

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #18-013

## MOBILE TICKETING PLATFORM

### SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA WATER EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

#### **ADDENDUM No. 2**

June 11, 2018

#### **SCOPE**

Addendum No. 2 consists of three (3) pages. Addendum No. 2 includes the following:

- A. Response to questions submitted from May 17, 2018 through June 6, 2018.

This addendum has been posted on the WETA website for review by all potential bidders.

#### **A. CLARIFICATIONS, QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

- Q1.** Are non-US companies allowed to present and offer? If so, are any mandatory documents/certifications needed for foreign companies?  
**A1.** Yes, companies from outside the United States are allowed to offer on this bid. No mandatory documents/certifications are needed for foreign companies.
- Q2.** Does the proposed Mobile Ticketing Platform (MTP) hosting facility have to be located in the United States?  
**A2.** There is no locational requirement for the MTP.
- Q3.** Can foreign companies apply for Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) certification?  
**A3.** No. Please note, while WETA encourages DBE participation on this project it is not a requirement and there is contract specific DBE goal.
- Q4.** Is the estimated annual budget (between \$50,000 - 60,000) to provide, host, operate and maintain the MTP considered a firm cap? Can proposals in excess of such budget (assuming WETA estimated transaction volume) evaluated under criteria set in section K.2 of RFP?  
**A4.** The estimated annual budget of \$50,000-\$60,000 is not a firm limit; proposals can exceed this estimated budget.
- Q5.** The RFP states that the "MTP must be deployed and in use at an existing transit agency or organization." Do complete booking and ticketing solutions for ferries, including similar mobile ticketing features, comply with this requirement?  
**A5.** Yes.

- Q6.** The MTP shall not manage any tickets inventory (seats availability vs. sold tickets); on-board capacity is managed off-line when tickets are validated; please confirm if this statement is correct.
- A6.** Yes.
- Q7.** The MTP shall issue tickets for the origin and destination selected only. No specific identification of the ride (Time of departure) is needed at purchase time, nor during validation; please confirm if this statement is correct.
- A7.** Yes.
- Q8.** Is there a rule for how long a ticket will be valid after purchase?
- A8.** No; however, WETA would prefer that this be a configurable variable.
- Q9.** What is the standard payment required for the MTP other than the desired mobile wallet payment options? If it is by credit card, is it expected that the related bank account to be held and managed by the Vendor or by WETA?
- A9.** Credit card will be the standard payment required for the MTP. WETA desires that the Vendor will deposit fare revenues (minus applicable transaction and credit card processing fees and taxes) into WETA's bank account on a regular basis with specific dates and frequencies to be agreed upon after the proposal process. WETA's proposed estimated budget assumes the Vendor will pay market-standard credit card processing fees. For the purpose of price proposals assume that the Vendor will pay the processing fees, however WETA is open to other financial processing methods and revenue models that can be determined during final contract negotiations.
- Q10.** Can we assume the Vendor will integrate the mobile payment system with WETA's existing payment processor and gateway, and WETA will be responsible for paying the transaction fees?
- A10.** Refer to QA 9 above for more detail.
- Q11.** The RFP states that the MTP "doesn't require a user account or sign-in to purchase tickets, but will be optional." Is the purpose of this requirement as listed to provide an experience with minimal and frictionless login, or to actually remove initial account creation entirely?
- A11.** The purpose of this requirement is to provide a minimal and frictionless login experience. WETA prefers to have a login experience that allows the user to choose between easily creating a user account OR by checking-out as a "guest" that doesn't require an account. An MTP solution that provides both options is preferred. An MTP solution that requires a user to make an account is acceptable but the process must be as minimal and frictionless as possible.
- Q12.** Application Programming Interface (API) for extracting usage data that is free for WETA to access, use, and share. Can you further describe use-cases envisioned for this functionality?
- A12.** Uses include, pulling sales data into WETA internal tools, sharing WETA sales data programmatically with other agencies, and allowing sales data to be pulled programmatically into Blue & Gold Fleet's (WETA's contract operator) internal tools.
- Q13.** Page 3, Desired Features. Ability for third party applications such as Google Maps, Apple Maps, Transit app, Citymapper, and TNC's (Uber/Lyft) to offer WETA mobile

tickets in their app via an API or SDK. Please clarify your expectations and purpose. Please confirm that you have all these APIs or SDKs available.

- A13.** Many 3<sup>rd</sup> party applications which would offer transit ticket sales (UBER, Google Maps, Transit App, etc) either just started offering this feature or have yet to offer it because it is relatively new. By having an API that allows these 3<sup>rd</sup> parties to sell tickets these integrations could happen in the future. Some examples of agencies that have 3<sup>rd</sup> party integrations are: NICE Bus on Long Island, Las Vegas RTC, and TAO Orléans (France). WETA does not have any APIs or SDKs, these would be provided by the 3<sup>rd</sup> party applications (UBER, Google Maps, Transit App, etc).
- Q14.** Requirement D, Data Security. "The Consultant must process and store all WETA PII in a single-tenant environment and at no time will WETA PII be commingled with data of other users of Consultant's services. Many SaaS solutions operate on a multi-tenanted platform which helps lower costs for all parties involved. Controls can be put in place to maintain security of WETA PII data while hosting in a multi-tenanted environment. Is Requirement D stipulated by law or merely the preference for WETA?"
- A14.** WETA will consider a proposal that provides adequate assurances that a multi-tenant environment is secure. WETA may require additional contractual protections be included in the Agreement if the highest ranked proposer includes a multi-tenant solution. Any proposal for a multi-tenant solution should also include specifics as to the cost savings described in the question.
- Q15.** Cost Proposal. For purposes of evaluation, Proposers should include a cost proposal that sets forth an all-inclusive lump sum amount for developing, hosting, and maintaining the Mobile Ticketing Platform during a two-month development period following issuance of a Notice to Proceed and a subsequent three-year operating period. Please clarify your expectations for this time line.
- A15.** WETA's schedule requirements are defined in Section C.4 and Section I.2.e of the RFP.
- Q16.** Can WETA please provide the following information for the past three (3) years per fare type:
1. The number of transactions and total amount per year for each fare type.
  2. The number of transactions and total amount for online, on board and 3<sup>rd</sup> party retail store per year for each fare type?
  3. The number of transactions and total amount per year collected from credit cards and cash for each fare type per year?
- A16.** This information is not readily available for distribution as part of this RFP process.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT BY OFFEROR**

Each Offeror is required to acknowledge receipt of all Addenda, including this Addendum No. 2 as specified in the RFP Instructions to Proposers.

### **ISSUED BY:**



Taylor Rutsch  
Project Manager

6/11/2018

Date