

---



---

## MEMORANDUM

---



---

**TO:** PHILIP A. KIRALY, ASSISTANT VILLAGE MANAGER  
**FROM:** KENDAL E. DEAN, MANAGEMENT ANALYST  
**DATE:** FEBRUARY 5, 2010  
**SUBJECT:** **WEB STREAMING & AGENDA MANAGEMENT- COST ANALYSIS**

At the October 20, 2009, Communications and Legislation meeting, the Committee determined that web streaming and agenda management services were important Village initiatives and should be explored for implementation simultaneously. Staff was directed to conduct further research on the agenda management capabilities of two of the three companies that presented their web streaming product to the Committee in September, Granicus and IQM2. The third provider, PEG Central, does not offer a compatible agenda management solution at this time. During the interim, staff was approached by a fourth provider, ClerkBase. Information on the platform offered by this company is included below.

Following is a cost breakdown of the IQM2, Granicus and ClerkBase products in comparison to current Village practice. Please note that this costing has been prepared in regards to only one meeting group (Village Board of Trustees).

|   | <b>IQM2</b>        | <b>GRANICUS/MCCi</b>            | <b>CLERKBASE</b>   | <b>CURRENT VILLAGE PRACTICE*</b> |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Up-Front: Implementation</b>                           | \$16,000.00        | \$47,522.81                     | \$3,500.00         | NA                               |
| <b>Monthly</b>  | \$1,260.00         | \$1,045.20/NA                   | \$1,149.00         | \$486.24 - \$607.80              |
| <b>Other</b>  | NA                 | \$2,000.00<br>(travel, maximum) | **\$1,513.75       | NA                               |
| <b>TOTAL: First Year<br/>(implementation + full year)</b> | <b>\$31,120.00</b> | <b>\$62,065.21</b>              | <b>\$18,808.75</b> | <b>NA</b>                        |
| <b>TOTAL: Annual<br/>(after implementation)</b>           | <b>\$15,120.00</b> | <b>\$25,109.40</b>              | <b>\$13,795.00</b> | <b>\$5,834.88 - \$7,293.60</b>   |

*\*In the above cost breakdowns, it is important to note that the current village practice includes only agenda packet creation. This cost cannot be wholly compared to the costs from ClerkBase, Granicus/MCCi and IQM2 as they are quoting for web streaming capabilities as well. Also, it should be noted that any solution from these vendors will not completely remove the staffing costs, only reallocate them.*

*\*\* Approximate cost of suggested PC with encoder for video streaming.*

### **IQM2 – INTELLIGENT MEETING MANAGEMENT ([www.igq2.com](http://www.igq2.com))**

IQM2 offers a full-process solution that allows for meeting management technologies teamed with web-streaming. This solution, M2 Suite™, is both user-friendly and customizable. The Professional Edition provides for web-streaming, agenda and minutes creation, as well as a complete coordination amongst media and documents. The product also includes a comprehensive workflow and tracking process.

As noted in the October 15, 2009 memo (attached): no communities in this area currently use IQM2. Staff contacted East Hampton and Southampton, New York, who both currently utilize this product.

Representatives from these towns indicate the product is easy to use; allows for smooth and effective streaming; provides the ability to customize; and requires little staff time.

**GRANICUS** ([www.granicus.com](http://www.granicus.com))

Granicus specializes in web-based video streaming live and on-demand, and its product is designed almost exclusively for government use. While Granicus has some agenda management functionality, they currently do not offer a comprehensive agenda creation/management solution. Most often, Granicus will work with the municipality and an automated agenda provider to create a workflow between agenda management and Granicus' public access tools.

Granicus connected the Village with **MCCi (a division of the Municipal Code Corporation)**, one of their partner providers, to discuss Legistar. The Legistar software allows users to draft an agenda, route it for approval, and track the agenda workflow.

As noted in the October 15, 2009 memo (attached): The Granicus product is used locally by both Highland Park and Glenview. Highland Park finds the product easy to use and manage. Glenview staff that work with the product believe it to be slightly cumbersome. Cost of the product was listed as a negative by both municipalities.

**CLERKBASE** ([www.clerkbase.com](http://www.clerkbase.com))

ClerkBase, a division of CompBase, provides an e-publishing solution for agendas and minutes in conjunction with live and on-demand video streaming of meetings. The ClerkBase product is used primarily on the East Coast and not currently in Illinois.

With this solution, staff would still continue to prepare the agenda items and corresponding attachments in a Word based format. These documents would be forwarded on to ClerkBase to configure and post on the created client site. The search feature is robust and provides for easy document retrieval. Staff believes that workflow management would not be improved as agenda items would still be collected in the existing manner. The only real change appears to be in who is posting the information to the website; this aspect requires the least amount of staff time in the current Village practice.

As stated, the company also provides capabilities for live and on-demand video streaming of meetings. In this medium, the Clerk or recorder can take minutes along with the respective agenda item as it is being filmed. After the meeting, the various video segments are juxtaposed with the respective agenda item on the client site by ClerkBase staff.

**CURRENT VILLAGE PRACTICE**

The Village's current practice does require a good deal of staff time. At a minimum, 8 to 10 hours are spent during the week prior to a Board meeting preparing the agenda packets for Regular Board Meetings as well as Committees of the Whole. Assuming that there are at least two meetings per month, a minimum of 192 to 240 hours a year are spent on agenda workflow (approvals) and packet preparation in various departments. While we have provided an estimate to the number of hours spent by staff on agenda creation, this is only a rough number. There can be no absolute number because each agenda and agenda item is different, requiring a varied amount of time and effort.

It is important to note that while implementing any of these products will allow for the reallocation of staff hours currently spent on agenda management to other tasks, this is not necessarily a cost savings. Accountability can be improved by utilizing an automated system, allowing staff in General Government to keep track of who has reviewed items.

## **CONCLUSION**

If the Board is so inclined to move forward with this initiative, of the options presented, staff would recommend the purchase of IQM2's M2 Suite™. IQM2 is a one-stop shop, providing a product that is focused on the entire meeting process. As noted by the municipalities that currently utilize IQM2, the company is extremely flexible and works to create a solution that is adapted to the end users' needs. Working with multiple vendors, as would be the case with Granicus, could prove to be burdensome especially when technical issues arise. Staff believes ClerkBase replicates the status quo with exception to who posts the items on the website and does not offer workflow management.

Funds for this project are not currently allocated in the 2009/10 Fiscal Year. If the Board is interested in moving forward, staff would recommend budgeting this item in the next fiscal year and beginning the process sometime around May 1. If the Board chooses to move forward with these systems this year, a funding source would need to be identified.

Staff will be present at the February 9, 2010 Communications and Legislation meeting to answer any questions.

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

**TO:** Phil Kiraly, Assistant Village Manager

**FROM:** Cheryl Fayne-DePersio, Communications Manager  
Casey Ligas, IT Network Administrator  
Dan Kaup, Assistant to the Village Manager

**DATE:** October 15, 2009

**RE:** Video Streaming/Agenda Management

---

The Village Board recently requested that staff research video streaming technologies to broadcast Board and Plan Commission meetings on the Village's website. The following analysis covers two types of services; the first is video streaming and the second is agenda management. Neither of these items are included in the current fiscal year's budget.

**VIDEO STREAMING**

Three trustees, along with staff participated in several demonstrations of video streaming products. These include PEG Central, Granicus and IQM2, all companies that specialize in streaming public meetings to the web. These are detailed below:

1. PEG Central: PEG Central is an accompanying product for our Leightronix Ultra Nexus video switcher (used to record our meetings currently) that would allow for on-demand streaming on the Internet. The company is planning to offer a live-streaming option at some time in the future, but does not offer that option now. This product provides relatively little archiving capability; video files cannot be annotated with bookmarks (making it difficult for the viewer to find a particular item from a meeting without watching the entire meeting); and it is very new to the market. However, it is relatively expensive and offers an opportunity to further utilize our existing equipment.
2. Granicus: Granicus specializes in live and on-demand web-based video streaming, and its product is designed almost exclusively for government use. It is the most widely used web streaming product available and both Highland Park and Glenview (among other Illinois communities) utilize this product. Both have been very positive about their experiences with the product. Cost and technology glitches were mentioned as drawbacks for this product.
3. IQM2: IQM2 is a streaming product that looks and acts like a Microsoft program, and like Granicus, is designed almost exclusively for government use. IQM2 offers both on-demand and live video streaming. While no communities in this area currently use IQM2, staff contacted East Hampton and Southampton, New York, who both currently utilize this product. Representatives from these towns had very positive comments, and recommend it highly. Some of the positives include ease of use; smooth and effective streaming; and ability to customize in addition to relatively low staff time requirements. Cost is also somewhat of a drawback for this item.

Streaming is something that could be implemented with relative ease and at a relatively low cost almost immediately. However, there are some items to consider, such as timing a roll out with the Village's new website, long-term usage, and the product's ability to provide the greatest ease of use to the residents who will be viewing the online video. Also, as will be explained below, if the product is able to interact with

agenda management software, it will provide better access to all agenda documents along with the video feed.

### **AGENDA MANAGEMENT**

Staff has been researching modifying the current process of developing of Board agendas. Current processes are cumbersome and time consuming. To that end, a product that would link agenda management to the streaming methods described above would be an ideal solution in that viewers of the streaming product would be able to interact with the agenda and various agenda items while viewing the video. Both Granicus and IQM2 offer agenda management solutions, however, PEG Central does not.

Agenda management makes sense for a number of reasons. It clarifies internal roles and responsibilities related to staff development of Board action items; it provides agenda packets that are easy for the public to understand; and lessens the staff time necessary to develop and distribute (both in paper copy and electronically) the agenda packets themselves.

Staff is very interested in teaming one of the above streaming options to an agenda management system.

### **CONCLUSION**

At the October 20, 2009 Communications and Legislation Meeting, the Committee should consider the following questions:

- 1. Even though this expenditure is not currently budgeted in the FY 2009/10 budget, is web streaming an initiative that should be undertaken at this time?**
- 2. Does the Committee believe that agenda management warrants additional study, and if so, should it be launched together with web streaming?**
- 3. Given that the Village will be undertaking a redesign of its website, should streaming be rolled out in advance of a new website or in conjunction with the new site?**

Once staff receives additional feedback from the Board, we can present more detailed cost analysis of the both options. We will be present at the October 20 meeting to answer any questions that might arise.