

City of Boston

Commonwealth Citizens Connect RFP

RFP #DOIT090412

www.cityofboston.gov PHONE 617.635.4783 FAX 617.263.3035

Boston City Hall, Room 703, One City Hall Plaza
Boston, Massachusetts 02201



Table of Contents

- 1. Overview 3
 - 1.1. Summary 3
 - 1.2. The Mobile App..... 3
 - 1.3. The Router 4
 - 1.4. The WOM System / Open311 Adapter 5
 - 1.5. Submission Requirements 6
 - 1.6. Important Things to Know 6
 - 1.7. Timeline 6
 - 1.8. Submission Address 6
 - 1.9. Contact Information 6
- 2. Architecture..... 7
 - 2.1. Mobile App communication with the Router 7
 - 2.2. Mobile app communication with the WOM / Open311 Endpoint 7
 - 2.3. Router communication with the WOM / Open311 Endpoint 7
- 3. Mobile App Technical Evaluation Criteria 9
 - 3.1. Technical Merit 9
 - 3.2. Experience 10
- 4. Router Technical Evaluation Criteria 11
 - 4.1. Technical Merit 11
 - 4.2. Experience 12
- 5. Work Order Management System / Open311 Adapter Technical Evaluation Criteria 13
 - 5.1. Technical Merit 13
 - 5.2. Experience 14
- 6. Pricing 15
 - 6.1. Instructions for completing the Pricing Spreadsheet..... 15
 - 6.2. Definitions 15
 - 6.3. Pricing Spreadsheet 16
 - 6.4. Pricing Samples 16
 - 6.5. Bundling..... 16
 - 6.6. Total Price..... 16

- 7. Submission Requirements..... 17
 - 7.1. The Minimum Requirement Check List 18
 - 7.2. Summary Letter 19
 - 7.3. Organization Identification..... 19
 - 7.4. Legal & Financial Information..... 19
 - 7.5. A Description of Your Proposed Solutions..... 19
 - 7.6. Contact Information for 3 References 20
 - 7.7. Completed Attachments 20
 - 7.8. A Price Proposal 20
 - 7.9. Separate Submission Requirement..... 20
- 8. Important Things to Know 22
 - 8.1. Questions About The RFP 22
 - 8.2. Changes or Additions to the RFP 22
 - 8.3. Disclosing Who Bid 22
 - 8.4. Offeror Interviews..... 23
 - 8.5. Offeror Selection Process 23
 - 8.6. Contracting Timeline 23
 - 8.7. Contracting Language..... 23
 - 8.8. Contract Term..... 23
 - 8.9. No Obligation to Proceed 24

1. Overview

1.1. Summary

The City of Boston, through a Commonwealth of Massachusetts Community Innovation Challenge (CIC) Grant, is supporting the development of a suite of applications that work across municipalities that allows individuals to report basic problems, such as potholes, directly to the appropriate local government.

This suite is composed of three components: (1) the mobile app; (2) the router that allows that app to report cases across municipalities; (3) the work order management system / Open311 adapter that allows local governments to respond to requests made through the mobile app. These components are described in detail below, and the relationship between them is described in Section 2 of the RFP.

Based on the quality and cost represented in the responsive submissions, the City of Boston may elect to select separate vendors for any of the three components or more than one vendor for any or all components. Vendors who believe they have a quality solution for any one of the components are strongly encouraged to submit.

Through this grant, we intend to support up to thirty (30) Massachusetts' cities & towns use of this system for up to the next three (3) years. This includes five (5) municipalities by the end of calendar year 2012 and twenty (20) to twenty-five (25) additional municipalities by the end of the first quarter of calendar year 2013. To the extent of available grant funds, participating Massachusetts cities and towns will be able to use these products at no cost to them, under the terms of this RFP. Cities and towns must comply with Massachusetts procurement law as well as their own local rules, and may add local contractual requirements. The City of Boston shall not be a party to any agreement between a contractor and a city or town and each city or town will be required to sign a participation agreement with the City of Boston acknowledging same.

For more background information on the organizations involved in this effort, visit:

- www.cityofboston.gov
- www.mass.gov/anf/budget-taxes-and-procurement/working-for-you/community-innovation-challenge-grant/

The budget for this project is \$300,000 of the grant available for the scope of work described in this RFP. This amount will cover costs for all three components described in this RFP for up to three years. The final number of Massachusetts municipalities included in this project will be determined by the fixed cost of each component, and the per municipality costs of the mobile app and WOM / Open311 adapter. Lower costs per component and per municipality will allow this project to include more Massachusetts municipalities, and extend the positive impact of this project.

1.2. The Mobile App

We are looking for an app that meets four main criteria.

1. *App Functionality*

The app should allow a resident to submit a description, photograph and location of a service request (SR) to a local government. The app should show the tracking number for that SR and contact details from that relevant municipality. The app should show the status of that SR (e.g., the case is open or closed.)

2. *App Integration*

The app should be able to integrate with two types of services: a Massachusetts-wide router and an Open311 GeoReport v2-compliant (Open311) endpoint. When a user reports a SR through the app, the router directs the app to the geographically appropriate Open311 GeoReport v2-compliant (Open311) endpoint. The Open311 endpoint connects to a work order management (WOM) system, and brokers all communications between them.

3. *App Look & Feel*

We want municipalities to have the opportunity to customize the app so that, when you are reporting an SR to a particular municipality, the user knows that she or he is connecting with that municipality. Consequently, the look & feel of this app should support dynamic branding (i.e. the branding of the app should change on the fly to represent the branding of the municipality receiving the SR)

The intent of this effort is to draw a closer connection between the public and the public sector. Any response that features an app that is heavily branded as a 3rd party intermediary will not be seen as advantageous.

4. *App Platforms*

This app should work on smartphones that leverage iOS and the Android operating system. Preference will be given to those that also operate well on other platforms.

The criteria each response will be evaluated by for the app component is outlined in detail in [Section 3](#).

1.3. The Router

The router is the component that tells the mobile app which Open311 endpoint to contact. This router will be similar to previous efforts such as GeoWebDNS (http://wiki.open311.org/GeoWeb_DNS) or LoST (<http://lost.cs.columbia.edu>).

Additionally, we view this router as a potential platform to allow for discovery of and connection to municipal services beyond both the current scope (participating municipalities in Massachusetts) and duration (3 years) of this grant. The following criteria are intended to ensure that this component is an open platform that is of enduring value to developers.

1. *Location-based Routing*

The router should be able to respond quickly to calls from any app and connect that app to the appropriate Open311 endpoint. The router must contain a geo-coded list of Open311

endpoints. The app will report a location, and the router will respond with the appropriate Open311 endpoint(s) that match that location.

2. *Open Sourced & Separate*

To ensure that this router is available for developers, the code and all components of the router should be open source software.

3. *API Key Management*

To make this router a convenient discovery tool for municipal APIs, there should be an API Key management platform as part of the router. Developers should be able to register for a key, and that key should automatically be available to any municipality using this system.

The criteria for each response will be evaluated for the router component as outlined in detail in [Section 4](#).

1.4. The WOM System / Open311 Adapter

This component serves three purposes that are dependent upon the needs of the participating municipality: it provides a light WOM tool for municipalities that do not already use a WOM system; it provides an Open311 endpoint to the public, and it can serve as a general integration point for municipalities that operate an existing WOM system.

1. *Service Request Management*

For municipalities that do not have WOM systems, we want to provide a lightweight tool that allows them to manage the cases. At a minimum, the system should allow the municipality to see SR's on a map, filter/group them by type, and allow them to set the status of the SR (open, closed, pending, etc.).

2. *Open311 Endpoint*

This system will serve as the public Open311 endpoint for the municipality. This endpoint must be 100% compliant with the Open311 GeoReport v2 specification. This system must also allow the municipality to configure the Open311 endpoint, specifying SR types (and other details) and blacklisting API keys.

3. *Integration Point*

For municipalities that have an existing WOM system (with a published API), we want to provide an adapter that can be configured to talk to that system. We would like to see a skeleton framework that can be configured by a moderately technical person, but we will also look favorably on pre-existing custom integrations.

Some of the existing WOM systems in use in Massachusetts include, but are not limited to, Cartograph, EnerGov, IntelliGov, GovQA, Lagan and Munis.

The criteria each response will be evaluated by for the WOM System / Open311 Adapter component is outlined in detail in [Section 5](#).

1.5. Submission Requirements

Section 7 outlines the list of documents you must submit as well as the form in which you must submit them. **Please pay careful attention to this section, if you fail to meet any of the requirements outlined in that section, your submission will not be considered.**

1.6. Important Things to Know

Section 8 lists other key factors you should know about this RFP process and the contracting that would follow. Please read it.

1.7. Timeline

Request for Proposals Available	Wednesday, September 5, 2012
Pre-Bid Conference	Wednesday, September 12, 2012 at 1pm EST
Questions Due to the City	Friday, September 14, 2012
City Responses to Questions Posted	Tuesday, September 18, 2012
Requests for Proposal Due	Monday, September 24, 2012 at 12pm EST
RFP Award Decision	Friday, September 28, 2012

1.8. Submission Address

City of Boston DoIT Department
Attn: Paul Kresser
One City Hall Plaza, Room 703
Boston, MA 02201

1.9. Contact Information

Paul Kresser, Department of Innovation & Technology, paul.kresser@cityofboston.gov

2. Architecture

A description of the three-part solution that the City of Boston is pursuing is below. As noted above, these three parts may or may not be awarded separately. While the router component should be open sourced, the other components may be commercially available and licensed software.

2.1. Mobile App communication with the Router

The mobile app will request a list of endpoints from the router. This communication should generally follow this pattern:

1. The mobile app sends a location to the router
2. The router performs a geo-lookup to identify Open311 endpoints that overlay the location
3. The router responds to the mobile app with either the list of endpoints, or a message indicating that there are no endpoints available.

2.2. Mobile app communication with the WOM / Open311 Endpoint

Once the mobile app has a list of endpoints, it will contact them to identify the services available.

1. The mobile app sends an Open311 service query to the endpoint
2. The endpoint responds with the list of services, detail questions and a link to the municipality's branding assets. In the instance where there are multiple endpoints, the app should present all the services, grouped by endpoint.
3. If the mobile app needs the branding assets, it should download them, cache them locally and apply the assets to the apps appearance. In the instance where there are multiple endpoints, the app should fall back to default branding until a service type (and endpoint) are chosen by the user.

When the user has completed creating a new SR, the mobile app will submit the payload to the appropriate endpoint.

1. The mobile app sends an Open311 SR payload to the endpoint
2. The endpoint processes the payload, and forwards the SR either to the built-in light WOM component, or to an external WOM system.
3. The endpoint sends a case ID (or other unique identifier) to the mobile app.

The mobile app will periodically poll the endpoint(s) for status updates.

1. The mobile app sends an Open311 status query to the endpoint
2. The endpoint processes the payload, and queries the WOM system for a status update.
3. The endpoint sends the status to the mobile app.

2.3. Router communication with the WOM / Open311 Endpoint

When an app communicates with the WOM / Open311 endpoint, it will include an API key. The API key authorizes the app to communicate with the endpoint, and the endpoint will reject all payloads

including an invalid API key. Management of API keys happens in the router. Once granted, an API key is available to all endpoints, but each endpoint can choose to reject a key.

1. The Open311 endpoint receives an API key from the mobile app, and checks the key against its internally cached list. If the key is blacklisted then the payload is rejected. If the key is not on the list, the endpoint sends the key to the router for validation.
2. The router receives the key, and validates it against the master record.
3. The router notifies the endpoint of the key's status: "valid" or "not valid" (e.g. not present in the master record or globally blacklisted).

3. Mobile App Technical Evaluation Criteria

All responsive mobile app proposals will be evaluated by the following technical criteria. Please note that any proposal that fails to meet the requirements of [Section 7](#) will be considered non-responsive.

Submissions will be evaluated on technical merit and experience of the vendor.

3.1. Technical Merit

The mobile app technical proposals will be evaluated in five categories: *functionality, integration, look & feel, platforms, timeline*. Described below are the characteristics that would make up a not advantageous, advantageous, and highly advantageous response in each of those categories

3.1.1. Functionality

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	The app cannot support the submission of photos, text and case types to municipalities or provide a tracking number so a user can follow-up on a case.
<i>Advantageous</i>	The app can support the functionality listed in “not advantageous.”
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	In addition to supporting the functionality listed in “not advantageous,” the app allows for updates to case status, social sharing of cases, and other features that strengthen the communication between the public and the public sector.

3.1.2. Integration

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	The app does not use the Open 311 standard for case submission.
<i>Advantageous</i>	The app uses the Open 311 standard for case submission.
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	The app uses the Open 311 standard for case submission and has integrated already with more than one municipality with different work order management systems.

3.1.3. Look & Feel

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	The app is clearly and primarily branded as a 3 rd party app.
<i>Advantageous</i>	The app can be branded as an app of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	The app can dynamically change to reflect the municipality that it is being used in.

3.1.4. Platforms

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	Does not work on smartphones using iOS and/or the Android operating system.
<i>Advantageous</i>	The app works on smartphones using iOS and/or the Android operating system.

<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	The app also works on other platforms such as Windows Phone, Blackberry and websites and / or uses SMS.
----------------------------	---

3.1.5. Timeline

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	Could not reasonably deploy to five (5) municipalities by the end of 2012 and 15-25 additional municipalities by the end of the first quarter of 2013
<i>Advantageous</i>	Could reasonably deploy to five (5) municipalities by the end of 2012 and 15-25 additional municipalities by the end of the first quarter of 2013
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	Could reasonably deploy to more than five (5) municipalities by the end of 2012 and more than 15-25 additional municipalities by the end of the first quarter of 2013

3.2. Experience

The mobile app technical proposals will be evaluated for the experience of the vendor.

3.2.1. Mobile 311 Apps

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	The vendor has never built and deployed to a municipality a mobile 311 reporting app.
<i>Advantageous</i>	The vendor has built and deployed to a municipality a mobile 311 reporting app.
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	The vendor has built and deployed to at least five municipalities a mobile 311 reporting app

3.2.2. Open 311 Experience

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	No demonstrable experience developing apps that meet the Open 311 standards
<i>Advantageous</i>	Demonstrable experience developing apps that meet the Open 311 standards
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	Demonstrable experience developing apps that meet the Open 311 standards and contributing to the development of the Open 311 standard

3.2.3. References

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	References provide poor or no recommendations or the contact information is inaccurate
<i>Advantageous</i>	References provide good recommendations
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	References provide excellent recommendations

4. Router Technical Evaluation Criteria

All responsive router proposals will be evaluated by the following technical criteria. Please note that any proposal that fails to meet the requirements of [Section 7](#) will be considered non-responsive.

Submissions will be evaluated on technical merit and experience of the vendor.

4.1. Technical Merit

The router technical proposals will be evaluated in four categories: *functionality, open source, resilient architecture, timeline*. Described below are the characteristics that would make up a not advantageous, advantageous, and highly advantageous response in each of those categories

4.1.1. Functionality

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	The router cannot maintain a list of Open311 endpoints, it cannot allow endpoints to be assigned to a geographic area, it cannot manage API keys or it doesn't respond in a timely manner to requests for endpoints or validating API keys.
<i>Advantageous</i>	The router performs all of the functions described in "not advantageous."
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	In addition to the functionality required for "advantageous", the router supports other features advantageous for developer support, such as managing geo-coded endpoints for other standards besides Open311.

4.1.2. Open Source

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	Some or none of the router's codebase will be released with an open source license.
<i>Advantageous</i>	The entire codebase of the router will be released with an open source license.
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	The router is based on existing open source and/or Open311 community efforts, and already enjoys community support.

4.1.3. Resilient Architecture

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	Router is not deployed in a scalable and robust environment capable of withstanding typical IT failure scenarios.
<i>Advantageous</i>	Router is deployed in a scalable and robust environment capable of withstanding typical IT failure scenarios.
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	Router is deployed in a scalable, robust and redundant environment capable of withstanding unusual and extreme IT failure scenarios.

4.1.4. Timeline

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	Could not reasonably have a test environment ready for use by November 30,

	2012, and the production deployment complete by March 15, 2012.
<i>Advantageous</i>	Could reasonably have a test environment ready for use by November 30, 2012, and the production deployment complete by March 15, 2012.
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	Could reasonably be ready for production use earlier than November 30, 2012

4.2. Experience

The router technical proposals will be evaluated for the experience of the vendor.

4.2.1. Open 311 Experience

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	No demonstrable experience developing apps that meet the Open 311 standards
<i>Advantageous</i>	Demonstrable experience developing apps that meet the Open 311 standards
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	Demonstrable experience developing apps that meet the Open 311 standards and contributing to the development of the Open 311 standard

4.2.2. References

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	References provide poor or no recommendations or the contact information is inaccurate
<i>Advantageous</i>	References provide good recommendations
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	References provide excellent recommendations

5. Work Order Management System / Open311 Adapter Technical Evaluation Criteria

All WOM / Open 311 Adapter responsive proposals will be evaluated by the following technical criteria. Please note that any proposal that fails to meet the requirements of [Section 7](#) will be considered non-responsive.

Submissions will be evaluated on technical merit and experience of the vendor.

5.1. Technical Merit

The WOM / Open 311 Adapter technical proposals will be evaluated in four categories: *functionality, usability, reporting, timeline*. Described below are the characteristics that would make up a not advantageous, advantageous, and highly advantageous response in each of those categories

5.1.1. Functionality

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	The Open311 adapter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is not 100% compliant with the Open311 GeoReport v2 specification • doesn't support cloud hosting as well as local installation • does not include a toolkit to facilitate 3rd party WOM integrations The WOM system: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not provide a map interface that displays all SR's, with options to filter what is displayed • does not provide the capability to append notes to a SR or change the status of a SR (open, closed, etc.)
<i>Advantageous</i>	The app can support the functionality listed in "not advantageous."
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	In addition to supporting the functionality listed in "not advantageous," the WOM system provides other features that enable greater degrees of work order management by a municipal user (for example, assigning SR's to specific users), as well as options for mobile municipal workers to manage the case load.

5.1.2. Usability

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	The user interface for the Open311 adapter and the WOM system are poorly designed, cluttered, or difficult for new users to comprehend.
<i>Advantageous</i>	The user interface for the Open311 adapter and the WOM system are well designed, clear and logical, and easy for new users to navigate and accomplish necessary tasks.
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	The users interfaces are clearly superior, with respect to the criteria described in "advantageous", and have an existing and satisfied user community

5.1.3. Reporting

Rating	Criteria
---------------	-----------------

<i>Not Advantageous</i>	Provides no, or few, auditing and management reports
<i>Advantageous</i>	Provides at least 10 auditing and management reports that support performance management principals
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	Provide greater than 10 auditing and management reports, or capability for ad hoc reporting

5.1.4. Timeline

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	Could not reasonably deploy to five (5) municipalities by the end of 2012 and 15-25 additional municipalities by the end of the first quarter of 2013
<i>Advantageous</i>	Could reasonably deploy to five (5) municipalities by the end of 2012 and 15-25 additional municipalities by the end of the first quarter of 2013
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	Could reasonably deploy to more than five (5) municipalities by the end of 2012 and more than 15-25 additional municipalities by the end of the first quarter of 2013

5.2. Experience

The WOM / Open 311 Adapter technical proposals will be evaluated for the experience of the vendor.

5.2.1. Work Order Management system Experience

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	The vendor has never built and deployed to a municipality a WOM system.
<i>Advantageous</i>	The vendor has built and deployed to a municipality a WOM system.
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	The vendor has built and deployed to at least five municipalities a WOM system.

5.2.2. Open 311 Experience

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	No demonstrable experience developing apps that meet the Open 311 standards
<i>Advantageous</i>	Demonstrable experience developing apps that meet the Open 311 standards
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	Demonstrable experience developing apps that meet the Open 311 standards and contributing to the development of the Open 311 standard

5.2.3. References

Rating	Criteria
<i>Not Advantageous</i>	References provide poor or no recommendations or the contact information is inaccurate
<i>Advantageous</i>	References provide good recommendations
<i>Highly Advantageous</i>	References provide excellent recommendations

6. Pricing

All responsive proposals will be evaluated by the following pricing criteria. Please note that any proposal that fails to meet the requirements of [Section 7](#) will be considered non-responsive.

6.1. Instructions for completing the Pricing Spreadsheet

Completely fill in the spreadsheet for each component your proposal covers. If your proposal does not include a component, fill in that section with "N/A."

6.2. Definitions

- *Per Municipality*: the cost per municipality for each application's one-time costs component at each designated range of municipality participation (# of Municipalities column)
- *Per Municipality Per Year*: the cost per municipality per year for Maintenance and Support at each designated range of municipality participation
- *One-Time Costs*: Any costs that occur only once, typically for development, deployment, customization or training. Provide annotations to your pricing spreadsheet explaining which specific activities contribute to the figures in this column.
- *Maintenance & Support (M&S)*: The cost to ensure up time of the app, fix any bugs that may occur and upgrade the app due to necessary changes (such as alterations in the Open311 standard)
- *1 Year / 2 Years / 3 Years M&S*: Maintenance & Support costs for the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year of deployment of each application, except that the router application requires a cost entry for the 1st year only
- *4th year and beyond*: Assuming a 3 year period of M&S has just concluded, M&S costs per year after the 3rd year, for the 4th, 5th, and 6th years, except that no cost entry is required for the router application
- *Local / Hosted*: We expect that most of the municipalities participating in this project will prefer a hosted solution, but there may also be some that wish to have the system installed locally. Please provide pricing for maintenance and support of each type of deployment, keeping in mind that the final deployment may be a combination of locally installed and hosted instances.

6.3. Pricing Spreadsheet

	# of Municipalities	Per Municipality		Per Municipality Per Year		
		One-Time Costs	1 Year M&S	2 Years M&S	3 Years M&S	4th, 5th and 6th Year M&S
Mobile App	1 - 9					
	10 - 19					
	20 - 49					
	50+					
Router						
WOM / Open 311	1 - 9	Local				
		Hosted				
	10 - 19	Local				
		Hosted				
	20 - 49	Local				
		Hosted				
	50+	Local				
		Hosted				

6.4. Pricing Samples

An Excel fill is included as an appendix to this RFP with samples of completed spreadsheets.

6.5. Bundling

You may bundle multiple components into a “package,” and provide different pricing models depending on the number of components selected from your proposal.

6.6. Total Price

The lowest price for each application will be determined by 1) calculating the lowest total price to deploy each application to the maximum number of municipalities for three years, taking into account the \$300,000 total budget for all applications, then 2) adding the cost of maintenance and support for the 4th, 5th, and 6th years . For purposes of the RFP price calculation only, the calculation assumes that 90% of the municipalities will select a hosted solution.

The lowest bundled price for all applications will be determined by 1) calculating the lowest total price to deploy all application to the maximum number of municipalities for three years, taking into account the \$300,000 total budget for all applications, then 2) adding the cost of maintenance and support for the 4th, 5th, and 6th years . For purposes of the RFP price calculation only, the calculation assumes that 90% of the municipalities will select a hosted solution.

The price billed will be based on the level of annual municipality participation estimated by the City at the beginning of the contract period. One year after the contract is executed, the actual municipal participation will be determined and the parties will true-up the amount billed to reflect the pricing for the actual level of municipality participation. In no event will the City be obligated to pay in excess of the \$300,000 grant funds available. The selected contractor is responsible for monitoring the level of orders to ensure that the project stays within this budget, even after true-up .

7. Submission Requirements

In this section are described are the specific requirements that are the minimum standards for any responsive RFP.

Any proposal not completed in the manner specified below and submitted by the due date will not be evaluated. Please carefully read what is listed below.

To help you, we've provided a check list for you to fill out. To ensure we get as many responsive bids as possible, you must fill out, sign and submit this checklist with your technical proposal.

7.1. The Minimum Requirement Check List

Technical Proposal:

A summary letter

- ___ A summary letter
- ___ Organization Description
- ___ Legal & Financial Information
- ___ A description of your proposed solution. You only need to provide a description for the component(s) you are bidding on, as described in Sections 3, 4 & 5.
- ___ Contact Information for 3 references
- ___ Completed attachments including:
 - ___ Appendix A - Standard Contract City of Boston/County of Suffolk (Form CM 10 and 11)
 - ___ Appendix B – Bid Response Form (Form CM 07)
 - ___ Appendix C – No Proposal Response Form (if applicable)
 - ___ Appendix D – Certificate of Authority (Form CM 06)
 - ___ Appendix E – Title and Intellectual Property Rights
- ___ A signed version of the minimum requirement check list

Price Proposal:

- ___ A price proposal using the tables provided in Section 6. You only need to provide a proposal for the component(s) you are bidding on, as described in Sections 3, 4 & 5.
- ___ A written description of what is included in each of the price proposal categories. Again, you only need to provide a description for the component(s) you are bidding on, as described in Sections 3, 4 & 5.

Separate Submission Requirement & Signature

- ___ Submit a separate, sealed price proposal to the Submission Address in Section 1
- ___ Submit a separate, sealed technical proposal to the Submission Address in Section 1
- ___ Signature; the Offeror's authorized representative shall sign on the line provided here, certifying that the responses provided by the Offeror to these Minimum Evaluation Criteria are provided without modification, qualification or limit.

The Offeror certifies under penalties of perjury that their Proposal has been made and submitted in good faith and without collusion, fraud or unfair trade practice with any other person. As used in this paragraph, the word "person" shall mean any natural person, business, partnership, corporation, union, committee, club, or other organization, entity or group of individuals. Any actions to avoid or frustrate fair and open competition are prohibited by law, and shall be grounds for rejection or disqualification of a Proposal or termination of the Contract.

SIGNED UNDER THE PAINS AND PENALTIES OF PERJURY

Signature

Date

Name

Title & Company

7.2. Summary Letter

Submission of the letter will constitute a representation by your firm that your firm is willing and able to perform the commitments contained in the proposal. The letter must be signed by a person authorized by your firm to obligate your firm to perform the commitments contained in the proposal. The letter must also include a statement that your firm is able to comply with the City's contract requirements.

7.3. Organization Identification

Provide, as applicable, the following information about the Offeror's organization, company, partnership, coalition or unincorporated association:

- Offeror's Name
- Federal Identification Number
- Office Address and Telephone Number
- Name and Telephone Number of Offeror's contact person. This person must be capable of committing the Offeror to an agreement with the City.
- Number of years Offeror operated under this name.
- Brief description of the nature of Offeror's business
- Number of years Offeror has been in continuous operation
- Type of business organization and where registered or incorporated
- The names and addresses of all parent corporations, officers, general and/or limited partners:
 - If the Offeror has conducted business under any name other than the current name of the organization/company, state the time when, and place where, the certificate required by M.G.L.c. 110, §5, was filed.

7.4. Legal & Financial Information

List any legal actions taken against or by the Offeror within the last five (5) years relating to a claim of contract default, including without limitation its provision of a constituent relationship management/work order management. For each legal action, provide the parties involved, the date of the action, any judgments and a brief description.

Attach Dunn & Bradstreet Reports for past two years.

7.5. A Description of Your Proposed Solutions

The technical proposal should describe your proposed solution for the components outlined in Sections 3-5. For ease of review, please separate these proposals into three distinct sections.

7.6. Contact Information for 3 References

Each references should include contact name, contact address, contact telephone number, contact E-mail address. Please check the email and phone numbers before providing them.

7.7. Completed Attachments

The Offeror must complete the attached legal documents and submit an original set of legal forms.

- Appendix A - Standard Contract City of Boston/County of Suffolk (Form CM 10 and 11)
- Appendix B – Bid Response Form (Form CM 07)
- Appendix C – No Proposal Response Form (If applicable)
- Appendix D – Certificate of Authority (Form CM 06)
- Appendix E – Title and Intellectual Property Rights

7.8. A Price Proposal

Your price proposal for each component should use the table and follow the instructions described in Section 6.

7.9. Separate Submission Requirement

The following is a really important requirement. It's easy to get it wrong; please don't.

Each proposal must be submitted in two (2) separate sealed envelopes, one containing only technical information and marked 'TECHNICAL PROPOSAL', and the other containing only price information and marked "PRICE PROPOSAL." Under no circumstances shall any price information be included with a technical proposal. **Failure to submit a separate sealed Price Proposal will result in disqualification of the entire Proposal.**

The Technical Proposal: The Offeror should submit one original (clearly marked) paper copy, one electronic copy (thumb drive), and five (5) copies of the Technical Proposal. The technical proposal must conform to the order, content and format set forth in this RFP. **The technical proposal shall contain absolutely no reference to price.**

The Technical Proposal shall be submitted in a sealed envelope marked:

City of Boston
RFP# DOIT090412 Citizens Connect for Commonwealth Municipalities
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL
Submitted by: (Name of Offeror)
(Date Submitted)

This sealed envelope shall be submitted or mailed to:

City of Boston Department of Innovation & Technology
Attn: Paul Kresser
One City Hall Plaza, Room 703
Boston, MA 02201

The Price Proposal: The Offeror should submit one (1) original (clearly marked) paper copy, one electronic copy (thumb drive), and five (5) copies of the Price Proposal. The Price Proposal must conform to the order, content and format set forth in Section 6Section 6.

The Price Proposal shall be submitted in a separate sealed envelope marked:

City of Boston
RFP# DOIT090412 Citizens Connect for Commonwealth Municipalities
PRICE PROPOSAL
Submitted by: (Name of Offeror)
(Date Submitted)

This sealed envelope shall be submitted or mailed to:

City of Boston Department of Innovation & Technology
Attn: Paul Kresser
One City Hall Plaza, Room 703
Boston, MA 02201

These two envelopes must be submitted or mailed separately. They must reach City of Boston by the RFP due date and time listed in Section 1.

8. Important Things to Know

This section describes important things you should know about how this RFP process and the resulting contracts will be handled. Please read it thoroughly.

8.1. Questions About The RFP

There are two ways you can ask questions about the RFP. The City of Boston will conduct a pre-bid conference on **Wednesday, September 12, 2012 at 1:00 PM Eastern** in a conference room located in Boston City Hall. The City of Boston will also answer a round of vendor questions regarding this RFP. Vendor questions are due to the **City by Noon (Eastern), Tuesday, September 18, 2012**. The City will post and distribute both a summary of the questions and answers from both opportunities as an addendum to this RFP on the City's website (www.cityofboston.gov/procurement) and via email to any and all respondents who have requested the RFP by Monday, September 24, 2012.

Any other communications between an Offeror and an employee or contractor/consultant of the City of Boston may cause the Offeror's bid to be rejected.

8.2. Changes or Additions to the RFP

Any supplemental instructions, amendments or changes to the RFP, or attached documents, shall be in the form of written addenda to this RFP. If issued, such addenda shall be emailed to all parties on record as having received and/or requested an RFP from Mr. Paul Kresser at the email address listed therein. Such addenda, if any, will be sent no later than five (5) business days prior to the deadline for submission of proposals and will be posted on the City's website (www.cityofboston.gov/procurement).

Failure of any Offeror to acknowledge receipt of any such addenda shall not relieve such Offeror from any obligation under the proposal as submitted. At the time of the opening of proposals, each Offeror shall be conclusively presumed to have received and understood all RFP documents, including all addenda, and the failure of any Offeror to examine any form, instrument, or other document which is part of the RFP shall in no way relieve such Offeror from any obligation arising under law from the submission of a proposal. Failure of any Offeror's proposal to address any addendum or addenda may also result in the rejection of the entire proposal. Any costs incurred by the Offeror's as a result of responding to this RFP are to be borne by the Offeror and are not to be reimbursable by the City.

8.3. Disclosing Who Bid

A register of proposals with the name of each Offeror and the number of options for which a proposal was submitted will be open for public inspection following the opening of the technical proposals. Proposals will be confidential until the completion of the evaluations, or until the time for acceptance specified in the RFP, whichever is earlier. All submissions will be public records. Do not submit confidential materials.

8.4. Offeror Interviews

If necessary, the City of Boston will ask offerors to present their solutions.

8.5. Offeror Selection Process

The City of Boston reserves the right to award a contract(s) to other than the Offeror(s) offering the lowest overall cost. The contract(s) resulting from this solicitation shall be awarded to the responsive and responsible Offeror(s) whose proposal(s) the City has determined to be the most advantageous, based on the evaluation criteria set forth in the Request for Proposals. Evaluation of all of the non-price proposals will be completed prior to the opening of any price proposal.

Price proposals will be evaluated to determine the lowest total cost, within budget, for the largest number of municipalities, as further described in section 6.6 included.

The City of Boston may determine that it is most advantageous to award to a separate offeror for each of the three components of this RFP. Each offeror, consequently, may be awarded a contract for 0, 1, 2 or all 3 of the components outlined in this RFP.

8.6. Contracting Timeline

All contracts resulting from this RFP shall be signed by the Offeror(s) within a reasonable time upon receipt, which period shall not exceed 90 days. Thereafter the Offeror(s) proposal may be rejected.

8.7. Contracting Language

The Standard Contract for the City of Boston/County of Suffolk documents are contained in Appendix A, Appendix B, Appendix C, Appendix D and Appendix E to this RFP. They will be part of the Contract of the successful Offeror. The Contract will also include, without limitation, the following standard City of Boston forms: (1) a CORI Compliance Certification; (2) Living Wage forms, and (3) Contractor Certification. Copies of these documents are available for review upon request. To the extent applicable, a license agreement and statement of work, under terms acceptable to the City, will be included as part of the Contract.

8.8. Contract Term

Successful Offeror(s) will be awarded a contract for a period until completion of contract or until June 30, 2015, whichever is earlier.

8.9. No Obligation to Proceed

The City is under no obligation to proceed with this project and may cancel this RFP at any time without the substitution of another, if such cancellation is deemed in the best interest of the City. Further, the Contract shall be subject to the availability of an appropriation. The City reserves the right to reject any or all Proposals, as well as the right to waive informalities and minor irregularities in offers received. Furthermore, the City may issue a new or modified RFP, if doing so is found to be in the best interest of the City.