

RFP #09-003

Amendment #4 – Clarification on Pricing Model for the eCityGov Alliance Hosting Option

The purpose of this Amendment #4 is to provide clarification on the Price Proposal forms in the RFP and the eCityGov Alliance hosting option.

The RFP requests separate pricing for each Participating City (Bothell, Issaquah, Kirkland, Redmond, Renton and Sammamish). In addition, there are forms at the end of the document for vendors to complete if they are proposing a solution for the separate eCityGov Alliance hosting option.

CLARIFICATION

eCityGov Alliance would like to have a system separate from the systems to be implemented at the Participating Cities that eCityGov Alliance can use to host a permitting system for various subscriber cities, mainly cities/municipalities smaller than the Participating Cities (Sammamish, Kirkland, Bothell, etc.).

eCityGov Alliance has already had some cities express an interest in subscribing to this service because these cities don't have IT resources and/or can't afford to purchase their own permitting system.

If a vendor has a solution for the eCityGov Alliance's hosting option that it would like to propose, then the vendor should complete the appropriate pricing form for this option.

While eCityGov Alliance's hosting option has functional requirements which are similar to those of the City of Sammamish, eCityGov Alliance is different from the other Participating Cities because it currently has no subscribers for the system and, consequently, it has no system users, permits or transactions.

Therefore, a vendor who is proposing a solution for eCityGov Alliance option will need to propose a pricing model that will allow eCityGov Alliance to be able to scale from having no users or subscriber cities/agencies to many subscriber cities/agencies.

The eCityGov Alliance is very open to creative approaches for this hosting option, and, as you can imagine, controlling costs is very important. It's also important for eCityGov Alliance to be able to have an easy to administer pricing model so that they can quote prices to potential subscriber cities/agencies.

The pricing model that the vendor chooses to propose is entirely up to the vendor, and eCityGov Alliance has no preferred model at this time, although proposed models that are economical and easy to administer will be viewed favorably.

To clarify what a pricing model might be, here are a few examples (because an example is described does not mean that it is a preferred approach):

- Pricing for the eCityGov hosting option may be the same pricing model used for the other cities, or it could be another proposed approach.
- No initial up front cost, but then pay a per user fee per month (sort of the SaaS model)
- A minimum fee for each subscriber city and a license fee per user.
- A tiered pricing schedule. For example, a fee per user up to 25 users, then every user after that is \$10 cheaper up to 50 users, then every user above 50 is another \$10 cheaper, etc.
- An enterprise license option such that there is no extra cost no matter how many users are on the system.
- Pricing by # of permits issued per year.
- Pricing based on operating budget of each subscriber city.