



RFP 060B7400059 Meeting Live Streaming and Hosting Services
Amendment #3
May 10, 2017

This amendment is being published to provide answers to questions. Reminder: the due date was extended in Amendment #2.

Proposals will be due on Monday, June 5, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.

You must acknowledge any amendments to the RFP and submit the acknowledgement with your proposal. Please return page 4 with your submission.

Thank you.

June Dwyer
Procurement Officer

060B7400059 Meeting Live Streaming and Hosting
Questions submitted

3.4 Services

(E) Service shall utilize e-mail contacts in existing State e-mail systems, including Google and Microsoft products (e.g., Exchange, MDS 365) for meeting scheduling, hosting, and participation.

What access to state e-mail systems will be provided to contractor? Is there any uniformity or a finite list of systems used by the state?

Answer: The Contractor will not have access to the State's email system.

3.4.3.4

Latency – fine for RTMP but appears to conflict with requirements of no Flash.

See technical performance requirements at **3.4.3.7**. Looks like CISCO telepresence requirements. **This CISCO standard is applicable to video conferencing units only and NOT to live video streaming.** To be clear, if the standard is retained in this RFP, it should apply only to video conferencing components of the RFP and not to live streaming. Or it should be made clear the vendor is to develop such live streaming technology (none currently exists outside of the teleconferencing realm) for point-to-multipoint live streaming.

Answer: Cisco was referenced in this section as an example only.

3.4.4.3

Please clarify. I believe this is supposed to say the service will function *with* as opposed to on. Given the lack of specificity of actual equipment to be made compatible, this section should probably be stricken. Or specifics on equipment brands and configurations should be given to provide prospective bidders adequate information to bid.

Answer: Offerors are to provide the level of information appropriate for the state to determine the Offeror's general capability. The solution should be as widely compatible as possible and require limited or no specific equipment for an Agency to use the service.

3.4.4.6

“Any closed captioning or other visual support shall not be placed over the top of the video.” Closed captions by definition appear on top of the video, but can be turned on or off by the end user. Does the state require this? Is captioned text acceptable (there is a separate text box that plays underneath the video). This restriction seems to ban open captions, where video is not embedded in the video file as data, but instead “burned into” the video, thus permanently displayed over the video content.

The Offeror should propose the solution that best meets the requirements for accessibility without sacrificing the viewing capability of any portion of the video. There is not a state requirement for where this should be placed and is not intended to ban open captions if an Agency prefers that option. There may be other ways to meet the requirements that can be proposed in your solution.

Are you looking for a "one to many" live streaming tool purposed for large scale broadcasting? As opposed to a highly interactive web/video conferencing tool.

The State is looking for a tool that allows many individuals to view a video feed from a meeting, with no interactivity coming back from the users. If this can be met with a highly interactive web video conferencing tool, then the state will consider it.



RFP 060B7400059
Amendment #3

Amendment Acknowledgement

Received By: _____
(Print Name)

Signature _____ Date _____

Vendor _____

Telephone No. _____ Email: _____