



November 7, 2025

**Addendum #1
RP034-25**

The due date has changed. Proposals Should Be Received By: 2:50 pm on November 19, 2025.

Attachment:

Please see the attached updated version of Exhibit B that should export/print more smoothly for inclusion with proposals.

Questions:

- Q1. Please provide technical details about the existing audio feed – such as format (analog or digital), output type (balanced/unbalanced), and available interfaces (XLR, 3.5mm, USB, IP-based, etc.).
- A1. Technical details: analog, balanced, XLR, and 3.5mm**
- Q2. Should the live stream be embedded directly on the County's website, or linked via an external streaming platform (e.g., YouTube, Vimeo, etc.)?
- A2. Provide embedded live stream player. Separate feeds are sent to FB Live and YouTube.**
- Q3. Are there any specific security or access control requirements for the public live stream (e.g., HTTPS, viewer authentication, IP restrictions, or content archiving)?
- A3. Below are specific security or access control requirements directly related to public live stream. Additional generic security and compatibility requirements are outlined in the Functional Requirements and Security Purchasing Guidelines within the solicitation.**
- **HTTPS – General requirement for all SaaS solutions.**
 - **Viewer authentication – Citizens will most likely need anonymous access to view the stream. For County employee integrations and interactions listed on Page 6, an Entra Enterprise App Registration would be preferred.**
 - **IP restrictions – The County website is available worldwide, outside of the hostile nation list (CN, IR, KP, RU)**
 - **Content archiving – The solution needs to support the County's ability to define and administer retention business rules based on County policy and other policies to which the County is required to comply.**
- Q4. Please provide details on the current cablehead system – manufacturer, model, and interface specifications – to confirm compatibility.
- A4. Cable headend: Tightrope Media Systems – Cablecast VIO 4+ with REFLECT. TriCaster Vizion is the live production solution for live BOC and other meetings originating from the auditorium. The output of the TriCaster feeds the headend for cablecast and current live streaming platforms.**
- Q5. Is the County expecting simultaneous streaming to both the website and the cable channel, or should the solution send the stream to cablehead, which then handles broadcast distribution?
- A5. The output of the TriCaster system feeds the cablehead. The headend distributes for broadcast.**

Q6. Are there any specific protocols or formats (e.g., RTMP, MPEG-TS, HLS) that must be supported for integration with the cablehead?

A6. The TriCaster outputs supported formats for live streaming.

Q7. Please clarify what specific social media platforms the County expects integration with (e.g., Facebook, X/Twitter, YouTube, Instagram, LinkedIn).

A7. The County does not anticipate any direct integration with social media platforms. At most, links may occasionally be shared onto the social media pages. The County does have a social media presence on several outlets such as X, YouTube, Instagram, and LinkedIn. Visit the County website at www.GwinnettCounty.com to understand the specific social media presence.

Q8. What types of content should be supported for posting – for example, text updates, live video clips, meeting links, or automatic status messages?

A8. Meeting Links.

Q9. Should the system allow automatic posting (e.g., start of meeting, agenda updates) or require manual approval by a designated user before posting?

A9. Manual approval by a designated user(s) is required.

Q10. Does the County have existing social media management policies or accounts that the proposed system must use (e.g., official County handles)?

A10. The County has presence on Facebook, Instagram, X, YouTube, and LinkedIn. The standard handle for the Gwinnett County Government pages is @GwinnettGov. The County does not currently integrate any of these social media platforms with the agenda management software and doesn't anticipate doing so.

Q11. Are there any security or audit requirements – such as logging all posts made during a meeting for record-keeping or compliance purposes?

A11. Cybersecurity would get what they need through the Single Sign On (SSO) integration. Documents and other artifacts would need to be kept according to the retention rules that the County should be able to configure with the proposed solution.

Q12. Could the County confirm if the mobile application to embed or integrate with Skype, or is integration with other video conferencing platforms (e.g., Microsoft Teams, Zoom, Webex) acceptable?

A12. The current solution does not contain a mobile application so no specific requirements about one being embedded with a video conferencing platform have been included. That said, the County currently uses Webex and Teams as the main platforms. Some departments also use Zoom.

Q13. Is the County currently using a specific platform for remote participation, or should vendors propose their own integrated streaming/video conferencing solution?

A13. Service providers should propose their own integrated steaming/video. The County may opt to continue to use the one they are currently using for which requirements to interface are included within the solicitation.

- Q14. Should the mobile app provide real-time two-way audio and video, or is one-way streaming (view-only for public participants) sufficient for remote BOC members?
- A14. One-way streaming (vie only for public participants) is acceptable. Responding service providers are encouraged to share a description of the mobile application and its functionality within the response to the request for proposal where questions and requirements about the mobile application options are posed.**
- Q15. Should remote participants raise hands, request to speak, or chat within the app, like standard virtual meeting platforms?
- A15. The County does not offer remote participants from the general public (i.e. residents).**
- Q16. Should the voting be real-time and synchronized with the ongoing meeting session?
- A16. That is not currently how the County does business but is open to this feature should leadership decide to go in that direction.**
- Q17. Does the requirement to strip or flatten comments from attachments apply only to Microsoft Word files, or also to PDFs and other formats with annotations?
- A17. Both MS Word and PDF would be preferred. The responding service provider should outline what types of files and use cases are supported.**
- Q18. Should the system maintain an internal copy of the original (unflattened) documents for internal reference or version control before stripping comments?
- A18. The ability to maintain the original and have version control is preferred. The responding service provider should outline what types of files and use cases are supported.**
- Q19. Should the system automatically archive or replace older agenda templates beyond the last five years, or should users manage them manually?
- A19. The user should have the opportunity to manage the templates created. Logic can prompt for automatic replacement, but admin users or owners should have the ability to overwrite that automatic replacement. All Agenda items that had action taken by the Board of Commissioners are permanent records and CANNOT be modified.**
- Q20. Should the agenda templates support auto-population of fields from the case data (like owner info, case number, date), or are they static document layouts?
- A20. Assuming "case" refers to agenda item. Auto population options would be preferred, but users should have the option to overwrite the auto-populated content.**
- Q21. What document formats are expected for templates – e.g., Word, PDF, HTML, or system-defined form templates?
- A21. Generally used formats are expected such as MS Word, PDF, Excel, and HTML. The County wants to understand what formats the responding service providers can provide.**
- Q22. Should the initials-based field-level validation apply to all fields or only to specific critical fields (e.g., financial, legal, or owner-related fields)?
- A22. The current agenda management solution utilizes signature fields, to approve agenda items based on a user's role and on specific tabs based off certain roles.**

- Q23. Should the initials confirmation work independently or integrate with the existing digital signature or e-signature process?
- A23. Both options are acceptable. The County currently uses Adobe Sign and DocuSign for internal signature. DocuSign is used for external and legally binding signature capture.**
- Q24. Should users be able to view all past and current agenda items over which that person had authority, or only the agenda items currently active in that user's workflow step?
- A24. Both.**
- Q25. Should administrators be able to configure and modify role-based visibility rules through the user interface (e.g., defining which roles can see which workflow stages), or will this be managed through backend configuration?
- A25. Setting roles and permissions through a user interface is preferred – assuming access to the interface can also be controlled as to who can access it.**
- Q26. Should the workflow bypass apply only to board appointment agenda items, or to any type of agenda item the Clerk creates?
- A26. Workflow bypass should be made available to any agenda item type, but only available as an option for users and administrators assigned that level of authority. In addition, the current solution does not allow users who create agenda items to bypass all workflow queues. This is only allowed by the Clerk's office users. The ability to support these restrictions is a requirement of the new solution.**
- Q27. Should only users with the "Clerk" role have the workflow bypass privilege, or should it be configurable so that an admin can assign this bypass right to other roles as well?
- A27. Workflow bypass should be made available to any agenda item type, but only available as an option for users and administrators assigned that level of authority. In addition, the current solution do not allow users who create agenda items to bypass all workflow queues. This is only allowed by the Clerk's office users. The ability to support these restrictions is a requirement of the new solution.**
- Q28. Please confirm whether Accela provides API endpoints or web services for two-way data synchronization.
- A28. Accela does provide standard APIs for a variety of needs. For Data Synchronization needs, depending on the product in question yes, the County can go batch process route, file base Imports to achieve data-synch.**
- Q29. Kindly clarify the specific data elements that need to be shared between the agenda system and Accela (e.g., case number, applicant name, decision status, attached documents).
- A29. Agenda Item number and attached documents. As the business needs change additional fields should be able to passed between Accela and the proposed agenda management solution.**
- Q30. Please confirm whether updates made in the agenda system (e.g., decision outcomes) should be automatically pushed back to Accela in real time or through scheduled synchronization.
- A30. Accela Imports. The current solution and workflows do not push anything to Accela. Accela APIs can be used for real time data push or scheduled batch jobs.**

Q31. Kindly clarify Azure B2C integration is intended for external users or citizens accessing limited features, and which functionalities should remain publicly accessible without authentication.

A31. The ability to create and manage Agenda items and packets is internal facing and should only be available to authorized County employee users. Meeting information and posted artifacts should be accessible without authentication. What is available to the public should be configurable and controllable by County authorized users.

Q32. Please confirm if both County Active Directory and Azure B2C users should be supported through a unified login experience or separate access portals, and whether Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) policies differ between internal and external user types.

A32. The County requires support for both County Active Directory (AD) and Azure B2C authentication within the Agenda Management Solution.

The preferred approach is a unified login experience that allows both internal (County AD/Azure AD) and external (Azure B2C) users to access the system through a single, secure entry point while maintaining distinct identity governance.

- **Internal Users (County staff, elected officials, and board members) will authenticate via County AD, synchronized with Azure AD.**
- **External Users (citizens) may browse public information without logging in. When participation or submission of information is required (e.g., comments, requests, or forms), they will authenticate via Azure B2C for secure access.**
- **MFA enforcement will differ by user type:**
 - **Internal Users: Managed through County's Azure AD Conditional Access policies.**
 - **External Users: Enforced through Azure B2C custom MFA policies (e.g., email OTP).**

Alternatively, the County will consider proposals supporting separate access portals if the service provider determines this provides stronger security or architectural benefits:

- **Internal Users: Access through a secure internal portal within the County network or VPN and authenticated via County AD/Azure AD.**
- **External Users: Access through a public portal (browsing without login, authentication via Azure B2C when interaction is required).**

External viewers of the Public Meetings can access the recordings and posted materials (view only) through the publicly available website (GwinnettCounty.com) without having to login to the system. The URLs are included in the request for proposal. An example of one such URL is : [Public Meetings - Gwinnett | Gwinnett County](#). Another such informative page that is publicly available is: [Commission Meeting Videos - Gwinnett | Gwinnett County](#).

Q33. Please confirm whether the County's Laserfiche environment supports API-based integration and if relevant repository endpoints and credentials will be made available.

A33. Currently only one department is using Laserfiche. This use does not extend to scanning related to Agenda Management. The County uses Kofax Capture for scanning documents into FileNet – where the majority of the current Agenda Management Solution resides.

Q34. Kindly specify the Laserfiche version and deployment type (e.g., Laserfiche Cloud or on-premises) to ensure compatibility with our proposed integration approach.

A34. Laserfiche is not used for scanning the documents into the current Agenda Management System. The County uses Kofax Capture.

- **Version – 11.1.1.0.0.687**
- **Deployment type (i.e. Cloud, on-prem?) – On Prem**
- **Need # of current users – 60**

Q35. Is the County looking to partner with the awarded service provider in managing the video production and running the cameras?

A35. No, this is not something the County is interested in at this time.

Q36. How many cameras does the County have in the current meeting room? Is there any desire to replace these cameras?

A36. Six. No need to be replaced.

Q37. Does the County need English and Spanish captions?

A37. Having the option for multiple language captioning would be a plus, but not required.

Q38. How many unique meeting bodies (committees, boards or commissions) will be using the system?

A38. Currently there are two unique meeting boards (Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners).

Q39. Would the County like for residents to digitally submit requests to speak and add comments to a published agenda.

A39. No – residents who wish to speak are required to appear in person.

Q40. How many total users will the County have?

A40. 300.

Q41. How many users does the County plan to train as drafters?

A41. 150 – Assuming “drafters” refer to users who need Agenda creation capabilities.

Q42. How many users does the County plan to train as approvers?

A42. 55 – assuming agenda “approvers” refers to those who are adding a signature on a form for approval.

Q43. How many users does the County plan to train as agenda coordinators?

A43. Eight.

Q44. How many users does the County plan to train as minutes processors?

A44. Eight.

Q45. How many users does the County plan to train as system administrators?

**A45. IT System Administrator – Three.
End-User Administrator – Five.**

RP034-25
Addendum 1
Page 7

This addendum should be signed in the space provided in the original solicitation and returned with your quote. Failure to do so may result in your quote being deemed non-responsive.

Sincerely,

Bethany White
Purchasing Associate II