15 – Can we get an example of Case Automation Rules as described in this requirement? Examples of Case Automation Rules includes calendaring of ticklers for answer dates (e.g. the date the Answer to a lawsuit is due), response dates (for any type of responsive filing or motion), and deadlines set forth in the Court's docket control order.

An example of a docket control report is attached, which requires the designation of expert witnesses by a certain date.

Also attached is motion which requires a response by a certain date. The due date for motions would depend on whether the case is being litigated in federal or state court and we would need different automation rules set up (once the system has the indicator that lets it know whether the case is in federal or state court).

17. D30 – Can you provide a sample of an automatically generated document, and what type of event would dictate this should happen?

Below, please find several examples of events that would dictate automatic generation of a document:

- a. the initial documents to be generated with original suits in state or federal court for service of citation and the case information sheet;
- b. an Order generated with any motion or response to a motion in a lawsuit;
- c. a form for responses to requests for disclosures that should be generated for us to populate for all lawsuits and the form would be generated;

Attachments Pending

18. D31 – Can you provide an example of when a mail merge might be required? For example, the Contracts section uses mail merge to merge different names, addresses, percentages, amounts, tax ID number, etc. into form/template documents. It is also used to personalize letters (e.g. merge name and address) into a standardized letter template.

19. D33 – Can you provide examples of documents that users would want to print in batch? An example of batch printing might be an associated set of documents, such as a contract and all of the exhibits, a motion and all of its exhibits, or an email and all of its attachments. Alternatively, a user may want to batch print several documents all of which were responsive to a system search (e.g. a search for all opinions regarding the "maximum contract amount" yields 5 opinions and all of them will be printed).

20. Does the ELM need to support a mixed environment of Corel WordPerfect and MS Word – specifically regarding the creation of new documents? Both Corel Word Perfect and MS Word are used in the City's current environment to create documents. The City prefers that the ELM support a mixed environment of Corel Word Perfect and MS Word. However, the City will consider an ELM that does not support Corel Word Perfect. Conversely, the City will not consider an ELM that does not support MS Word. Proposers must note whether the ELM supports Corel Word Perfect, MS Word, or both.

21. Alcohol License Permits

At what point does the City Attorney's office get involved and how is that information conveyed to the City Attorney from the Mayor's office. [The City Attorney's office will investigate when it receives a complaint from any source. It does not have to originate from the Mayor's office. The information is not conveyed to or from the City Attorney's office using the current Legacy System, nor does the City expect to use the ELM to convey such information.](#)

22. Training room

Could you provide details about the training room? How many workstations for participants would you be able to handle? This will have an impact on the training plan that we are developing. [The City has several options for a training room. We have a room that has a large screen \(and WebEx access\) and can accommodate 30+ users. We also have smaller rooms with large screens \(and WebEx access\) that can accommodate 10-20 people. The City could supply approximately 10-15 laptops participants could use to follow along during the training session.](#)

23. Support Hours

Is Saturday a regular workday for your staff or is this on an as needed basis? [The majority of our staff works between 7 AM – 7 PM Monday through Friday. But, with a department of over 100 people, there are several people working on any given Saturday or Sunday or after 5 PM on weekdays. If support were needed after hours or on a weekend, our staff should be able to reach and receive a response from someone in technical support. This would be particularly important as attorneys or preparing for or a handling hearings or trials on the weekends and late evenings.](#)

24. Liquor License Complaints

Would you consider allowing these submittals to auto-populate into City Law? This would reduce the amount of paper and time staff spends handling these matters. For these complaints – would you consider them as a Code Enforcement type of a violation/complaint rather than a Municipal Prosecution? [Yes, auto-populating would be acceptable, but we will need TABC to be a sub-category for Code Enforcement. These types of complaints are considered Code Enforcement violations and not Municipal Prosecution violations/complaints.](#)

If you have additional questions or require further clarification please contact Division Manager, Brenda Chagoya at (832) 393-8723 or via email brenda.chagoya@houstontx.gov

When issued, Letter(s) of Clarification shall automatically become a part of the proposal documents and shall supersede any previous specification(s) and/or provision(s) in conflict with the Letter(s) of Clarification. All revisions, responses, and answers incorporated into the Letter(s) of Clarification are collaboratively from both the Strategic Purchasing Division and the applicable City Department(s). It is the responsibility of the proposers to ensure that it has obtained all such letter(s). By submitting a proposal on this project, proposers shall be deemed to have received all Letter(s) of Clarification and to have incorporated them into this proposal.