REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Cyber Threat Intelligence Sharing Platform
Issued by the City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office of Public Safety

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Summary

In an effort to strengthen cybersecurity for Los Angeles infrastructure, businesses, and residents, the City of Los Angeles ("City"), through the Mayor's Office of Public Safety ("Mayor's Office"), seeks a Contractor to provide a secure, scalable, cloud-based Threat Intelligence Sharing Platform and associated implementation, migration, training, support, and professional services. The solution must enable the City to collect, normalize, enrich, analyze, produce, share, distribute, and operationalize cyber threat intelligence for the City and authorized RCC members. The Contractor must provide a production-ready solution that supports human and machine participation, complies with city, state, and federal law, improves analyst efficiency, and provides measurable service, implementation, migration, and exit outcomes.

1.2 Funding and Budget

The anticipated source of funds for this project/position is the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Fiscal Year 2025 and Fiscal Year 2026 Urban Area Security Initiative ("UASI 25" and "UASI 26" respectively) Grant, which is administered by the City of Los Angeles, by and through the Mayor's Office. The project/position that is the subject of this Request for Proposals ("RFP") has a budget not to exceed Two Hundred Sixty Thousand Dollars (**$260,000.00**). The resulting contract will be on a fixed-price basis.

Funding for this project/position is subject to City Council approval and the continuing availability of funds. The City reserves the right to change the funding source and budget for this project/position.

1.3 Administrative Entity

The Mayor's Office of Public Safety administers the UASI 25 and UASI 26 grants for the City and serves as the administrative entity for this RFP and any resulting contract. The UASI grant program awards funding to jurisdictions to address unique equipment, training, exercise and planning management needs, and assist in building effective prevention and protection capabilities to prevent, respond to, and recover from threats or acts of terrorism. The Mayor's Office is responsible for all day-to-day coordination of this project/position.

1.4 Proposer Qualifications

Proposers must possess the following qualifications and competencies:

- Ability to work independently and efficiently with a very rigorous timeline;
- Strong working knowledge of the private and public sector and their integration as it pertains to cybersecurity;
- Ability to work with board members, City officials, and collaborate and network with other entities; and
- Ability to disseminate accurate and helpful information and manage subscriptions and cyber updates.

1.5 Proposer Eligibility

Proposals will be accepted only from proposers that meet ALL the following requirements:

- Must be in good standing with the Secretary of State if a corporation or Limited Liability Company;
- Must have a license to do business in the City of Los Angeles;
- Has not been debarred by the Federal Government, the State of California, or local government;
- Must not have outstanding debt to the State of California or the City of Los Angeles that has not been repaid or for which a repayment agreement plan has not been implemented. If proposer has contracted with any city agency, it must not have an outstanding disallowed cost or other liability to the City;
- Must be financially solvent, possessing an ongoing ability to provide the services proposed;
- Must possess adequate staffing, including support and backup staff, with sufficient experience and technical expertise;

1.6 Scope of Work Specific Eligibility Requirements

As the scope of work will elaborate on, this project requires certain characteristics in order to meet the City's expectations for the cyber threat intelligence sharing platform. These characteristics are considered requirements and each proposal must address them in order to be considered.

- RCC community operating model:

    - The proposed solution and associated services must operate as a City-administered, multi-organization public-sector threat intelligence community. It must provide segregated, full-analyst RCC member workspaces; City-controlled community membership, roles, trusted groups, and sharing policies; secure member-to-member sharing within City-approved boundaries; organization-specific access and intelligence; auditable administration; and human and machine distribution. A City-only enterprise threat intelligence license without these capabilities is nonresponsive.
- Demonstrated community experience:
    - The proposer must provide at least three references for relevant production multi-organization or community deployments. At least one reference must be a public-sector, ISAC, ISAO, public-sector coalition, or comparable trusted-sharing community of similar scale. References must describe the number and type of participating organizations, the proposer's role, participation methods, and duration of production operation.
- Current availability:
    - Mandatory capabilities must be generally available and supported as of the proposal due date. Roadmap or planned capabilities must not satisfy a mandatory requirement unless expressly authorized by the City in writing.

For more information on the full breadth of the scope of work, please see Section 4 of this document and/or the associated scope of work document in the “Files” section of the RAMP opportunity under “Threat Intelligence Sharing Platform (TISP) SOW”.

2 REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS PROCESS

2.1 Questions Regarding the RFP

Specific questions concerning this RFP should be submitted via e-mail to the Contract Specialist An Joon Ang at anjoon.ang@lacity.org. Please identify the RFP title on the subject line of your communication. Responses will be posted as a PDF document to the opportunity on RAMP (rampla.org) under “Q&A.” Please check this Q&A document periodically as it will be updated on a rolling basis. Questions on this RFP will be accepted through **November 17, 2026 at 4:30 p.m. PST.**

The City will make every effort to respond to all written questions as soon as practicable. Responses to questions, or any other changes to or interpretation of the RFP, will be posted on RAMP. Any such changes or interpretations shall become a part of said RFP and may be incorporated into any Contract awarded pursuant thereto.

2.2 Proposal Submission Deadline

Timely submission of proposals is the sole responsibility of the proposer. Proposers must submit one proposal in Adobe PDF format via email by **December 1, 2026 at 4:30 p.m. PST**.

Proposals must be emailed to: An Joon Ang (anjoon.ang@lacity.org) with copy to Emily Helder (emily.helder@lacity.org)

All proposals will be electronically dated and time stamped upon receipt. Late proposals will not be accepted. Late proposals will be disqualified from review and will not be scored.

2.3 Award of Contract

The award of a contract shall be on an as-needed basis and shall be made to the proposer with the best combination of experience, quality of service delivery, and price. Awards are not restricted to the lowest offer or bid.

The contract shall have a performance period that begins on or about the date of contract execution and is expected to last a duration of twenty-four months from the date of contract execution. The project is expected to be completed in advance of **December 31, 2028**. If proposer is uncertain of meeting or unable to meet this timeline, proposer may submit with its proposal, an alternate schedule and timeline within the scope of this RFP.

3 PROPOSAL FORMAT AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Proposals shall be submitted in accordance with the requirements set forth in this RFP.

3.1 Authorized Signature

Proposals must be signed by an officer duly authorized to sign contract documents and authorized to bind the proposer entity to all commitments made in the proposal. Consortiums, joint ventures, or teams submitting proposals will not be considered responsive unless it is established that all contractual responsibility rests solely with one Proposer or one legal entity. The proposal must identify the responsible entity.

3.2 Information Requested and Not Furnished

The information requested and the manner of submission are essential to permit prompt evaluation of all proposals. Accordingly, the City reserves the right to declare as non-responsive and reject any proposals in which information is requested and is not furnished or when a direct or complete answer is not provided. Alternatives that do not substantially meet the City's requirements cannot be considered. Proposals offered subject to conditions and/or limitations may be rejected as non-responsive.

3.3 Proposal Errors

Proposers are responsible for all errors or omissions incurred by proposer in preparing the proposal. Proposers will not be allowed to alter or amend proposal documents after the submission deadline.

The City reserves the right to make corrections or amendments due to errors identified in the proposal by the City or the proposer.

3.4 Waiver of Minor Administrative Irregularities

The City reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to waive minor administrative irregularities contained in any proposal.

3.5 Interpretation and Clarifications

All recommendations or requests for clarification must be in writing and submitted to the Contract Administrator. The City reserves the right to modify requirements on any RFP if it is in the best interest of the City.

3.6 Cost of RFP

The City is not responsible for any costs incurred by proposers in connection with submitting proposals. All proposers who respond to this RFP do so solely at their own expense.

3.7 Rejection of Proposals

The City reserves the right to reject any or all proposals; to waive any minor error in proposals received; to reject any unapproved alternate proposal(s); and to reject the proposal of any proposer who has previously failed to perform competently in any prior business relationship with the City. The rejection of any or all proposals shall not render the City liable for costs or damages.

4 SCOPE OF WORK AND DELIVERABLES

4.1 Licensing and Capacity

4.1.1 Base community quantity: Base pricing must include 50 RCC member-organization entitlements. Each entitlement must provide a separately provisioned full analyst workspace with capacity for up to 20 named member users and must include STIX/TAXII client and server access and documented API access. The base community must therefore support up to 1,000 named member-user accounts in aggregate. The solution must support future expansion to at least 100 member organizations without platform replacement or material architectural redesign.

4.1.2 City administration: The base solution must include, separately from the 50 member-organization entitlements, the City administrator, City analyst, integration, and service accounts required to operate, support, audit, and integrate the RCC community. The proposer must state all included quantities and privileges.

4.1.3 Member user entitlements: Each member-organization entitlement must include capacity for up to 20 named users within its segregated workspace. Each member organization must be able to administer its own authorized

users within that limit. The proposer must describe available roles, replacement-user rules, any concurrent-use limitations, and unit pricing for capacity beyond 20 named users or for additional member organizations. City administrator, City analyst, integration, and service accounts required under Section 4.2 must not reduce a member organization's 20-user allocation.

4.1.4 Email ingestion entitlement: Secure email ingestion and approved email distribution must be available without requiring the City to assign a member-organization entitlement when no portal workspace is provisioned. The proposer must disclose any applicable volume, attachment, retention, or processing limits.

4.1.5 Entitlement transparency: The proposer must identify every license, feature dependency, feed allowance, API or TAXII allowance, service-account limit, storage or retention limit, AI usage allowance, data allowance, overage, and separately priced capability necessary to operate the proposed solution. No mandatory capability may depend on an undisclosed or unpriced entitlement.

4.2 Multi-Organization Community Requirements

4.2.1 Member separation: The solution must maintain logical separation of member organizations, users, dashboards, saved searches, priority intelligence requirements, cases, investigations, reports, credentials, integrations, and restricted content. Member information must remain private to the member organization unless shared under an authorized policy.

4.2.2 City-controlled community administration: Authorized City personnel must be able to create, activate, suspend, and remove organizations; assign community roles; approve trusted groups or circles; establish, modify, and revoke persistent sharing permissions; configure visibility and handling policies; and export a current community roster without routine vendor intervention.

4.2.3 Member organization administration: Authorized administrators designated by each member organization must be able to create, activate, suspend, modify, and remove users within only that organization; assign approved organization-level roles; manage local credentials; and review organization-level user and activity records.

4.2.4 Secure member-to-member sharing: The solution must permit authorized members to share intelligence directly with other members only through City-approved trusted groups, circles, or persistent sharing policies. Sharing must enforce organization-, group-, source-, item-, audience-, and TLP-level controls; preserve provenance and source restrictions; record the sharing event and

recipient scope; and permit the City to modify or revoke the authorization. Ad hoc cross-organization sharing outside an approved policy must be prohibited.

4.2.5 No forced sharing: The solution must support private, community, and source-protected contributions and must not require an RCC member to contribute intelligence as a condition of participation. Member-private content must not be disclosed to other members by default.

4.2.6 Full analyst workspace: Each licensed member organization must be able to independently search, enrich, analyze, and operationalize authorized intelligence and to create and manage its own dashboards, saved searches, watchlists, priority intelligence requirements, alerts, cases, investigations, reports, exports, and analytical workflows.

4.2.7 Organization-specific intelligence: The solution must support organization-specific intelligence based on member sector, technologies, assets or priorities supplied by the member, geography, mission, and stated intelligence needs, while enforcing the member separation and sharing controls in this section.

4.2.8 Member service paths: The solution must support email, portal, dashboard, and machine-to-machine participation within the same governed RCC program. A member must not be required to deploy STIX/TAXII infrastructure to submit or receive approved intelligence by email.

4.3 Email Ingestion and Distribution

4.3.1 Secure email intake: The solution must securely ingest threat intelligence submissions from City or community member email addresses or connectors. The intake process must support original RFC 822 messages and common email file formats, including EML and MSG, together with message headers, body content, embedded URLs, indicators, and attachments.

4.3.2 Parsing and preservation: The solution must extract supported observables and relevant metadata, preserve source and chain-of-custody context, retain the original message or an integrity-verifiable copy, identify duplicate content, and record ingestion and processing status.

4.3.3 Safe processing: The email-ingestion workflow must isolate or safely process potentially malicious attachments and links, enforce file and content limits, record failures, and prevent automated publication or distribution before City-approved review and handling controls are applied.

4.3.4 Analyst review: Email-ingested content must be routed to an authorized City analyst workflow for validation, enrichment, confidence and severity assignment, TLP marking, approval, rejection, correction, and controlled distribution.

4.3.5 Outbound email products: The solution must support approved delivery of indicators, alerts, bulletins, weekly analytical products, and organization-specific context by email. It must preserve formatting and hyperlinks, record delivery status, surface failures or bounces, and support corrected or superseding versions.

4.3.6 Demonstration and acceptance: During demonstration and acceptance testing, the proposer must ingest a City-provided sample email with headers, URLs, indicators, and an attachment; show the extracted and preserved content; route it through analyst review; and deliver an approved product to a test email recipient.

4.4 Intelligence Collection and Lifecycle

4.4.1 Sources and formats: The solution must ingest and manage relevant open-source, government, commercial, community, and City sources using supported standards and formats, including STIX 2.x, TAXII 2.x, JSON, CSV, email, files, and documented APIs.

4.4.2 Base intelligence sources: The proposer must identify at least 40 relevant intelligence feeds or sources included in base pricing, their provenance, update frequency, licensing restrictions, and applicability to public-sector and critical-infrastructure organizations.

4.4.3 Normalization and provenance: The solution must normalize, deduplicate, correlate, enrich, and score intelligence while preserving source attribution, timestamps, confidence, handling restrictions, and a complete change history.

4.4.4 Analytic workflow:The solution must support unified search, threat actors, campaigns, vulnerabilities, malware, MITRE ATT&CK mapping, watchlists, alerts, priority intelligence requirements, cases, analyst notes, evidence, and controlled intelligence lifecycle management.

4.4.5 Feed health and governance: The solution must monitor feed and connector health, identify stale or failed sources, support inclusion and exclusion rules, and require City approval before new sources are distributed to members.

4.5 Reporting and Distribution

4.5.1 Product types: The solution must support reusable, editable templates for weekday indicator briefs, weekly analytical reports, time-sensitive alerts, executive summaries, sector-specific products, and organization-specific intelligence.

4.5.2 Handling controls: Reports and distributions must support TLP 2.0 markings, audience restrictions, source-specific handling requirements, approval status, version history, correction and supersession, and documented release authority.

4.5.3 Export formats: The solution must export usable DOCX, PDF, CSV, JSON, and STIX-compatible products as applicable, with preserved hyperlinks, indicators, citations, graphics, and tables.

4.5.4 Distribution audit: The solution must record what was distributed, when, by whom, to which audience, through which channel, and with what delivery outcome. Authorized City administrators must be able to report and export this information.

4.6 STIX/TAXII, APIs, and Security Integrations

4.6.1 STIX/TAXII: The solution must support standards-based STIX 2.x and TAXII 2.x client and server functions, scoped collections and credentials, filtering, directionality controls, and testable delivery to City and member security tools.

4.6.2 APIs: The solution must provide documented APIs for intelligence search, retrieval, submission, enrichment, case or workflow integration, administration, and reporting as applicable. The proposer must disclose authentication methods, rate limits, quotas, and feature restrictions.

4.6.3 Security-tool integration: The solution must support integration with commonly used SIEM, SOAR, firewall, email-security, DNS, EDR/XDR, vulnerability-management, and ticketing platforms through native connectors, APIs, or standards-based interfaces.

4.6.4 Integration controls: Each proposed integration must identify whether it is inbound, outbound, or bidirectional; its approval and automation behavior; the enforcement point; credential scope; health monitoring; error handling; test procedure; and recovery method.

4.6.5 Detection content: The solution must generate, manage, and export actionable detection content in supported vendor-neutral and control-specific formats, including Sigma, YARA, Snort, Suricata, SIEM queries, or equivalent formats applicable to the proposed solution. STIX/TAXII transport must not, by itself, satisfy this requirement. The proposer must identify which formats can be generated, imported, exported, evaluated, and deployed. City approval must be required before activation or enforcement.

4.6.6 Optional telemetry and security data capability: The proposer must separately price an optional capability to ingest, retain, search, and correlate approximately 50 GB of City security telemetry for the primary City environment. The proposer

must disclose included daily or total data volume, retention, supported sources, query and alerting functions, overages, and integration dependencies. This optional capability must be evaluated separately and must not be required to satisfy the base TISP scope.

4.7 AI-Assisted Threat-Intelligence Analysis

4.7.1 Analytic functions: The base solution must provide generally available, licensed, supported, and contractually committed AI-assisted intelligence search, prioritization, triage, scoring, enrichment, correlation, investigation support, report generation, summarization, and natural-language interaction appropriate to authorized threat intelligence workflows. These capabilities must be demonstrated before award and validated during acceptance testing.

4.7.2 Source grounding: AI-assisted outputs must identify the source records used, relevant timestamps, confidence or uncertainty, and material limitations. The solution must enable analysts to inspect the underlying evidence before relying on or publishing an output.

4.7.3 Governance and access: AI functions must enforce the same role, organization, TLP, privacy, retention, and audit controls that apply to the underlying data. Prompts, retrieved content, outputs, approvals, and material configuration changes must be auditable.

4.7.4 Human approval: The solution must support assisted and approval-gated triage, scoring, and investigation. It must require authorized human approval before an AI-generated product is externally published or shared and before detection content, blocking, enforcement, or another consequential action is activated. Autonomous enforcement or blocking may be proposed only as a separately identified optional capability and must be disabled by default.

4.7.5 Data use disclosure: The proposer must disclose model providers, hosting, subprocessors, data flows, retention, training use, isolation, opt-out controls, usage limits, and costs. City or member data must not be used to train shared or public models without the City's prior written approval.

4.8 Security, Privacy, and Governance

4.8.1 Access and encryption: The solution must support least-privilege role-based access, multifactor authentication, federation, encryption in transit and at rest, credential rotation, session controls, and prompt revocation of access.

4.8.2 Auditability: The solution must maintain searchable audit records for authentication, administration, content access, changes, sharing, exports, integrations, AI use, and security-relevant events. Audit records must be exportable to the City.

4.8.3 Security assurance: The proposer must disclose its current SOC 2, ISO 27001, FedRAMP, StateRAMP, CJIS, penetration-testing, vulnerability-management, business-continuity, and incident-response posture as applicable. The City will evaluate current evidence without accepting unsupported claims.

4.8.4 Data location and subprocessors: The proposer must identify hosting locations, data residency, backup locations, subprocessors, support access, and cross-border data flows. Material changes must require advance notice and any approval required by the final contract.

4.8.5 Handling and records: The solution must support TLP 2.0 and NIST SP 800-150-aligned handling, retention schedules, legal holds, records export, source provenance, and no forced sharing between members.

4.8.6 City data rights: The City must retain ownership or durable City-use rights for City-funded data, configurations, dashboards, reports, templates, documentation, and work products. Click-through terms must not override the City contract or create direct obligations for RCC members.

4.9 Implementation, Migration, Training, and Support

4.9.1 Implementation plan: Within five business days after notice to proceed, the Contractor must provide a detailed implementation plan, governance structure, schedule, risk register, decision log, testing plan, and weekly status-reporting cadence.

4.9.2 Current-state inventory: The Contractor must inventory and document incumbent member organizations, users, roles, permissions, trusted groups or circles, feeds, dashboards, saved searches, priority intelligence requirements, watchlists, alerts, cases, investigations, reports, STIX/TAXII configurations, API configurations, email configurations, integrations, credentials, historical intelligence, audit records, retention settings, and operating procedures before migration decisions are made.

4.9.3 Migration and continuity: The Contractor must preserve and migrate all City-approved items identified in the current-state inventory and must provide source-to-target mapping, rehearsal, validation, rollback, cutover, and continuity plans. No configuration, credential, content, history, audit record, or member record must be deleted before City authorization. The proposer must identify any item it cannot migrate natively and provide an alternate preservation method.

4.9.4 Pilot: The Contractor must conduct a City-approved pilot with representative member organizations covering email-only, portal or dashboard, and machine-to-machine participation before production acceptance.

4.9.5 Training and onboarding: The Contractor must provide role-based City administrator, analyst, and member training; current documentation; recorded sessions; office hours; annual refresher training; and vendor-assisted onboarding and technical integration support.

4.9.6 Support: The Contractor must provide Pacific Time business support, 24x7 coverage for critical incidents, defined escalation paths, named service management, monthly service reporting, and direct Level 2 support for approved member onboarding and integration issues.

4.9.7 Exit assistance: At contract end or transition, the Contractor must provide complete, documented exports of City and member data, configurations, reports, histories, rosters, audit records, and integration information in usable, nonproprietary formats and must certify deletion when directed by the City.

4.10 Minimum Service Levels

4.10.1 Priority 1: For service unavailability, a material security incident, or a critical sharing failure, the Contractor must acknowledge within 15 minutes, provide hourly updates, and restore service within four hours or provide a City-approved workaround.

4.10.2 Priority 2: For major degradation or failure of a critical integration, the Contractor must acknowledge within one hour, provide updates at least every four hours, and restore service within one business day.

4.10.3 Priority 3: For a noncritical defect or administrative issue, the Contractor must acknowledge within four business hours and provide a resolution plan within three business days.

4.10.4 Priority 4: For questions, enhancements, or documentation requests, the Contractor must acknowledge within one business day and provide status within five business days.

4.10.5 Measurement: The Contractor must report monthly on availability, incidents, response and restoration performance, feed and integration health, support cases, delivery failures, onboarding activity, security events, and outstanding corrective actions.

5. PROPOSAL CONTENTS

Responses to this RFP are strongly recommended to be limited to twenty (20) pages and should be written in Arial 12-point font and 1-inch margins. Mandatory exhibit pages (please see section 7.4) do not count towards this page limit:

Cover Letter/Executive Summary: The cover letter must include the name, title, address, and telephone number of the person or persons who will be authorized to represent the proposer entity. Cover letter shall not exceed one page.

Table of Contents: A clear identification of proposal content by section and page number.

Project Introduction: A brief one page summary of the proposer's understanding of the project subject matter, its goals and objectives, the Scope of Work, tasks, and deliverables.

Project Plan: This section should detail how the activities and services described in the Scope of Work and Deliverables, Section 4 of this RFP, will be accomplished.

Statement of Work / Qualifications: A description of the relevant background and experience of the proposer and the legal business status, address, telephone number, fax number, and email address of the proposer entity. This section should include a description of the proposer's experience performing the duties described in Section 4 of this RFP and types of relevant projects proposer has previously worked on.

Team/Staff Organization: A description of the proposed organization of the personnel the proposer has selected to complete this project, and a description of the roles and responsibilities employees will fulfill, reflective of the Scope of Work. This section must include the names of team/staff members assigned or to be assigned to particular roles within the proposed team organization.

Resumes: Provide resumes of the proposer's project team, describing the skills and experience of all personnel identified to work on the project as outlined in Section 4 of this RFP.

Budget/Cost: Itemized quote for the services outlined in Section 4 of this RFP.

References: At least three professional references with the names and contact information of clients or customers for whom the services were provided, dates and periods during which the indicated service was provided, and the extent and exact nature of the services rendered.

Supporting Documents: Any additional supporting documentation/reports demonstrating the organization's ability to deliver the services.

6. GENERAL INFORMATION

6.1 Property of City/Proprietary Material

All proposals submitted in response to this RFP shall become the property of the City of Los Angeles and subject to the State of California Public Records Act. In

the event that the City receives a request regarding this procurement, you may be asked to identify all proprietary or confidential information in your proposal that you believe are exempt from the California Public Records Act (California Government Code Section 6250 et seq.). In the event a Proposer claims such an exemption, the Proposer will be asked to sign the following statement:

"The Proposer will indemnify the City and its officers, employees and agents, and hold them harmless from any claim or liability and defend any action brought against them for their refusal to disclose copyrighted material, trade secrets or other proprietary information to any person making a request therefore."

6.2 Contract Negotiations

Prior to the award of a contract, the successful proposer may be required to attend negotiation meetings that will be scheduled at a later date. The intent of the meeting(s) will be to discuss and negotiate contract requirements, prices, service level agreements, detailed scope of work specifications, ordering, invoicing, delivery, receiving and payment procedures, and anything else to ensure successful administration of the contract.

As part of the negotiation process, the City reserves the right to:

- Fund all or portions of a proposer's proposal and/or require that one proposer collaborate with another for the provision of specific services, either prior to execution of an agreement or at any point during the life of the agreement;
- Require that a funded proposer utilize a facility designated by the City for purposes of implementing its project;
- Request changes or disallow proposed expenditures included in a proposer's cost proposal;
- Elect to contract directly with one or more identified collaborators; and
- Require all collaborators identified in the proposal to become co-signatories to any contract with the City.

6.3 Execution of Contract

A response to this RFP is an offer to contract with the City on an as-needed basis based upon the terms, conditions, service level agreement, and specifications contained in the RFP. A contract will be negotiated and prepared after the City makes an award to the selected proposer.

6.4 Prime Contractor

The proposer awarded the as-needed contract must be the prime contractor/consultant performing the primary functions of the contract. If any portion of the contract is to be subcontracted, it must be clearly set forth in the proposal document as to what part(s) are to be subcontracted, the reasons for the subcontracting, a listing of subcontractors, and the percentage and dollar amount of total contract to be subcontracted. The City reserves the right to reject any proposal wherein use of subcontractors significantly affects the ability of the proposer to function as the prime contractor on the awarded contract. The

prime contractor shall at all times be responsible for the acts and errors or omissions of its subcontractors or joint participants and persons directly or indirectly employed by them.

6.5 Subcontractor/Joint Ventures

Acceptance or rejection of a proposer's request to use subcontractors is at the sole discretion of the City. With approval of the City, the selected proposer may enter into subcontracts and joint participation agreements with others for the performance of portions of the resulting contract.

The provisions of the resulting contract shall apply to all subcontractors in the same manner as to the selected proposer. In particular, the City will not pay, whether directly or indirectly, the fees and expenses of subcontractors that do not conform to the limitations and documentation requirements of the resulting contract. Upon written request from the City, the selected proposer shall supply the City with all subcontractor agreements.

6.6 General City Reservations

6.6.1 The City reserves the right to extend the proposal submission deadline should this be in the interest of the City. Proposers have the right to revise their proposals in the event that the deadline is extended.

6.6.2 The City reserves the right to withdraw this RFP at any time without prior notice. The City makes no representation that any contract will be awarded to any proposer responding to this RFP. The City reserves the right to reject any or all submissions.

6.6.3 If an inadequate number of proposals is received or the proposals received are deemed non-responsive, not qualified, or not cost effective, the City may at its sole discretion reissue the RFP or execute a sole-source contract with a vendor.

6.6.4 The City shall evaluate and rate submitted proposals. Proposers may not make any changes or additions after the deadline for receipt of proposals. The City reserves the right to request additional information or documentation, as it deems necessary.

6.6.5 The City reserves the right to verify all information in the proposal. If the information cannot be verified or if errors are not willful, the City reserves the right to reduce the rating points awarded.

6.6.6 The City reserves the right to require a pre-award interview and/or site inspection.

6.6.7 The City reserves the right to waive minor defects in the proposal in accordance with the City Charter.

6.6.8 If the selection of the proposer is based in part on the qualifications of specific key individuals named in the proposal, the City must approve in

advance any changes in the key individuals or the percentage of time they spend on the project. The City reserves the right to have the selected proposer replace any project personnel.

7. SPECIFIC TERMS AND CONDITIONS

7.1 Statutory Requirements

The City of Los Angeles Standard Provisions for City Contracts (rev. 05/26, v.1), attached as Exhibit L, are hereby incorporated into this RFP. Please review this information carefully. Compliance with these requirements and submission of necessary forms is mandatory prior to award of contract.

7.2 Contractor Evaluation Ordinance

When the term of the contract pursuant to this RFP has concluded, the City will conduct an evaluation of the contractor's performance. The City may also conduct evaluations of the contractor's performance during the term of the contract. As required by Section 10.39.2 of the City of Los Angeles Administrative Code (LAAC), evaluations will be based on several criteria, including the quality of the work product or service performed, the timeliness of performance, financial issues, and the expertise of personnel that the contractor assigns to the contract. A contractor shall be provided with a copy of the final City evaluation and allowed fourteen (14) calendar days to respond. The City shall use the final City evaluation, and any response from the contractor, to evaluate proposals and to conduct reference checks when awarding other service contracts.

7.3 Nondiscrimination, Equal Employment Practices and Affirmative Action Program

Proposers are advised that any contract awarded pursuant to this procurement process shall be subject to the applicable provisions of LAAC Section 10.8.2., Non-discrimination Clause.

Non-construction services to or for the City for which the consideration is $1,000.00 or more shall comply with the provisions of LAAC Sections 10.8.3., Equal Employment Practices Provisions.

Non-construction services to or for the City for which the consideration is $100,000.00 or more shall comply with the provisions of LAAC Sections 10.8.4., Affirmative Action Program Provisions.

As a condition to the award of a contract under this RFP, the contractor shall assure that it will comply fully with the nondiscrimination and equal opportunity provisions of the following laws:

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color and national origin;
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, which prohibits discrimination against qualified individuals with disabilities;

- The Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age.

The contractor shall also comply with all regulations implementing the laws listed above and all requirements of the grantor funding this project. This assurance applies to the contractor's operation of the program or activity. The contractor understands that the United States and the City of Los Angeles have the right to seek judicial enforcement of this assurance.

7.4 Certifications, Statements, and Affidavits

Please carefully review all attachments and exhibits to this RFP and any additional information published by the Bureau of Contract Administration, available at: https://bca.lacity.org/contracting. Acknowledgement of and compliance with these requirements and submission of necessary forms is mandatory prior to award of contract. Proposers must submit with its response to this RFP, at a minimum, the below documents marked (*):

- Certificate of Insurance (uploaded to KwikComply at kwikcomply.org) and Insurance Requirements (Exhibit A)
- Proposer Workforce Information (Exhibit B)*
- Statement of Non-Collusion (Exhibit C)*
- Contractor Responsibility Questionnaire (Exhibit D)*
- Pledge of Compliance, Contractor Responsibility Ordinance (Exhibit E)
- Equal Benefits Ordinance Affidavit (Exhibit F)*
- Certification and Disclosure Regarding Lobbying (Exhibit G)*
- Certification Regarding Debarment, Ineligibility, Suspension (Exhibit H)*
- Certification Regarding Drug-Free Workplace Act (Exhibit I)
- Bidder Certification City Ethics Commission Forms 50 and 55 (Exhibit J)*
- Living Wage Ordinance Forms (Exhibit K)*
- Slavery and Border Wall Disclosure Ordinance Affidavit (available on www.rampla.org) (Exhibit L)*
- City Contracting History (Exhibit M)*
- Child Support Obligations (Exhibit N) *
- Standard Provisions for City Contracts (rev. 05/26, v.1) (Exhibit O)

7.5 Americans with Disabilities Act

The selected contractor shall comply with the Disabilities Act 42, U.S.C. Section 12101 et seq., and it's implementing regulations. The contractor will provide reasonable accommodations to allow qualified individuals with disabilities to have access to and to participate in its programs, services and activities in accordance with the provisions of the Disabilities Act. The contractor will not discriminate against persons with disabilities or against persons due to their relationship to or association with a person with a disability. Any subcontract entered into by the contractor, relating to the resulting contract of this RFP, to the extent allowed hereunder, shall be subject to the provisions of this paragraph.

7.6 Child Support Assignment Orders

Any contract awarded pursuant to this RFP shall be subject to the following:

The contract is subject to Section 10.10 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code, Child Support Assignment Orders Ordinance. Pursuant to this Ordinance, contractor certifies that it shall: (1) fully comply with all State and Federal employment reporting requirements applicable to Child Support Assignment Orders; (2) that the principal owner(s) of the contractor is/are in compliance with any Wage and Earnings Assignment Orders and Notices of Assignment applicable to them personally; (3) fully comply with all lawfully served Wage and Earnings Assignment Orders and Notices of Assignment in accordance with California Family Code Section 5230 et seq.; and (4) maintain such compliance throughout the term of this contract. Pursuant to Section 10.10.b of the Los Angeles Administrative Code, failure of contractor to comply with all applicable reporting requirements or to implement lawfully served Wage and Earnings Assignment Orders and Notices of Assignment or the failure of any principal owner(s) of contractor to comply with any Wage and Earnings Assignment Orders and Notices of Assignment applicable to them personally shall constitute a default by the contractor under the terms of this contract, subjecting this contract to termination where such failure shall continue for more than ninety (90) days after notice of such failure to contractor by the City. Any subcontract entered into by the contractor relating to this Contract, to the extent allowed hereunder, shall be subject to the provisions of this paragraph and shall incorporate the provisions of the Child Support Assignment Orders Ordinance. Failure of the contractor to obtain compliance of its subcontractors shall constitute a default by the contractor under the terms of this contract, subjecting this contract to termination where such failure shall continue for more than ninety (90) days after notice of such failure to contractor by the City.

Contractor shall comply with the Child Support Compliance Act of 1998 of the State of California Employment Development Department. Contractor assures that to the best of its knowledge it is fully complying with the earnings assignment orders of all employees, and is providing the names of all new employees to the New Hire Registry maintained by the Employment Development Department as set forth in subdivision (1) of the Public Contract Code 7110.

8. EVALUATION CRITERIA

8.1 All proposals shall be initially reviewed to determine if they are responsive to all of the City's statutory requirements. Those proposals deemed non-responsive shall be eliminated from consideration. Those proposals deemed responsive shall be evaluated by a panel selected by the City.

8.2 Proposer Interviews/Questions & Answers: The evaluation panel may invite selected proposers receiving the highest scores to present their qualifications in a virtual format or to address the panel's clarifying questions, if any.

8.3 The City at its option may reject any and all proposals submitted in response to this RFP, or waive any administrative irregularities or informalities in a proposal when to do so would be to the advantage of the City.

8.4 Evaluation Factors

Proposals shall be evaluated on each of the topic areas listed in Section 4.

Evaluation shall be based on the following factors and points available for each factor:

Written Proposal Evaluation Factors	
Experience: Qualifications and experience of the proposer and key personnel assigned to the delivery of the project services.	**50**
Quality and Responsiveness of the Proposal: Clarity, brevity, and focus of the proposal in understanding and addressing the issues and requirements of the RFP.	**40**
Cost: Reasonableness of costs to services and best value to the City.	**10**
Total Available Points	**100**

Proposals are due via email no later than **4:30 p.m. PST on December 1, 2026.**