

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)  
FOR  
LEGISLATIVE DRAFTING AND INFORMATION SYSTEM  
DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SERVICE**  
**ANSWERS TO CONSOLIDATED QUESTIONS FROM PROSPECTIVE OFFEROR(S)\***

\*All questions are presented verbatim as provided by prospective Offeror(s).

1. *[RFP Page 13 Section (III)(A)] This section indicates that an Offeror may only submit one proposal for this RFP. Is it possible for an Offeror to propose a solution with multiple options for one or more components within its proposal?*

Offering multiple options for components within the same proposal would be satisfactory as long as the options are separately identifiable and can be separately delineated in the pricing.

2. *[RFP Page 13 Section (III)(C)] Can appendixes be added to the proposal that do not count towards the 40-page limit?*

Yes, provided that the appendices include information that is supplementary to or a more detailed description of what is available in the 40-page limit.

3. *[RFP Page 15, Section (IV)] The Scope of Work doesn't seem to include a redesign of the public facing website (<https://www.nmlegis.gov>). Can you confirm that the public facing website is out of scope?*

Yes, the website is out of scope. The plan is to maintain the current legislative website but use the data from the new application to automatically update the site. This will require an interface between the current site and the new application.

4. *[RFP Page 15, Section (IV)(A)] For the platform of the drafting application, does the LCS have preference of this being Microsoft Word-based or web-based?*

The LCS does not require a specific word processing application for the drafting application, so long as the platform provides the ability for continuity of service (on-premise application) in the event of a web outage and the rest of the legislative processes could still use a standard tool such as Microsoft Word. The new application will need to provide a means to incorporate the other appropriation bills, including the feed bill, the capital outlay bill and other general appropriation bills, into the same legislative document request and management system as other legislation.

5. *[RFP Page 16, Section (IV)(A)(1)(b)] Can you clarify what it means to check for consistency of substantive sections?*

The RFP provides that the drafting application would provide tools to assist drafters in the generation of title text, including a tool to check for consistency with substantive sections. For

example, the drafting application may include tools to assist drafters in ensuring the consistency of a title of a bill with its substantive sections by flagging substantive sections that are not referenced in the title, by flagging language in the title that does not appear in a substantive section of a bill or by flagging inconsistencies between the title and key words used in the section headings or the provisions of substantive sections. There would be no single approach to checking for consistency between the language in a bill title and the substantive provisions of the bill, and prospective Offerors could identify their own proposed approaches in providing such tools.

6. *[RFP Page 16, Section (IV)(A)(1)(b)] Can you clarify what it means to create outlines of legislation?*

The LCS wants to obtain the ability to create outlines for bills that allow for easy identification and navigation to specific parts of the bill. Each section would have displayed the action (e.g., amending/enacting/repealing), the heading of the section (or a description written by the drafter), page number and other useful information. Effective dates could also be incorporated into the outline. The Contractor may offer this as part of the user interface of the drafting application, but the LCS would also like the ability to extract the outline information to a separate document for use outside of the application.

7. *[RFP Page 22, Section (IV)(B)(8)] This section mentions "differentiating between two levels of sponsorship for publication on the website." What are the two levels of sponsorship? Looking at some bills through the public website, there didn't seem to be different sponsorship levels.*

The two levels of sponsorship are primary sponsor and co-sponsor. Primary sponsors are listed on the bill's home page. When clicking on the "sponsors" tab, the names of primary sponsors and co-sponsors appear. Members have a variety of reasons for selecting their level of sponsorship, and primary sponsors are contained in one database, while co-sponsors are entered into another one. All of that data is uploaded to the website. However, the "sponsors" tab does not differentiate between primary and co-sponsors. It would be helpful if it could.

8. *[RFP Page 23, Section (IV)(B)(10)(f)] The RFP says that the system will be tested in a legislative session prior to the completion of the contract. Is this indicating that New Mexico is planning on conducting a production parallel of the new system during a session before the new system is officially live?*

Because of time constraints during a legislative session, this will not be a complete parallel operation, but the new application will be tested as much as possible with live session data.

9. *[RFP Page 24, Section V] Item (2) of the evaluation factors says that the ability to perform the work in the required time frame is a factor for evaluation. What is the required time frame for the project?*

The required time frame is not specific but depends upon the time frames and completion times or dates for distinct deliverables identified by the Offeror and that would ultimately be

incorporated into and required pursuant to a contract. Demonstration of the Offeror's ability to meet deadlines for specific deliverables on similar projects within set time frames could help demonstrate an ability to perform the work in the required time frame.

10. *[RFP, Page 25, Section (VI)(B)] The section states that the total compensation shall not exceed the limit specified in the Contract. Section III.1.(e) of the RFP indicates that reasonable expenses would be reimbursed. Does the compensation limit in the Contract include or not include expenses?*

The LCS is looking for a total application cost, so any reimbursements for reasonable expenses should be included in the cost factors. Reasonable expenses may include reimbursement for necessary travel expenses, including airfare, meals and lodging. It would be preferable to include those reasonable expenses based on a total amount for all reasonable expenses per person per travel day or some similar basis that would avoid the necessity to require LCS staff review of individual travel-related receipts.

11. *[RFP, Page C2, Appendix C] The section states that proposed amendment instructions are not allowed to amend another adopted amendment. Does this mean that the new system does not need to support amendments to amendments (or 2<sup>nd</sup> degree amendments)?*

In general, yes. However, there are situations in which amendments are referenced by other amendments. For example, this kind of instruction will need to be allowed: "On page 6, line 14, after the period, and after House Appropriations and Finance Committee Amendment 7, insert "Amendment instructions are tricky."".

When amending the General Appropriation Act, another situation may arise in which an amendment is referenced by another amendment. Usually, the Senate Finance Committee strikes the entire bill and inserts a new bill as one voluminous amendment instruction. Any proposed amendment after the adoption of the committee report would amend the amendment, because otherwise the entire 200+ page bill would have to be stricken and rewritten with the proposed change included.

12. *[Survey and Mapping Report, Page 24, Section 2.3.2] From this section, it seems that floor amendments need to be drafted by LCS. Can you confirm that "handwritten" floor amendments (i.e., amendments directly from legislators that do not go through LCS) will not need to be supported by the new system?*

This is correct with respect to such amendments in "handwritten" format. Using the drafting system, the LCS exclusively would convert "handwritten" floor amendments into a typed format, so those amendments could be incorporated into the metadata for the bill after adoption.

13. *General Question:*

1. *Do these requirements need to be restated in the proposal response and answered where applicable?*

It is assumed this question is asking whether the requirements of the RFP need to be restated in the proposal response and answered where applicable. No restatement of requirements is necessary in a response to the RFP, so long as the requirements for proposal content and organization specified on pages 13 and 14 of the RFP are met.

*14. Proposal Response Format:*

*1. Besides what is stated, does the offeror have the freedom to respond to the scope of work in any manner desired or do the respective section(s) need to be restated and commentary offered as to how the scope of work will be achieved?*

Offerors have the freedom to respond to the scope of work in any manner, so long as the requirements for proposal content and organization listed on pages 13 and 14 of the RFP are met.

*15. Within IV. Scope of Work A. Legislative Drafting Components 1) Legislative Document Drafting Application b) Bills (6<sup>th</sup> paragraph)*

*1. What is meant by language generation add-ons?*

The LCS's current drafting application has several algorithms to create specialized language for legislation. Examples include repeal sections (which follow very strict rules and can be convoluted to write manually), appropriation sections and conversions of numbers into currency language (using specific LCS style). The LCS wants to be able create and modify these algorithms. The Contractor should provide for an easy method of allowing this kind of language generation and insertion into legislation while still maintaining the metadata correctly.

*16. Within IV. Scope of Work B. Legislator Information, Committee and Chamber Components 4) Calendar Creation Application*

*1. Does the offeror have to provide the real-time feature detailing the current calendar item and associated marketing to the website?*

The application should provide an interface for the current legislative website to read from the new application's data to create the calendars. Yes, the interface will need to work in real time to access the floor calendar and to allow the website to display the current floor calendar item (for third reading). The current website shows the current item for third reading and also marks the items that have already been heard.

*17. Within IV. Scope of Work B. Legislator Information, Committee and Chamber Components 10) Other Requirements a) Calendar and Legislative Day Manipulation*

*1. What is meant by the "applications will allow authorized users to manipulate calendar and legislative days?"*

As legislative days do not correspond to the calendar day, an authorized user will need to change the legislative day as the day is "rolled" by the particular chamber.

*18. What is the LCS's time line for implementation and deployment of the new system?*

Preferably, the time line would be no more than four years for the implementation and deployment of the entire new system. Distinct and sustainable parts of the system can be implemented and deployed earlier if they work with the existing system or with subparts of the new system.

*19. In our experience with modernization of legislative systems, the most successful projects apply Agile development methodologies throughout, which means taking an iterative approach to building and implementing new systems, as opposed to the high-risk "waterfall" or "big bang" approach. This can mean regular use of prototypes, pilots and proof of concept builds and iterative deployment to confirm the new technologies are the right fit for complex and tradition-rich legislative processes and rules.*

*Does the LCS have a preferred development methodology and implementation process?*

The LCS has no preferred development methodology and implementation process. The Offeror should feel free to identify and propose any development approach it deems appropriate.

*Would the LCS accept an Agile development approach?*

The Offeror should feel free to identify and propose any development approach it deems appropriate.

*What are the LCS's expectations regarding project management resources-both from the LCS and the Contractor-for the project?*

The LCS expects to have dedicated project management staff for LCS purposes and for coordination with the Contractor. The LCS expects the Contractor to have dedicated project management staff that is consistently available, specifically contractor staff with appropriate authority to act on behalf of the Contractor. The LCS would also provide year-round or session staff — subject matter experts (SME) — to be available for assistance, questions and training as time, sessions and workload permit.

*20. The New Mexico Legislature Survey and Mapping Project document states:*

*"There was a stated desire to move their drafting tools to Microsoft Word."*

*The document also makes a recommendation in 1.5.4 that the LCS "Introduce Drafting Tools in MS Word".*

*Thirdly, the document lists "Drafters, proofers and word processors have improved drafting capabilities with custom tools built on Microsoft Word." The document appears to strongly reflect a presumption that a Word-based solution would be a key success factor in a contractor's proposal.*

*Does the LCS have a preference for a drafting solution based on Microsoft Word? Would an XML-based drafting solution be less attractive?*

The Survey and Mapping Project document was created by an outside contractor based upon interviews with legislative staff. Their recommendations to use MS Word for the drafting application do not reflect the preference or non-preference of the LCS to other approaches that will meet its needs. An XML-based solution that acts like a word processor from the user point of view could be acceptable. The LCS desires to switch from a WordPerfect-based system to some other application that fully meets its needs.

*Does the LCS prefer an XML document in any stage or portion of the work process?*

The LCS is looking for an effective and user-friendly drafting tool that staff can utilize without extensive training and continuing support. The LCS will accept an application that uses XML if the application meets these ease-of-use requirements.

*21. The RFP requests that the contractor "will develop models for all types of legislation". The concept of a document model is also mentioned in other areas of the document.*

*What are the components of a "model"? We assume the model includes the rendering rules. Does it include structure and hierarchy of the document? Does it include semantic tagging, such as definitions and references?*

Each piece of legislation has multiple components that need to be modeled. There are also multiple types of sections. The structure of each component needs to be modeled and maintained in legislation. The LCS does not require semantic tagging, but that may be a useful tool to have.

*22. The RFP requests the drafting application ". . .prepare a set of session laws for delivery to the New Mexico Compilation Commission in a format that suits the commission's needs."*

*What format(s) does the Compilation Commission need? Is a standards-based document format, such as XML and/or Akoma Ntoso/LegalDocML desired?*

The New Mexico Compilation Commission uses MS Word as the source for its publishing.

*23. The RFP requires metadata to be associated with whole documents and with portions of documents (e.g. sections and amendment instructions).*

*Does the LCS envision that this metadata will exist within the documents, or in a separate external database? If the metadata is to be in a document, which format does it need to be in?*

There are probably two different sets of metadata. One set of metadata that is associated with the document and changes to the document should be contained within the document. The other set of metadata that is related to actions within the legislative process may or may not be contained in the document depending upon the application. The format of the metadata and document will be determined by the Contractor, but both sets of metadata should be easily accessible. The important factor here is that there are many requirements for interfacing with the metadata.

*24. Will the LCS allow specific COTS legislative software products to be offered by multiple prime contractors (such as Word or other legislative drafting COTS) products?*

The LCS is open to any solution that meets its needs. The basic requirement here is that the application is fully integrated and that the prime contractor is fully responsible for the entire application and all of its components.

*25. In turn, will the LCS allow a proposal from a prime contractor that offers multiple options for COTS software solutions, allowing the LCS to the ability to choose the most appropriate tools for the modernization effort?*

Yes. The basic requirement here is that the application is fully integrated and that the prime contractor is fully responsible for the entire application and all of its components.

*26. Does the LCS have a preference for a desktop, online, browser-based or hybrid solution for drafting?*

No, but the architecture should contemplate factors such as ease of use, compatibility, maintainability, cost, system and data security, etc.

*27. Does the LCS have any preference for an on-premises or cloud-based solution? We understand the legislative database, if cloud-based, must maintain a "local" copy in the event of internet access interruption.*

There is no preference, so long as business continuity is assured in the event internet access is interrupted.

*28. Does the LCS envision conversion of all 30,000 sections of law and other legislative materials all at once or would it anticipate a phased approach over time?*

The LCS envisions that the conversion of law, constitutional and rules sections would need to be completed prior to the system going live. Whether the prospective Offeror's approach would convert the sections of law all at once or over time (e.g., while the application is being developed) would be identified by the prospective Offeror in the RFP response.