

## RFP Questions & Answers

**1. Section 1.1.2 describes multiple existing systems, including in-house developed applications (DOVS, CVVS, LACityClerk Connect/CFMS, Public Comment Portal, Speaker Request System, Early Notification System) and different Granicus-provided services. Is the City's expectation that the selected partner and solution will ultimately replace all of these existing systems with a single integrated platform? Or are there specific systems the City intends to retain, with the new solution integrating alongside them?**

The City's goal is to have one integrated solution; however, we are open to all proposed solutions.

**2. For data migration purposes, can the City provide approximate volumes for: (a) total Council files, (b) total documents, (c) years of historical data to be migrated, and (d) current data formats/export capabilities from CFMS and Granicus?**

As of January 21, 2026, here are the following statistics:

(a) 171,417 total Council files

(b) 497,586 total documents

(c) Historical data in CFMS goes back to 1979

(d) In CFMS, the current data formats/export capabilities are:

Online Docs - PDF

Database - MS SQL Database

**3. With a timeline of RFP due in Feb, Contract start in August, does the City have any expectation or desire about when a cut over to a new solution should occur, or will that be dependent upon a solution development schedule determined by the City and this contract Awardee?**

The City would like to transition over to the new product as soon as reasonably possible. The timeline is ultimately dependent on the product and how well its features align with the existing operations of the City. The Awardee should work with the City to facilitate the transition as soon as reasonably possible.

**4. Section 1.1.2 of the RFP notes that the City's current system hosts videos on YouTube. For the proposed solution's live and on-demand video streaming requirements outlined in Section 2.9, is YouTube integration a mandatory requirement, or is the City open to alternative video hosting and streaming platforms that meet the stated functional requirements (indexing, closed**

**captioning, searchability, archival, etc.) as long as it's just as easily accessible to citizens?**

The City is open to alternative video hosting and streaming platforms that meet the stated functional requirements.

**5. Section 2.1 references NIST encryption and hardened software requirements. Does the City require or prefer vendors to hold specific security certifications such as SOC2 Type II, StateRAMP, or GovRAMP authorization for the proposed cloud-based solution? If so, what certification level or status is acceptable (e.g., authorized, in process, ready)?**

The City's Policy:

Specific Authorization Frameworks (StateRAMP/GovRAMP) The provided sources do not explicitly mention StateRAMP or GovRAMP authorizations. However, the City's security policies and procedures are generally based upon the following standards:

- NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF)
- NIST 800-53 (Security and Privacy Controls for Federal Information Systems)
- HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act)
- PCI DSS (Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard)

Acceptable Certification Level or Status

- SAS 70: The City requires the "latest" audit report.
- NIST/FedRAMP/SOC 2: While specific levels (e.g., Moderate vs. High, or Type I vs. Type II) are not explicitly detailed as minimum thresholds in the policy text, the City requires vendors to demonstrate compliance with internal control practices consistent with industry standards. The City uses the responses regarding FedRAMP, SOC 2, and ISO 27001 to evaluate the vendor's security program

and here are all the specific requirements we need from vendors

The vendor requirements outlined in the City of Los Angeles Information Security Policy Manual and Information Handling Guidelines are comprehensive, covering acquisition, auditing, access control, and ongoing risk management.

#### 1. Auditing, Certification, and Documentation

The City places significant emphasis on auditing standards and verified compliance for vendors providing IT support or services.

- **Mandatory Auditing Standards:** Vendors providing services to the City, particularly for IT support, are required to maintain a Statement of Auditing Standards (SAS) No. 70. Vendors must provide the latest SAS 70 audit report to demonstrate compliance with internal control practices.

- Security Questionnaires:
- Service Vendors: Vendors that store, manage, or process sensitive data are required to complete the Services Acquisition Questionnaire (Appendix H).
- Product Vendors: Vendors providing products that store, manage, or process sensitive data must complete the Product Acquisition Questionnaire (Appendix I).
- Security Evaluation: The City evaluates vendors using a specific form (Appendix C) that requests documentation regarding compliance frameworks such as FedRAMP, SOC 2, or ISO 27001.
- Confidentiality Agreements: Vendors must sign confidentiality statements for any engagement requiring non-City staff to ensure sensitive information is not released to unauthorized parties.

## 2. Access Control and Connectivity

Strict technical controls govern how vendors connect to and interact with City networks.

- Account Management:
- Vendor accounts in the Microsoft Active Directory must be configured to expire based on contract requirements or every 6 months.
- Vendor accounts must be unique.
- Accounts used for remote maintenance must be kept in an inactive state except when needed, and activity must be monitored.
- Network Connectivity:
- Vendor connections must only be active when needed.
- Third-party network connections must terminate after 15 minutes of inactivity.
- Modem connectivity must be disconnected unless in use and also configured to terminate after 15 minutes of inactivity.
- Third-party networks are not allowed to permit Internet traffic or other private network traffic to flow into the City network.

- Authorization: Access to City information and systems must be approved in writing by the City Division Manager who hires the contractor/consultant.

### 3. Acquisition and Supply Chain Transparency

When the City acquires products or services, vendors must provide specific supply chain information to manage risk.

- Supply Chain Origins: Vendors are required to provide information regarding the chain of supply, including:
  - Product/service origin.
  - Product/service delivery methodology (identifying any foreign countries handling the product).
  - Product/service support origin.
- Personnel Assessment: Vendors must provide documentation confirming that their personnel have met the terms of the City's pre-employment personnel assessment processes.

### 4. Risk Management and Compliance

The City enforces a "trust but verify" approach to vendor management, integrating vendors into its risk management framework.

- Vetting and Inspection: Vendors are vetted to ensure compliance with acceptable Risk Management Frameworks (e.g., PCI, HIPAA). This process may include on-site visits for verification and auditing.
- Contractual Auditing Rights: Vendor contracts are reviewed to ensure mechanisms are in place to allow for auditing. If absent, these must be added as addendums.
- Remediation: Any security gaps identified must be addressed and remediated. Failure to fix grave security issues may result in fines, liability changes, or contract termination,.
- Physical Security of Data: If outside copying services are used for City documents, the original must be returned, and any spoils or overruns must be destroyed by the supplier.

### 5. Specific Data Handling Requirements

Certain types of data impose additional requirements on vendors.

- Mobility Data Specification (MDS): Vendors with access to the LADOT MDS System must sign a Master Data License and Protection Agreement. Access is strictly limited to

the minimum number of individuals necessary.

- Credit Card Data (PCI): Vendors must adhere to PCI requirements, and vendor accounts are prohibited from having remote access via modems unless specific security controls (timeout, activation only when needed) are in place.
- HIPAA: Vendors handling Personal Health Information (PHI) are subject to Business Associate Agreements and must align with HIPAA security rules regarding data protection and breach notification.

The acceptable certification level is ready.

**6. Is the City able to provide an estimated budget range or not-to-exceed amount for this project to help proposers right-size their proposed solutions?**

The City does not have a formal “not-to-exceed” dollar amount. The City will accept all proposals and evaluate the cost performance index of what the product can deliver and whether it significantly enhances the current operations of the Office of the City Clerk.

**7. Section 1.1.2 identifies several Granicus services currently in development, including the public portal, subscription services, updated voting system with speaker management, and public comment submission. For these in-development components:**

- a. Does the City retain ownership of any code, designs, or configurations being developed?**
- b. If the City selects a different vendor, should proposers assume these capabilities will need to be developed as part of the new solution's scope?**

- a. The City does not retain ownership of any code, designs or configurations being developed. However, the City does retain ownership of the data.
- b. Yes, if the City selects a different vendor, the proposer should assume these capabilities will need to be developed as part of the new solution’s scope.

**8. Does the City have any policies, preferences, or limitations regarding the use of artificial intelligence capabilities within the proposed solution (e.g., document search, transcription, accessibility features)?**

The City’s AI standard is Google Gemini; if the vendor uses another AI, we will need to get approval from our Information Technology Agency department.

**9. Will the evaluation process include product demonstrations or proof-of-concept requirements for shortlisted proposers?**

Yes, we will require product demonstrations and/or proof-of-concept demonstrations for proposers that make it past the first round of review.

**10. For the voting system requirements in Section 2.7 and the need to maintain accurate historical voting records, how does the City currently manage Council member roster data - including committee assignments, mid-term vacancies, and appointments to fill unexpired terms? Should the proposed solution include functionality to track these changes over time to ensure vote attribution accuracy, or will it integrate with an external source of record?**

In our current system, Councilmembers are manually added to our voting record database when there is a new Councilmember and manually disabled when a Councilmember's term ends. The current system is only a voting record for Council votes and is not used to track terms and vacancies. We currently do not track committee votes, but we would be interested in adding that feature in the future.

The proposed solution should include functionality to track Councilmember roster data and changes.

**11. Does the City conduct joint meetings where two or more committees meet together on shared agenda items? If so, should the proposed solution support joint meeting scenarios, including unified agenda creation, vote attribution across multiple bodies, and appropriate journal/record generation?**

Yes, the City does conduct joint meetings occasionally where two or more committees may meet together on shared agenda items. There is no requirement for a solution to support joint meeting scenarios, however, if a solution existed, it would be a benefit to the City. What is required is that the agenda creation process should be easily editable or customizable to create these occasional joint meeting agendas.

**12. Contract Terms / Negotiability**

*The RFP states that submission of a proposal constitutes agreement to the City's Standard Provisions, but it also references pre-award negotiations.*

**Can the City confirm whether proposers may submit contract exceptions or redlines and whether final contract terms are negotiable with the apparent successful proposer in good faith?**

The proposer may submit contract exceptions. After a proposal is submitted, there are contract negotiations before a contract is finalized.

### **13. Impact on Responsiveness / Evaluation**

**If a proposer identifies requested contractual exceptions, will that affect proposal responsiveness or evaluation scoring in any way?**

It may affect proposal evaluation.

### **14. List of Open and Pending Contracts**

***The Proposal Checklist requires a “List of Open and Pending Contracts.”***

**Can the City clarify the expected scope of this list and confirm whether a limited or high-level disclosure (e.g., public-sector contracts only or representative examples) is acceptable where full customer lists are confidential?**

Please provide the full list of all contracts with public entities, and all private contracts unless confidentiality is a term of the contract.