

**The Internet Society**  
**on behalf of**  
**The IETF Administrative Oversight Committee**

**Request for Proposal**  
**RFC Editor**  
**RFC Format CSS Design**

**Date of Issuance: July 22, 2016**  
**Proposal Submission Deadline: September 9, 2016**

## **IETF Request for Proposals**

### **RFC Format CSS Design Project**

The Internet Society (“ISOC”) on behalf of the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC) is soliciting this Request for Proposals (“RFP”) to provide a responsive design CSS for future RFC formats. Those submitting a Proposal (“Vendor”) shall do so in accordance with this RFP.

#### **I. Introduction**

The RFC Editor plans to produce a canonical RFC document in XML using the xml2rfc v3 grammar, and to publish the RFC in several Publication Formats as defined in RFC6949. In particular, there will be an HTML and PDF output that will support many new features within the documents, including SVG line art. This project will result in a CSS file that will reflect visually pleasing, accessible, and responsive design.

#### **II. Instructions and Procedures**

##### A. Submissions

Proposals must be received via email at [tmc@ietf-bids.org](mailto:tmc@ietf-bids.org) no later than September 9, 2016.

The Vendor assumes all risk and responsibility for submission of its Proposal by the above deadline. ISOC shall have no responsibility for non-receipt of Proposals due to network or system failures, outages, delays or other events beyond its reasonable control.

All Proposals shall become the property of the Internet Society.

##### B. Questions and Inquiries

Any inquiries regarding this RFP must be submitted in writing to [tmc@ietf-bids.org](mailto:tmc@ietf-bids.org). Other than such inquiries, Vendors are prohibited from contacting any person or institution involved in the selection process concerning this RFP.

Questions may be submitted at any time; however, all questions/inquiries must be submitted in writing and must be received no later than August 8, 2016.

Responses to questions and inquiries shall be posted on the IAOC website, <https://iaoc.ietf.org/rfps.html>, no later than August 15, 2016.

##### C. Addenda and Updates

Any addenda and updates to this RFP shall be posted on the IAOC website, <https://iaoc.ietf.org/rfps.html>. Any RFP addenda and updates will be posted no later than August 15, 2016. Each Vendor is responsible for checking the IAOC website prior to

submission of any Proposal to ensure that it has complied with all addenda and updates to this RFP.

D. Selection Criteria

Each Proposal must specifically address each of the selection criteria listed in Section III.B, and each proposal must use the format provided in Section IV.A. Each Proposal may be accompanied by any technical or product literature that the Vendor wishes the IAOC and the Internet Society to consider.

The IAOC will seek to enter into a contract with a Vendor that the IAOC deems, in its sole discretion, to represent the best value combination of performance and cost, not necessarily the low bidder.

E. Cancellation; Rejection

The Internet Society reserves the right to cancel this RFP, in whole or in part, at any time. The IAOC may reject any or all Proposals received in response to this RFP in its sole discretion. The Internet Society makes no guarantee or commitment to purchase, license or procure any goods or services resulting from this RFP.

F. Costs and Expenses

Each Vendor is responsible for its own costs and expenses involved in preparing and submitting its Proposal and any supplemental information requested by the IAOC. The Internet Society shall not reimburse any such costs or expenses.

G. Public Information

The IAOC is committed to transparency in the manner in which it conducts its operations. Accordingly, the following principles will apply to the Proposal and negotiations:

The names of all Vendors submitting Proposals may be announced publicly, but the Proposals and individual negotiations with Vendors will not be publicly announced or published.

Any Agreement negotiated with a Vendor, excluding cost and business confidential material as agreed to, will be made public after execution.

H. Intellectual Property Rights

All work performed, all software and other materials developed by the Vendor under the Agreement, shall be “works for hire” and shall be owned exclusively by the IETF Trust, and the Vendor shall not obtain or retain any rights or licenses from any work. Open source software is exempt from this requirement. Solutions based on existing vendor software are also exempt from this requirement as long as the IETF Trust

is granted a non-revocable perpetual license to use the software. Additional conditions may apply.

#### I. Relationships

Describe any relationship between your company, or any parent, subsidiary or related company, or any director or officer of any of them, with the RFC Editor, Internet Society, IAOC, IETF, IETF Trust, or any employee, director, officer or consultant of any of them.

#### J. Process Modification

In the case where responses to this RFP fail to meet the basic requirements defined herein, the IAOC reserves the right to modify this RFP process.

The IAOC may choose to re-open the RFP or to enter into further negotiations with one or more of the Vendors if the situation warrants at the discretion of the IAOC.

### **III. Selection**

#### A. Selection Procedure

1. The IAOC will or will cause the review and evaluation of each proposal to determine if the Vendor is qualified.
2. The IAOC will contact references.
3. The IAOC may conduct interviews and may require oral presentations.
4. Requests for clarity may be made of the Vendor.
5. Qualified Vendor, if any, will be notified of their selection for advancement to the negotiation phase by September 22, 2016.

#### B. Selection Criteria as Judged by the IAOC

The IAOC must have confidence in the Vendor - its qualifications, experience, capabilities, personnel, timely performance, and professionalism. To that end the IAOC will evaluate the following to inform its decision:

1. Vendor qualifications and experience performing similar services
2. Key personnel qualifications, if any
3. Vendor ability to meet requirements
4. Proposal as a reflection of the Vendor's understanding of the IETF, their processes, culture, and the scope of work and methodologies
5. Oral presentation, if conducted
6. Cost to furnish the services in USD; note that the lowest cost offer will not necessarily be awarded a contract

#### C. Schedule

The IAOC intends to process this RFP in accordance with the following schedule:

<b>Projected Schedule of Events</b>	
<b>Date</b>	<b>Action</b>
July 22, 2016	RFP Issued
August 8	Questions and Inquiries deadline
August 15	Answers to questions issued
August 15	RFP Addenda & Update issued
September 9	Proposals Due
September 22	Negotiations Begin
September 29	Contract Execution
October 3	Work Begins

#### **IV. Proposal Format**

##### **A. Proposal Submissions**

Proposals shall be submitted using the following format:

1. Executive Summary
2. Project Approach & Plan
3. Schedule
4. Test Plan
5. Cost & Payment Schedule
6. Warranty & Late Delivery Consequence
7. Technical Support & Maintenance
8. Documentation
9. Experience, Qualifications and Accomplishments
10. Key Personnel Resumes, if any
11. References (Two references attesting to performance)
12. Subcontractor Information (if any)
13. Assumptions
14. Intellectual Property
15. Miscellaneous

#### **V. Statement of Work**

##### **Overview**

The RFC Editor plans to produce a canonical RFC document in XML using the xml2rfc v3 grammar, and to publish the RFC in several Publication Formats as defined in RFC6949. In particular, there will be an HTML and PDF output that will support many new features within the documents, including SVG line art. Note that colors beyond black and white are not supported at this time. Regardless of color options, there is still a strong desire to create a practical and visually appealing style sheet to govern an updated look and guide the use of new features in the Series.

This project will result in a CSS file that will reflect visually pleasing, accessible, and responsive design. The HTML follows a semantic design as described in

<<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-iab-html-rfc/>>; all display details must come from an

embedded CSS. The PDF must also follow a semantic design, including proper PDF tags, as described in <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-iab-rfc-use-of-pdf/>>. The CSS will be embedded in the HTML; the CSS designer should avoid any feature that is not easily implemented in PDF. The CSS designer should be aware that we may choose to render PDF from the HTML, and so should avoid making any choices in the implementation of the CSS that would make that creating a visually similar PDF difficult.

## Deliverables

- Provide a responsive design CSS for future RFCs following the guidance in draft-iab-rfc-css
- The PDF and HTML output must look as similar as possible
- All of the HTML features that have been called out in draft-iab-html-rfc need to be in place in the CSS

## Engagement

In the course of this engagement, the contractor will be expected to:

- Create the initial strawman CSS for both HTML and PDF. This may be based on previous proofs-of-concept, or may be entirely new, at the discretion of the contractor;
- Work with the RSE through at least three rounds of community feedback to create the final output. The RSE will be the point of contact for the interaction with the community; the contractor may find it valuable to subscribe to the [rfc-interest@rfc-editor.org](mailto:rfc-interest@rfc-editor.org) mailing list to follow discussions on the topic.
- Develop a final CSS as per the detailed descriptions and requirements listed below.

Final approval for the CSS will be provided by the RSE.

## Detailed Description and Requirements

The CSS must follow the requirements described in <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-iab-rfc-css>. The developer will work with the RFC Series Editor and the community to agree on the overall visual design before submitting the final CSS that will be used in the publication process.

There is a hand-crafted example of intended HTML output at <http://hildjj.github.io/draft-hildebrand-html-rfc/test.3.html>. Where it conflicts with the definitions in draft-iab-html-rfc, the latter, defining, document takes precedence.

It is critical that the CSS take into account the accessibility requirements of the community while building a responsive, visually pleasing design. Where compromises are required due to mutually exclusive requirements in accessibility and responsiveness, the designer will work with the RFC Series Editor to come to a decision on what features to support.