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RFC Editor Automated Reports & Statistics Project

The Internet Society ("ISOC") on behalf of the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC) is soliciting this Request for Proposals ("RFP") to develop an automated system for the generation of RFC Editor reports and statistics. Those submitting a Proposal ("Vendor") shall do so in accordance with this RFP.

I. Introduction

The RFC Editor’s list of statistics and report products has grown over time, and maintaining them requires significant manual effort. This project will automate the generation of these statistics and reports. This includes the monthly production of reports at https://www.rfc-editor.org/report-summary/ and episodic creations of presentations for meetings with the community.

The current production process involves manual transcription of reports from a database into an Excel spreadsheet and production of graphics using that tool. This project will automate maintenance of the necessary information in the database, and on-demand production of the reports without involving Excel. It will also make extraction of the data into a form similar to the current spreadsheet easy, to facilitate ad-hoc reporting. This project will additionally automate the production of two new report artifacts.

II. Instructions and Procedures

A. Submissions

Proposals must be received via email at iaoc-tmc@ietf-bids.org no later than January 18, 2016 at 5:00 PM ET.

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 iaoc-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 11:59 PM ET on January 6, 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 by 11:59 PM ET on January 11, 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 January 28, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 29, 2015</td>
<td>RFP Issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6, 2016</td>
<td>Questions and Inquiries deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 11</td>
<td>Answers to questions issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 11</td>
<td>RFP Addenda &amp; Update issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18</td>
<td>Proposals Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 28</td>
<td>Negotiations Begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8</td>
<td>Contract Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>Work Begins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
15. Miscellaneous

V. Statement of Work

Overview

The RFC Editor’s list of statistics and report products has grown over time, and maintaining them requires significant manual effort. This project will automate the generation of these statistics and reports. This includes the monthly production of
The current production process involves manual transcription of reports from a database into an Excel spreadsheet and production of graphics using that tool. This project will automate maintenance of the necessary information in the database, and on-demand production of the reports without involving Excel. It will also make extraction of the data into a form similar to the current spreadsheet easy, to facilitate ad-hoc reporting. This project will additionally automate the production of two new report artifacts.

**Deliverables/Tasks**

The developer will work with the RFC production center staff to:

1. Identify any changes to the database needed to facilitate report production without the current manual transcription, and implement those changes.
2. Identify changes in the look of the needed reports, particularly those needed to indicate the current month information is ‘to-date’.
3. Design the format for two new reports artifacts.
4. Design and implement a mechanism to produce the needed reports on-demand.
5. Provide a mechanism to export the data used for the reports for use with programs like Excel to facilitate ad-hoc reporting.
6. Integrate the report generation mechanism with the RFC Editor website.
7. Provide a set of tests appropriate for regression testing for all software created by this project demonstrating correct operation.
8. Provide documentation and training for the production center staff.

**Detailed Description**

There are three artifacts at [https://www.rfc-editor.org/report-summary/](https://www.rfc-editor.org/report-summary/) which are currently manually produced that this project will automate:

1. The SLA table
2. The Monthly Submissions and Publications bar graph
3. The Queue Statistics bar graph

It is expected that the produced artifacts for the Monthly Submissions and Publication bar graph and the Queue Statistics bar graph will be very similar in look and form to what is currently produced, except for any changes needed to convey that the start and end of the graph may not reflect whole months and to represent page counts. In particular, results ending at the current time, need to convey that the report is ‘to-date’. The SLA table will change significantly to represent the new SLA found in [http://iarc.ietf.org/documents/RPC-SoW-2015-CommunityReview.pdf](http://iarc.ietf.org/documents/RPC-SoW-2015-CommunityReview.pdf) that measures pages gone to edit on a quarterly basis.
In addition, the project will create two new report artifacts

1. Monthly Errata statistics
2. Annual Submission and Publication rates

It must be possible to produce reports starting and ending on given days in the past. When such a report is generated, it will reflect the database contents at the time of the report generation. That is, it is not a requirement to reproduce a historic report exactly when the data in the database has changed. This mechanism will make it easy to produce whole-month results for result. For example, in any day in April, it will be possible to ask for the report that ends March 31.

It is acceptable to produce the report artifacts on-demand by running a program that produces the reports as files. The preferred output format is PDF. It would be nice to optionally also produce PNG. This program should be easy to integrate with a web-server so that the reports can be accessed on-demand through a webpage.

The mechanism for exporting data for use with programs like Excel should be similar. The preferred output format for this export is CSV. It should be easy to integrate the export mechanism with a web-server as above.

It is anticipated that the RFC Editor will use the program internally, either directly or through the web-server mentioned above, when preparing reports. The mechanisms for exporting data will initially be limited to that internal access. Externally visible pages, in particular https://www.rfc-editor.org/report-summary/ will show only the produced report artifacts. The developer will work with the RFC Editor staff to design when and how that page invokes the new tool to produce the needed artifacts. It would be a desirable feature to allow these reports to be run against arbitrary time intervals as needed.