

**City and County of San Francisco
Office of Contract Administration
Purchasing Division**

First Amendment

THIS **FIRST AMENDMENT** (“Amendment”) is made as of September 30, 2026, in San Francisco, California, by and between **OpenGov, Inc.** (“Contractor”), and the City and County of San Francisco, a municipal corporation (“City”), acting by and through its Director of the Office of Contract Administration.

Recitals

WHEREAS, City and Contractor have entered into the Agreement (as defined below); and
WHEREAS, City and Contractor desire to modify the Agreement on the terms and conditions set forth herein to extend the performance period, increase the contract amount, and update standard contractual clauses; and

WHEREAS, Contractor was selected pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 21.30 pursuant to waiver OCAWVR0012259 granted by the Office of Contract Administration; modified waiver OCAWVR0012344 granted by the Office of Contract Administration, and waiver OCAWVR0013532 granted by the Office of Contract Administration, and this Amendment is consistent with those waivers; and

WHEREAS, this Amendment is consistent with an approval obtained on June 18, 2026 from the Civil Service Commission under PSC number DHRPSC0006234 in the amount of \$6,500,000.00 for the period commencing 10/1/2026 and ending 9/30/2031; and

WHEREAS, this Amendment is consistent with an approval obtained from the City’s **Board of Supervisors** under **[insert resolution number]** approved on **[insert date of Board action]** in the amount of **[insert Dollar Amount]** for the period commencing October 1, 2026 and ending September 30, 2031; and

WHEREAS, the Department has filed Ethics Form 126f4 (Notification of Contract Approval) because this Agreement, as amended herein, has a value of \$100,000 or more in a fiscal year and will require the approval of the Board of Supervisors.

Now, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

Article 1 Preface

The following definitions shall apply to this Amendment:

1.1 **Agreement.** The term “Agreement” shall mean the Agreement dated October 1, 2025 between Contractor and City, as amended by the:

1.2 **Other Terms.** Terms used and not defined in this Amendment shall have the meanings assigned to such terms in the Agreement.

1.3 **San Francisco Labor and Employment Code.** As of January 4, 2024, San Francisco Administrative Code Chapters 21C (Miscellaneous Prevailing Wage Requirements), 12B (Nondiscrimination in Contracts), 12C (Nondiscrimination in Property Contracts), 12P (Minimum Compensation), 12Q (Health Care Accountability), and 12U (Sweatfree Contracting) are redesignated as Articles 102 (Miscellaneous Prevailing Wage Requirements), 131 (Nondiscrimination in Contracts), 132 (Nondiscrimination in Property Contracts), 111 (Minimum Compensation), 121 (Health Care Accountability), and 151 (Sweatfree Contracting) of the San Francisco Labor and Employment Code, respectively. Wherever this Agreement refers to San Francisco Administrative Code Chapters 21C, 12B, 12C, 12P, 12Q, and 12U, it shall be construed to mean San Francisco Labor and Employment Code Articles 102, 131, 132, 111, 121, and 151, respectively.

1.4 **Open For Business Legislative Changes.** In October 2025, San Francisco enacted legislation that reduced obligations City places on contactors. These changes went into effect January 1, 2026. Articles 141 and 142 were repealed, to the extent those conditions appear in this Agreement, they should be treated as nullified. The dollar value threshold for application for Administrative Code Chapters 12F, 12N, 12L, 12Y, and 101 and Labor and Employment Code Article 151 were increased. If the Agreement is valued at less than \$230,000, 12N, 12Y and 101 are not in effect. If the Agreement is valued at \$230,000 or less, 12F and 151 are not in effect. If the Agreement is valued at less than \$1,000,000, Chapter 12L is not in effect. Any clause in the Agreement concerning a condition referenced above that is not in effect shall be treated as nullified.

Article 2 Modifications of Scope to the Agreement

Article 2 of the Agreement currently reads as follows:

2.1 **Term of the Agreement.** Article 2 of the Agreement currently reads as follows:

2.1 **Term.** The term of this Agreement shall commence on October 1, 2025 and expire on September 30, 2026, unless earlier terminated as otherwise provided herein.

2.2 **Options to Extend.** City has the option to renew the Agreement for a period of [two] (2) additional years. City may exercise this option at City's sole and absolute discretion by modifying this Agreement as provided in Section 12.6, "Modification of this Agreement." Extensions may be for the whole or partial period provided for above.

Such section is hereby amended in its entirety to read as follows:

2.1 **Term.** The term of this Agreement shall commence on October 1, 2025 and expire on September 30, 2031, unless earlier terminated as otherwise provided herein.

2.2 **Section 3.3.1. Section 3.3.1 Compensation** of the Agreement currently reads as follows:

3.3.1 Calculation of Charges and Contract Not to Exceed Amount. The amount of this Agreement shall not exceed Five Million Nine-Hundred Thousand dollars [\$5,900,000], the breakdown of which appears in Appendix C, "Calculation of Charges." City shall not be liable for interest or late charges for any late payments. If City fails to make any payments required under this Agreement, then in addition to any other rights Contractor may have under this Agreement or applicable law, if City's account remains delinquent (with respect to payment of an undisputed invoice) for 30 days after receipt of a delinquency notice from Contractor, which may be provided via email to City's designated billing contact, Contractor may temporarily suspend City's access to the SaaS Services for up to 90 days to pursue good faith negotiations before pursuing termination in accordance with this Agreement. City will continue to incur and owe all applicable fees irrespective of any such service suspension based on such City's delinquency. City will not honor minimum service order charges for any Services covered by this Agreement.

(a) **SaaS Implementation and Training Services:** The breakdown of costs associated with the SaaS Implementation and Training Services appear in Appendix C ("Calculation of Charges"). Compensation for services rendered pursuant to Appendix A shall be made annually in advance within 30 calendar days of receipt of the invoice, unless a different schedule is set out in Appendix A. In no event shall the amount for SaaS Implementation and Training Services under this Agreement exceed One Million Nine-Hundred Thousand dollars and no cents [\$1,900,000].

(b) **SaaS Application and Hosted Services:** The breakdown of costs associated with the SaaS Application and Hosted Services appear in Appendix C ("Calculation of Charges"). Compensation for services rendered pursuant to Appendix C shall be made annually in advance within 30 calendar days of receipt of the invoice, unless a different schedule is set out in Appendix A. In no event shall the amount for SaaS Application and Hosted Services under this Agreement exceed Four Million dollars and no cents [\$4,000,000]. If there is an increase in annual SaaS Application and Hosted Services charges, Contractor shall give City written notice of such increase at least thirty (30) days prior to the expiration of the applicable SaaS Application and Hosted Services period. Annual SaaS Application and Hosted Services charges shall not increase more than five percent (5%) of the rate of the year immediately prior to such increase. If the City chooses to enter into a multi-year renewal before or at the conclusion of the initial term of the Agreement in accordance with Section 2.2, the escalation on SaaS Application and Hosted Services of five percent (5%) shall be on a base price of Three and a Half Million dollars and no cents [\$3,500,000].

Such section is hereby amended in its entirety to read as follows:

3.3.1 Calculation of Charges and Contract Not to Exceed Amount. The amount of this Agreement shall not exceed Thirty-eight Million, Nine Hundred Sixty-Five Thousand, Nine Hundred Eighty-Five Dollars and Ninety Two Cents [\$38,965,985.92], the

breakdown of which appears in Appendix C-1, “Calculation of Charges.” City shall not be liable for interest or late charges for any late payments. If City fails to make any payments required under this Agreement, then in addition to any other rights Contractor may have under this Agreement or applicable law, if City’s account remains delinquent (with respect to payment of an undisputed invoice) for 30 days after receipt of a delinquency notice from Contractor, which may be provided via email to City’s designated billing contact, Contractor may temporarily suspend City’s access to the SaaS Services for up to 90 days to pursue good faith negotiations before pursuing termination in accordance with this Agreement. City will continue to incur and owe all applicable fees irrespective of any such service suspension based on such City’s delinquency. City will not honor minimum service order charges for any Services covered by this Agreement.

(a) **SaaS Implementation and Training Services:** The breakdown of costs associated with the SaaS Implementation and Training Services appear in Appendix C-1 (“Calculation of Charges”). Compensation for services rendered pursuant to Appendix A-1 shall be made annually in advance within 30 calendar days of receipt of the invoice, unless a different schedule is set out in Appendix A-1. In no event shall the amount for SaaS Implementation and Training Services under this Agreement exceed Eight Million Four Hundred Thousand [\$8,400,000.00] in accordance with Appendix C-1 Calculation of Charges.

(b) **SaaS Application and Hosted Services:** The breakdown of costs associated with the SaaS Application and Hosted Services appear in Appendix C-1 (“Calculation of Charges”). Compensation for services rendered shall be made annually in advance within 30 calendar days of receipt of the invoice, unless a different schedule is set out in Appendix C-1. In no event shall the amount for SaaS Application and Hosted Services under this Agreement exceed Thirty Million, Five Hundred Sixty-Five Thousand, Nine Hundred Eighty-Five Dollars and Ninety-Two Cents [\$30,565,985.92]. If there is an increase in annual SaaS Application and Hosted Services charges, Contractor shall give City written notice of such increase at least thirty (30) days prior to the expiration of the applicable SaaS Application and Hosted Services period. Annual SaaS Application and Hosted Services charges shall not increase more than five percent (5%) of the rate of the year immediately prior to such increase.

2.3 **Appendix A.** Appendix A-SaaS Implementation and Training Services is hereby replaced in its entirety by Appendix A-1, attached to this Amendment and fully incorporated within the Agreement. To the extent the Agreement refers to Appendix A in any place, the true meaning shall be Appendix A-1, which is a correct and updated version.

2.4 **Appendix C.** Appendix C-Calculation of Charges is hereby replaced in its entirety by Appendix C-1, attached to this Amendment and fully incorporated within the Agreement. To the extent the Agreement refers to Appendix C in any place, the true meaning shall be Appendix C-1, which is a correct and updated version.

Article 3 Effective Date

Each of the modifications set forth in this Amendment shall be effective on and after the date of this Amendment and final approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Article 4 Legal Effect

Except as expressly modified by this Amendment, all of the terms and conditions of the Agreement shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Contractor and City have executed this Amendment as of the date first referenced above.

CITY
Recommended by:

CONTRACTOR
OpenGov, Inc.

Sarah Dennis Phillips
Director
SF Planning

Sam Kramer
Chief Financial Officer

City Supplier number: 0000053406

Approved as to Form:

David Chiu
City Attorney

By: _____
Margarita Gutierrez
Deputy City Attorney

Approved:

Sailaja Kurella
Director of the Office of Contract
Administration, and Purchaser

By: _____
Paul Cheng
Supervising Purchaser

Attachments:
Appendix A-1 Statement of Work
Appendix C-1 Calculation of Charges

Appendix A-1 Statement of Work

Attached

OPENGOV | PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

APPENDIX A-1 STATEMENT OF WORK

City and County of San Francisco, CA

Digital Enhancement Initiative

Permitting & Licensing - Permit SF

PREPARED FOR

City and County of San Francisco, CA

PermitSF Initiative

PREPARED BY

OpenGov, Inc.

Professional Services — Strategic Deals Division

Document Number	PS-11559.10
Version	Final
Issue Date	April 17, 2026
Valid Through	July 17, 2026
Lead Author	Dean Simpson, Staff Solution Consultant

1. Executive Summary	7
1.1 Engagement Purpose	7
1.2 Engagement Parameters	7
1.3 Key Delivery Principles	8
2. Implementation Methodology	8
2.1 Five-Step Hybrid Methodology	8
2.2 Delivery Model	9
3. Engagement Governance	10
3.1 Governance Structure	10
Decision Ownership by Role	10
Project Sponsor (City)	10
Project Manager (City)	10
Product Manager (City)	10
DataSF Data Officer (City)	11
OpenGov Program Manager	11
OpenGov Functional / Technical Leads	11
Key Governance Principles	11
3.2 OpenGov Responsibilities	12
Program Delivery	12
Scoping & Phase Planning	12
Execution & Delivery	12
Transparency & Reporting	12
Risk & Issue Management	12
Capability Transfer	13
Accountability	13
3.3 City Responsibilities	13
Program Participation	13
Data & Systems	13
Decision-Making	13
Phase Readiness	13
Shared Responsibility	14
3.4 Acceptance Procedure	14
Process	14

Key Clarifications	15
3.5 Change Control	15
Important Clarification	15
3.6 Phase Governance & Ongoing Program Review	15
Ongoing Program Review	15
3.7 Delivery Management System	16
4. Risk Management Framework	16
4.1 Risk Classification	16
Additional Classification Considerations	17
4.2 Key Risk Areas & Mitigations	17
4.3 Risk Ownership & Accountability	19
5. Quality Assurance	19
5.1 Quality Management Approach	19
Core Quality Principles	20
Quality Dimensions	20
5.2 Testing Strategy	21
Defect Management	21
Record Type User Acceptance Testing	22
5.3 Acceptance & Readiness Alignment	23
Key Clarifications	23
6. Permitting & Licensing	23
Department Selection & Sequencing	24
6.2 Solution configuration approach	25
Configuration Scope Includes:	25
Approach Principles	25
Out of Scope	26
6.3 Permit Model & Rationalization	26
Guiding Principle	26
OpenGov Responsibilities – Permit Rationalization	27
Standardized Permit Model	27
Complexity Classification Framework	28
Implementation Commitment	29
6.4 System Integrations	30

Scope Approach	30
Integration Definition & Authorization	30
Roles & Responsibilities	30
Key Clarifications	31
Future Definition	31
6.5 Data Migration	31
Purpose	31
In Scope	31
Out of Scope	32
Phase-Based Data Scope	32
Key Principle	32
6.6 Citywide Data Taxonomy	32
6.7 Training	33
a. Approach	33
b. Readiness Requirement	33
7.1 Delivery Team	34
7.2 Phase Delivery & Throughput	35
Core Principle	35
Phase Planning & Project Charters	35
Progress Measurement	35
Performance Expectations	35
7.3 Illustrative Phase Timeline	36
7.4 Environments	36
8. Phase Zero	36
8.1 Purpose	37
8.2 Phase Zero Timeline	37
8.3 Scope of Activities	38
Permit Rationalization	38
Assess third-party system readiness Data Assessment	38
Complexity Assessment	38
Sequencing & Phase Planning	38
8.4 Deliverables	38
9. Project Charters	39

9.1 Purpose	39
9.2 Relationship to Initial Scoping	40
9.3 Required Contents of Each Project Charter	40
1. Phase Overview	40
2. Scope	40
3. Complexity Mix	40
4. Capabilities	40
5. Data Scope	41
6. Assumptions & Dependencies	41
7. Timeline & Milestones	41
8. Success Criteria & Acceptance	41
9.4 Binding Nature	41
9.5 Changes to Scope	41
9.6 Phase Completion & Transition	42

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Engagement Purpose

This Statement of Work (SOW) governs the City and County of San Francisco's engagement of OpenGov to support the phased implementation of the OpenGov Permitting & Licensing Cloud (PLC) as part of the PermitSF initiative, a citywide modernization of permitting, licensing, inspections, and code enforcement operations across the City and County of San Francisco.

The engagement will begin upon contract execution with Phase Zero – an Initial Assessment - followed by defined phases authorized through Project Charters, which will serve as the binding scopes.

Implementation sequencing and department prioritization shall be determined through the Initial Scoping & Rationalization process defined in Section 8. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City has designated the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and San Francisco Public Works (SFPW/DPW) as priority departments. Discovery and Project Charter development for these departments shall be initiated upon contract execution and shall be rationalized into the overall program sequencing plan prior to authorization of subsequent Project Charters. Priority designation does not guarantee a specific implementation order, which remains subject to the outputs of Section 8.

1.2 Engagement Parameters

The following are initial planning assumptions and are **subject to refinement during Initial Scoping & Rationalization process defined in Section 8:**

Parameter	Description
Duration	Up to 36 months
Record Types	Existing permit inventory, up to one-hundred fifty (150) (to be consolidated), scoped to departments listed in Section 6.1 of this SOW up to 12 departments. Assumed complexity distribution: 25% low complexity, 50% medium complexity, 25% high complexity.
Departments	Implementation scoped to departments listed in Section 6.1 of this SOW up to 12 departments
Integrations	Up to eight (8)
Autofills	Up to one hundred (100)

Implementation scope is **not committed upfront** and will be defined phase-by-phase through approved Project Charters (defined in Section 9).

1.3 Key Delivery Principles

- **Phased Delivery:** Work is delivered in defined phases with clear scope and acceptance criteria
- **Rationalization First:** Existing permit structures will be standardized before implementation
- **Outcome-Based:** Progress is measured by configured, tested, and accepted scope, not effort
- **Shared Accountability:** Both parties are responsible for timely decisions, data readiness, and delivery execution
- **No Implicit Scope:** Only work explicitly defined in a Project Charter is in scope
- **Complexity-Based Planning:** Implementation scope is classified and sequenced using a Low/Medium/High complexity framework defined in Section 6.3

2. Implementation Methodology

2.1 Five-Step Hybrid Methodology

OpenGov will deliver services under this SOW using a phased methodology designed to support upfront scoping, controlled implementation, and iterative delivery.

This methodology will be applied across implementation (phases 1-5) authorized under this SOW, with participating departments, permits, capabilities, and timelines defined in the applicable Project Charter.

Phase	Name	Activities	OpenGov Deliverables
0	Initial Discovery & Capability Assessment	City led activity to understand full landscape and define phases	• Participate in rationalization workshops • Provide product fitness analysis
1	Initiate	Departmental kickoff, requirements discovery, stakeholder alignment, risk identification, and provisioning of any new environments to support development and testing	Project Charter

Phase	Name	Activities	OpenGov Deliverables
2	Validate	Requirements validation, workflow mapping, configuration planning, and data readiness assessment	Requirements Summary, Workflow Diagrams, Data Templates
3	Configure	System configuration, data services, integration development, configuration workshops, report development	Configured System, Integration Documentation, Reports, Configuration Sign-off
4	Train	Foundational training, administrator training, end user training, User acceptance testing (UAT)	Training Materials, UAT Plan & Report, UAT Sign-off
5	Launch	Go-live readiness assessment, production cutover, hyperadopt support, knowledge transfer, transition to Customer Success	Go-Live Checklist, Transition Plan, Handoff Documentation, Final Acceptance, Hyperadopt includes 2 weeks of user-facing guidance, Q&A, and professional services post go-live support

2.2 Delivery Model

OpenGov will perform services under this SOW using a hybrid delivery model combining remote execution with an embedded onsite team.

For onsite activities, the Customer will provide suitable workspace including conference rooms with appropriate attendee capacity, non-public Wi-Fi connectivity, and AV equipment. Specific onsite events are identified within each phase of Section 6. Permitting & Licensing.

3. Engagement Governance

This section establishes how decisions are made, how delivery is managed, and how scope is controlled.

Governance applies at both:

- the **overall program**, and
- each **implementation phase**, authorized through a Project Charter

3.1 Governance Structure

The engagement will follow a three-tier governance model:

Level	Cadence	Purpose
Executive Steering Committee	Monthly (or as needed)	Strategic direction, escalation resolution, phase approval
Program Review	Weekly	Delivery tracking, risk management, resource alignment
Working Sessions	Weekly (active phases)	Design decisions, configuration validation, issue resolution

Decision Ownership by Role

Project Sponsor (City)

- approval of Project Charters
- major scope changes and funding decisions
- resolution of escalated risks and cross-department conflicts
- alignment of implementation with business goals
- stakeholder engagement and organizational readiness
- escalation support when cross-team alignment is required

Project Manager (City)

- coordination across departments and with OpenGov delivery teams
- tracking of phase schedule, milestones, and dependencies
- acceptance of deliverables against defined criteria
- logistics for Phase Charter execution (scheduling, resourcing, status reporting)

Product Manager (City)

- prioritization of permits and capabilities within a phase
- prioritization of product / feature requests

- functional decisions on workflows, business rules, and user experience
- definition of acceptance criteria (handed to the Project Manager to confirm deliverables meet them)
- liaison with department subject-matter experts on functional requirements

DataSF Data Officer (City)

- reviews and provides written acceptance of the mechanism(s) OpenGov selects to satisfy the data-access requirements defined in Section 6.4, prior to the deprecation of the existing read replica in Production environment. Acceptance is limited to confirming the mechanism meets the standards in Section 6.4 and is not an approval of OpenGov's broader product roadmap.
- participates in the definition and ongoing review of "Contracted Views" and any other approved data-access mechanism(s) to ensure stable, documented data access for downstream City systems (e.g., DataSF, PIM). OpenGov retains final approval authority and will provide one hundred eighty (180) calendar days' notice prior to deprecating or changing any approved data-access mechanism.
- provides acceptance of data models developed as part of OpenGov Professional Services-delivered solutions to ensure they align with the City's open data standards.
- monitors and reports on OpenGov site responsiveness; escalating issues to OpenGov for remediation
- submits a prioritized list of high value data sets, as well as, capabilities for data-access and GIS through Project Charters and Ongoing Product Reviews described in Section 3.6, and receives a written response from OpenGov's product team on acceptance or status of requests.

OpenGov Program Manager

- delivery planning and execution
- timeline management and milestone tracking
- risk identification and escalation
- coordination of OpenGov resources

OpenGov Functional / Technical Leads

- solution design recommendations
- configuration approach and technical implementation
- identification of constraints, trade-offs, and risks

Key Governance Principles

- Decision ownership is **explicit and role-based**, not meeting-based
- Decisions are made at the **lowest appropriate level** and escalated only when needed

- The City retains ownership of **business and prioritization decisions**
- OpenGov is accountable for **delivery, execution, and technical implementation**
- Governance forums are used to **resolve decisions**, not defer them

3.2 OpenGov Responsibilities

OpenGov is responsible for delivery of the agreed scope and overall execution, with key decisions made in coordination with and subject to approval by the City as defined in the governance structure.

Program Delivery

- maintain OpenGov project plan, including phases, milestones, and dependencies
- manage delivery in alignment with approved Project Charters
- provide a Program Manager accountable for execution

Scoping & Phase Planning

- participates in the Initial Scoping and Capability Assessment
- advises on ways to consolidate permit types
- collaborate on building a standardized model to streamline future permit type onboarding
- classify scope as Low / Medium / High complexity
- propose phase-level scope based on readiness and dependencies

Execution & Delivery

- deliver configurations, integrations, and workflows as defined in Project Charters
- support testing, UAT, and go-live activities
- resolve defects and maintain delivery quality

Transparency & Reporting

- maintain a centralized project management tool
- provide real-time visibility into:
 - progress
 - risks and issues
 - deliverable status
- provide weekly status reporting

Risk & Issue Management

- maintain the RAID Register
- proactively identify and escalate risks
- propose mitigation strategies

Capability Transfer

- deliver services in a “build-with” model as identified in the applicable Project Charter
- train City staff to assume increasing ownership
- document reusable patterns and configurations

Accountability

OpenGov is responsible for:

- providing staffing and expertise in accordance with resource commitments defined in the applicable Project Charter maintaining continuity of delivery
- meeting agreed timelines and quality standards

3.3 City Responsibilities

The City is responsible for providing inputs, decisions, and participation required for delivery.

Program Participation

- define program scope and goals
- assign a Project Manager with decision-making authority
- designate an Executive Sponsor
- ensure SME participation

Data & Systems

- provide required data, documentation, and system access
- maintain data quality
- support integration access and third-party coordination

Decision-Making

- provide final review rights and serve as the decision owner on all program decisions
- provide timely decisions
- participate in governance forums
- align internal stakeholders

Phase Readiness

- meet readiness criteria defined in Project Charters
- support UAT, training, and go-live

- manage internal change management

Shared Responsibility

Both parties acknowledge that delivery depends on:

- timely decisions
- active participation
- transparent communication

Failure by either party may impact timelines and will be addressed through governance. If OpenGov determines in good faith that Customer is not fulfilling its responsibilities under this SOW, OpenGov will provide written notice to the City specifying the actions needed to progress the project. If the Customer does not respond to the identified actions within ten (10) business days of such notice, any resulting impact to project milestones or delivery schedules shall be documented through the program governance process, and OpenGov shall not be responsible for resulting delays or any associated impact to milestone dates.

3.4 Acceptance Procedure

Deliverables are reviewed and accepted based on criteria defined in the Project Charter.

Process

1. OpenGov submits deliverables, which may include documentation, configuration, and information
2. City reviews within **15 business days**
3. City provides:
 - acceptance, or
 - requested revisions

Note: Failure to provide feedback within the designated timeframe, does not deem the deliverable accepted. The review period may be extended by mutual agreement. If the Customer does not respond within the ten (10) business day period, the matter will be escalated to the Steering Committee to determine resolution.

4. OpenGov will acknowledge requested revisions within **10 business days**. Revisions will be addressed where they reflect a failure to meet the defined acceptance criteria for that deliverable; requests that represent new or expanded requirements will be handled through the Change Control process.
5. Further iterations and revisions will be reviewed in the governance structure
6. Final acceptance is confirmed

Key Clarifications

- Acceptance is based on **defined success criteria**, not evolving expectations
- Accepted deliverables are considered complete
- Changes after acceptance may require a Change Order

3.5 Change Control

Scope is defined by the approved Project Charter.

A **Change Order** is required when scope moves beyond that definition, including:

- addition of new record types
- new integrations
- expansion of capabilities
- material increase in complexity
- changes to the agreed upon timeline and/or milestones

Important Clarification

- Work taking longer than expected **within approved scope** does not trigger a Change Order
- Scope ambiguity should be resolved through Project Charter definition, not post hoc changes

3.6 Phase Governance & Ongoing Program Review

Work is delivered in phases, each authorized through a Project Charter.

Each Project Charter must define:

- permits in scope (rationalized)
- capabilities
- complexity mix
- dependencies and assumptions
- success and acceptance criteria
- resourcing, roles & responsibilities for the applicable phase

Ongoing Program Review

Every **9–12 months**, and between major phases:

- review completed work
- reassess remaining scope

- update priorities and sequencing
- define next phase
- review OpenGov roadmap & product enhancement backlog

OpenGov will provide:

- phase completion summary
- updated complexity assessment
- recommended next phase scope

No new phase begins without an approved Project Charter.

3.7 Delivery Management System

OpenGov will maintain a centralized system as the **single source of truth**.

This system must provide:

- Real-time access for the City
- Task management, including task definition, ownership, sizing or delivery target for the task, status, dependencies, and deliverables

4. Risk Management Framework

Proactive risk management is embedded throughout the engagement lifecycle. OpenGov and the Customer will jointly identify, track, and manage risks through a centralized RAID Register, which will be reviewed regularly as part of the program governance cadence.

Risk management applies at both:

- the **program level**, and
- the **phase level** for each authorized Project Charter

4.1 Risk Classification

Severity	Impact	Escalation	Response Time
Critical	Schedule delay > 2 weeks, and/or go-live at risk	Executive Sponsor	1 Business Day
High	Schedule delay 1–2 weeks, and/or	Program Directors	2 Business Days

	deliverable quality impacted		
Medium	Schedule delay < 1 week, and/or workaround available	Project Managers	5 Business Days
Low	Minimal impact, monitor only	Workstream Lead	Next status meeting

Additional Classification Considerations

In addition to severity, risks may be tagged based on type:

- Data
- Integration
- Dependency / Third-Party
- Scope / Complexity
- Resources / Capacity
- Change Management / Adoption

4.2 Key Risk Areas & Mitigations

The following risk areas reflect known complexities of the PermitSF program and shall be actively managed throughout the engagement:

Risk Area	Description	OpenGov-Led Mitigation Strategy
Data Readiness & Data Quality	Incomplete, inconsistent, or poorly structured data may delay configuration, integrations, reporting, and go-live readiness. Misalignment with City data standards may create downstream workflow and reporting issues.	Conduct early data assessment during Initial Scoping; align configurations to the City data taxonomy; provide structured data templates; support iterative test loads and validation; define MVP data migration scope and constraints per phase.
Integration Complexity & Third-Party Dependencies	Delays or failures due to third-party system readiness, API limitations, undocumented behaviors, or lack of coordination with external vendors.	Identify and prioritize integrations during scoping; establish a dedicated integration workstream; document integration assumptions; engage with the City and third-party vendors for testing and validation.

Risk Area	Description	OpenGov-Led Mitigation Strategy
Scope Definition & Complexity Underestimation	Permits, workflows, or integrations may be more complex than initially assessed, leading to delays or rework.	Perform Initial Scoping and Capability Assessment; classify work using the Low / Medium / High complexity model; define assumptions in Project Charters; apply phased delivery to limit exposure; conduct Periodic Program Review every 9–12 months.
Stakeholder Availability & Decision Delays	Limited SME availability or delayed decision-making may impact workshops, validation, and delivery timelines.	Define decision owners in Project Charters; schedule key activities in advance; track decision dependencies in the Program Plan; escalate delays through governance; engage executive sponsors as needed.
Cross-Department Coordination & Standardization	Variability in processes, data definitions, and workflows across departments may increase complexity and reduce standardization.	Develop a cross-department capability model during scoping; identify standard patterns and reusable configurations; align with the City provided data taxonomy; escalate standardization decisions through governance bodies.
Change Management & Adoption	End-user resistance or insufficient training may reduce adoption and impact operational effectiveness post go-live.	Apply a structured change management approach; engage department champions early; deliver phase-aligned training; provide post-go-live support and reinforcement through Expert Services.
Delivery Capacity & Resource Alignment	Misalignment between scope, complexity, and available resources may impact timelines and delivery quality.	Align scope to capacity through Project Charters; use complexity classification to inform staffing; provide transparent resource planning; review capacity regularly during Program Reviews.

Risk Area	Description	OpenGov-Led Mitigation Strategy
Dependency on Future Scoping	Over-reliance on future discovery or undefined scope may create ambiguity and delivery risk.	Establish a formal Initial Scoping phase with defined deliverables; require Project Charter approval before implementation; enforce phase-based delivery; conduct Periodic Program Reviews to validate scope and priorities on a regular basis throughout delivery.

4.3 Risk Ownership & Accountability

All risks must have a clearly defined owner.

- **OpenGov-owned risks:** delivery execution, configuration quality, integration implementation, and staffing adequacy
- **City-owned risks:** data availability, SME participation, internal decision-making, and third-party coordination
- **Shared risks:** scope alignment, cross-department coordination, and change management

Both parties are responsible for:

- proactive identification of risks
- transparent communication
- timely mitigation and resolution

5. Quality Assurance

5.1 Quality Management Approach

OpenGov's quality assurance framework is embedded across all phases of the engagement to ensure that deliverables meet defined requirements, support operational needs, and align with the City's implementation objectives.

Quality management applies at both:

- the program level, and
- the phase level as defined in each Project Charter

Core Quality Principles

- **Design Principles**
The implementation is designed to leverage platform capabilities to address existing workflows, with configurations based on requirements mutually defined during Project Charter development. OpenGov will work in good faith with City subject matter experts to identify opportunities for process modernization and operational efficiency, subject to the scope of the configured solution.
- **Defined Acceptance Criteria**
All deliverables must align with clearly defined success and completion criteria documented in the applicable Project Charter.
- **Progressive Validation**
Configurations, integrations, and workflows will be validated iteratively throughout the Phase lifecycle rather than only at the end of delivery.
- **Traceability**
Requirements, configurations, and deliverables must be traceable to agreed scope to ensure alignment and reduce rework.
- **Transparency**
Quality status, defects, and risks must be visible through the centralized delivery management system.

Quality Dimensions

Quality assurance will address the following dimensions:

1. Deliverable Quality

- completeness, accuracy, and alignment with defined requirements
- conformance to Project Charter scope
- documentation sufficient for review, acceptance, and future maintenance

2. Configuration Quality

- correct implementation of workflows, forms, inspections, fees, and business rules
- alignment with standard patterns and cross-department consistency where applicable
- adherence to platform best practices

3. Integration Quality

- accuracy and reliability of data exchange
- proper handling of edge cases and errors
- alignment with defined integration specifications

4. Data Quality

- accuracy and completeness of migrated or integrated data within defined MVP scope
- alignment with the City's data taxonomy and field definitions
- validation of data mappings prior to production use

5. Usability & Operational Readiness

- system supports business processes
- users can effectively perform required tasks
- configured workflows support the business processes defined within each Project Charter with role-based access controls defined, administered, and maintained by the City
- training and documentation align with system behavior

5.2 Testing Strategy

Testing is a shared responsibility between OpenGov and the City and will be conducted in structured stages aligned with the implementation phases.

Test Type	Description	Owner	Timing
Integration Testing	End-to-end workflow testing across modules, integrations, and data flows	OpenGov + City	Configure Phase
User Acceptance Testing (UAT)	Business scenario validation by end users with defined success criteria	City (OpenGov-supported)	Train Phase
Go-Live Readiness	Final validation of production environment, data, permissions, and integrations	OpenGov + City	Launch Phase

Defect Management

All defects identified during testing will be:

- logged in the centralized delivery management system
- categorized by severity
- tracked through resolution

Severity	Description	Target Response
Critical	Blocks core functionality or go-live readiness	Immediate prioritization
High	Significant impact with no acceptable workaround	Address in current phase
Medium	Moderate impact with workaround available	Scheduled resolution
Low	Minor issue or cosmetic defect	Address as capacity allows

Record Type User Acceptance Testing

OpenGov will:

- Work with Customer to plan and execute end-to-end UAT to identify misconfigurations. UAT will include the following:
 - Define acceptance criteria based upon workflows identified during the Validate phase.
 - Review and provide input on the User Acceptance Testing (UAT) Test Plan developed collaboratively with City.
 - Ensure that sign-off criteria for these mutually agreed test plans are explicitly included to provide transparency and agreement prior to building and testing.
 - Categorize and prioritize issues identified with City
 - Log pass/fail outcomes for each scenario
 - Facilitate UAT sessions through an iterative process to address the identified misconfigurations.
 - Refine the system based on UAT results.

City will:

- Collaborate with OpenGov to develop mutually agreed UAT test plans and scripts, including defined sign-off criteria.
- Perform UAT.

Data Validation Requirements During UAT

For record type UAT, the following requirements apply to the data used in testing, validation, and go-live readiness:

- **Validation Parity**

All record type configurations for new record types are built, tested, and validated in the test environment, unless otherwise agreed to in the Project Charter. Data access method for any newly built out record types on the UAT environment will be the same data access methods as on the production environment. Availability of reporting, integrations, and configured workflows for these record types will align as defined in the Project Charter.

- **UAT Defects Related to Data**

All Critical and High severity data defects, including data loss, incorrect mappings, incorrect configurations, or inaccurate integration outputs, as defined in the Project Charter, must be resolved prior to Phase acceptance or go live unless the City explicitly approves otherwise in writing. Ticket severity will be mutually agreed upon by both parties.

5.3 Acceptance & Readiness Alignment

Acceptance of deliverables is contingent on:

- successful completion of defined testing activities
- resolution (or documented acceptance) of material defects
- alignment with defined success criteria

Key Clarifications

- Acceptance is based on agreed scope, not evolving expectations
- Minor defects that do not materially impact functionality may be deferred with mutual agreement
- Go-live readiness requires:
 - completion of UAT
 - validated data (within MVP scope)
 - operational readiness of users and processes

6. Permitting & Licensing

The Permitting & Licensing implementation encompasses multi-department operational workflows. This workstream supports the management of permitting, licensing, inspections, fee collection, reporting, and integrations. The following sections detail the scope of services across each implementation phase.

All work under this section will be delivered using the **phase-based model** defined in this SOW, with scope authorized through Project Charters.

6.1 Departments in scope

The OpenGov Permitting & Licensing platform is licensed for use by the departments identified in this SOW.

This engagement is intended to support implementation of permitting and licensing capabilities across multiple City departments participating in the PermitSF initiative. Any department not identified in this SOW that seeks to participate in the implementation will require a written amendment or Change Order and may be subject to additional Professional Services and subscription fees.

Department Selection & Sequencing

As part of the Initial Scoping and Capability Assessment, OpenGov and the City will:

- identify candidate departments for implementation
- assess readiness and dependencies
- recommend sequencing across phases
- identify opportunities for grouping departments based on shared capabilities or workflows

Departments Expected to Participate in Implementation

The following departments have been identified as potential candidates for implementation under this engagement. This list represents the current planning inventory and is subject to refinement through the Initial Scoping & Capability Assessment and subsequent Project Charters. Inclusion on this list does not constitute a commitment to implement.

1. Department of Building Inspection (DBI)
2. San Francisco Planning Department
3. San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD)
4. San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH)
5. San Francisco Public Works (DPW)
6. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
7. Recreation and Park Department
8. Port of San Francisco
9. Board of Appeals
10. Office of Economic and Workforce Development
11. City Administrator

12. Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA)

6.2 Solution configuration approach

OpenGov will configure the system using standard platform functionality as the primary approach.

Configuration Scope Includes:

- Record types, forms, and workflows
- Business rules and automation
- Inspections and scheduling
- Fee calculation and payment workflows
- Reports and dashboards

Approach Principles

1. Standard-First Configuration

OpenGov will prioritize use of out-of-the-box functionality to ensure:

- maintainability
- scalability
- alignment with product roadmap

2. Capability-Based Design

Configuration will be driven by required **business capabilities**, not just individual record types.

Examples:

- inspections
- routing and approvals
- document generation
- public portal interactions
- payments and invoicing

This enables:

- reuse across departments
- reduced duplication
- consistent user experience

3. Cross-Department Standardization

OpenGov will identify and implement:

- shared configuration patterns
- reusable components
- standardized workflows where feasible

4. Gap Identification & Handling

Where requirements cannot be met through standard functionality, OpenGov will:

- clearly identify the gap
- propose alternative approaches using existing capabilities
- document impacts and trade-offs
- support City decision-making on whether to:
 - proceed with workaround
 - defer functionality

Out of Scope

The following are not included unless explicitly approved:

- custom platform development
- modification of core OpenGov product functionality
- unsupported integrations or architectures

However, OpenGov is still responsible for:

- identifying gaps early
- not deferring critical issues to late-stage discovery

6.3 Permit Model & Rationalization

The City has identified an initial inventory of permitting and licensing activities, currently represented as individual “record types.” This inventory reflects the current state across departments and may include duplication, fragmentation, and inconsistent structuring.

Guiding Principle

Permits and licenses will remain the primary unit of delivery within the system. However, the current inventory of record types is **not considered the target model**.

The objective of this engagement is to **rationalize and standardize permit types**, not to replicate the current state one-to-one.

During the Initial Scoping and Capability Assessment, the City shall:

- review full inventories of existing record types
- identify duplicate or overlapping permits
- consolidate fragmented permit types into **standardized permit types**
- align permit definitions to underlying business processes, regulatory requirements, and end-user expectations
- identify opportunities to reduce unnecessary variation across departments

OpenGov Responsibilities – Permit Rationalization

To support City's permit rationalization activities, OpenGov will:

- designate a representative responsible for evaluating proposed permit models for product fitness with OpenGov
- assign a resource to align with the City on prioritization for Phase Charters
- provide feedback to rationalization proposals within ten (10) business days of request
- provide timely decisions on consolidation and standardization recommendations, in accordance with the governance structure defined in Section 3.

Illustrative Example: Multiple existing permit types representing similar processes (e.g., variations of solar permits) may be consolidated into a smaller number of standardized permits where appropriate.

Standardized Permit Model

The City shall align a **normalized permit model**, which:

- reduces duplication and fragmentation
- supports consistent workflows and user experience
- enables reuse of configuration across departments
- aligns with the City's long-term operating model

Where more than one reasonable consolidation approach exists (each offering different tradeoffs in scope, complexity, departmental impact, or implementation risk), the City shall present the viable alternatives with their respective benefits and risks.

The City will collaborate with OpenGov in validating the normalized permit model to ensure the permit types and definitions suit the core software functionality and reflect permitting best practices.

This model will serve as the basis for:

- phase planning
- configuration
- training
- reporting

Complexity Classification Framework

Each permit type, or logical grouping of related permits, will be classified during the Initial Scoping & Capability Assessment using a Low / Medium / High complexity framework. Classifications will be documented in the applicable Project Charter and are subject to City approval prior to implementation commencing. Project Charters will define capabilities, including:

- workflow and routing for processes such as intake, issuance, and inspections
- flags
- forms and documentation
- fees and payment processing
- integrations to City systems
- reporting requirements
- data access

Classification	Description
Low	Each low classification record type includes configuration of the following: • up to 10 workflow steps • fixed or table-based fee structures with no custom logic and up to 14 fees • up to 5 inspection types with no logic • up to 2 department review(s) • up to 20 generated documents • up to 50 form fields • autofill or data lookup from existing sources or related records • re-using an existing custom script Low classification record types do not include: • branching workflows using conditional logic • integration dependencies. Note: Classifications are determined by the most complex element. If any limit is exceeded the next classification applies.

Classification	Description
Medium	Each medium classification record type includes configuration of the following: • up to 20 workflow steps • up to 4 branching workflows using conditional logic • fixed or table-based fee structures with no custom logic and up to 15 fees • up to 5 inspection types with logic • up to 3 department reviews • up to 1 integration dependency with a system of record (e.g., Oracle PTS, Clariti) • up to 20 generated documents • up to 50 form fields • autofill or data lookup from existing sources or related records • re-using an existing custom script Note: Classifications are determined by the most complex element. If any limit is exceeded the next classification applies.
High	Each high classification record type includes configuration of the following: • more than 20 workflow steps • more than 4 branching workflows using conditional logic • complex, branching fee calculations or more than 15 fees • more than 5 inspection types with logic • more than 3 department reviews • more than 1 integration dependency with systems of record (e.g., Oracle PTS, Clariti) • more than 20 generated documents • more than 50 form fields

The complexity mix across all in-scope permits will inform:

- phase sequencing and prioritization
- resource planning and team composition
- Project Charter development and timeline estimates
- overall program capacity and throughput planning

No permit type will be scheduled for implementation without a confirmed complexity classification agreed upon by both parties.

Implementation Commitment

No permit type is considered in scope for implementation unless defined within a Project Charter

The number and structure of permit types implemented may differ from the initial inventory based on rationalization outcomes.

6.4 System Integrations

This engagement is expected to include integration between the OpenGov Permitting & Licensing platform and other City and third-party systems.

Scope Approach

Given the variability in integration complexity, architecture, and third-party dependencies, detailed integration scope will **not be fully defined at the time of this SOW execution**.

Instead, integrations will be:

- identified during Phase Zero Initial Scoping and Capability Assessment
- aligned to the rationalized permit model and associated workflows
- evaluated based on technical feasibility, dependencies, and business priority

Integration Definition & Authorization

For each proposed integration, OpenGov shall:

- document the business purpose and supported workflows
- define the proposed technical approach (e.g., API, file-based, etc.)
- identify dependencies, assumptions, and constraints
- provide a level-of-effort assessment aligned to complexity

No integration work will proceed unless:

- defined within a Project Charter

Roles & Responsibilities

OpenGov will:

- support integration design and implementation within platform capabilities
- perform data mapping and configuration
- support testing and validation

The City will:

- provide access to systems, APIs, and documentation
- coordinate with third-party vendors
- ensure availability of technical SMEs

Key Clarifications

- Integration complexity may vary significantly and will be assessed on a case-by-case basis
- Integration scope, sequencing, and delivery timelines will be determined during phase planning
- No integrations are assumed or implied by this SOW. All integration scope must be explicitly defined and authorized through an approved Project Charter prior to any work commencing.

Future Definition

Following the Initial Scoping and Capability Assessment, the parties may:

- define a more detailed integration roadmap
- establish standard integration patterns
- refine scope and prioritization for subsequent phases

6.5 Data Migration

This engagement includes **limited MVP data migration services** to support operational readiness for permits and capabilities included in an approved Project Charter.

Purpose

The purpose of data migration under this SOW is to support:

- onboarding into the OpenGov platform
- go-live readiness
- continuity of active operations

In Scope

Unless otherwise specified in an approved Project Charter, data migration may include:

- active and in-flight records associated with in-scope permits
- limited historical data necessary to support operational continuity
- agreed data mapping and transformation activities
- validation of migrated data against agreed requirements
- initial and final migration loads required for go-live

Out of Scope

Unless expressly included in an approved Project Charter or Change Order, the following are out of scope:

- full historical backfile migration
- migration of all legacy records across all departments
- reconstruction of legacy workflows, workflow migration, audit trails, or historical system states
- large-scale cleansing, normalization, or remediation of legacy data beyond agreed migration preparation activities
- ongoing post-go-live historical backloads

Phase-Based Data Scope

The specific data migration scope for each phase shall be defined in the applicable Project Charter, including:

- data sources in scope
- record populations in scope
- required transformations
- validation approach
- roles and responsibilities of each party

Key Principle

Data migration under this SOW is intended to support **MVP operational readiness**, not full replication of all historical data or legacy system behavior.

Vendor must demonstrate $\geq 99\%$ mapped data accuracy for migrated fields and $\geq 98\%$ success rate on initial integration loads before City acceptance. City is responsible for providing validated field mappings and cleansed source data; accuracy thresholds apply only to data delivered in conformance with the agreed data standards.

6.6 Citywide Data Taxonomy

To ensure consistency across the permitting ecosystem, the Contractor shall adhere to the City's defined Data Taxonomy. All PLC configurations must utilize the common data elements and relationships defined therein. Adherence to this taxonomy is a prerequisite for deliverable acceptance. The City will provide data taxonomy in sufficient detail to support configuration and in a timely manner consistent with the phase schedule defined in the applicable Project Charter.

6.7 Training

The City has developed six training tracks and associated desired outcomes to optimize the adoption of the system. Outcomes for each track define the City's measurement of success and will be used by the City to determine readiness. OpenGov will support delivery of the trainings and staff readiness. See Exhibit 1 for six training tracks and goals by the City.

OpenGov will provide training to support adoption of the system for each implementation phase. Training under this engagement serves two purposes (1) operational readiness, structured to prepare staff to use the platform from the moment each phase goes live, and (2) civil service capability transfer, structured to support the progressive development of administrative knowledge among City staff over the contract term.

a. Approach

Training will be delivered in coordination with each Project Charter and will:

- be aligned to the permits and workflows included in the Project Charter
- be tailored to user roles as defined in the six training tracks in Exhibit 1
- reflect the rationalized permit model, not legacy structures
- include hands-on training aligned to configured workflows – not generic overviews
- support User Acceptance Testing (UAT) and post-go-live support

b. Readiness Requirement

Training is a prerequisite for go-live. A phase will not be considered ready for launch unless:

- 85% or more of users identified in the applicable Project Charter have been offered the opportunity to complete required training for their role
- at least one designated Administrator per department has been identified and offered the opportunity to complete the required training for that role
- training materials, identified in the Project Charter, are available, align to configured workflows, and accepted by the City's Project Manager

c. Training Roles and Responsibilities

OpenGov Responsibilities:

- Deliver training for each implementation phase, guided by the six training tracks in Exhibit 1, aligned to configured workflows and Project Charter scope

- Provide side-by-side mentorship to designated civil service Administrator and Champion staff throughout Year 1(measured from contract start date) configuration activities
- Deliver all configuration decisions and system documentation to City in editable formats that City staff can independently maintain and update
- During the HyperAdopt post-launch period, OpenGov's embedded support sessions shall be used to reinforce civil service staff capability, not to perform configuration or administrative tasks on the City's behalf that trained staff can perform.

City Responsibilities:

- Identify, and confirm availability of, appropriate staff for training tracks at the start of each phase
- Ensure that City staff are active participants, not passive observers, in all configuration and training sessions
- Designate qualified technical staff as Administrators or Champions for each participating department; these staff members will be expected to act as the department's primary point of contact and work collaboratively with other department OpenGov technical resources
- Maintain continuity of Administrator and Champion assignments across phases where operationally feasible; notify OpenGov promptly of personnel changes affecting designated roles
- Lead internal staff communications regarding training schedules, expectations, and readiness requirements

7. Delivery Model

This engagement follows a **phase-based delivery model** supported by a dedicated OpenGov program team. Work is authorized and executed through Project Charters, which define the specific scope, deliverables, and timelines for each phase.

This model is designed to provide:

- flexibility in sequencing and prioritization
- transparency in scope and progress
- alignment between effort, complexity, and outcomes

7.1 Delivery Team

OpenGov will provide a dedicated program team with appropriate expertise to support delivery across all phases of the engagement.

The specific composition, size, and roles of the OpenGov team:

- are not fixed in this SOW
- may vary by phase based on scope, complexity, and delivery needs
- must be sufficient to meet the deliverables and timelines defined in each approved Project Charter

OpenGov is responsible for:

- providing sufficient staffing and expertise to meet agreed deliverables
- maintaining continuity of delivery across phases
- adjusting team composition as needed to maintain delivery timelines
- minimizing disruption from staffing transitions

7.2 Phase Delivery & Throughput

Each phase will consist of a defined set of permits and associated capabilities to be delivered within a specified timeframe.

Core Principle

Delivery is measured by **completed and accepted scope**, not by time expended or staffing levels.

Phase Planning & Project Charters

See Section 9 for Project Charter details.

Progress Measurement

Progress will be tracked against:

- completion of in-scope permits and capabilities
- achievement of phase milestones
- readiness for testing and go-live

Status reporting must clearly indicate:

- what has been completed
- what is in progress
- what remains
- any risks to delivery

Performance Expectations

OpenGov shall:

- maintain progress consistent with the approved Project Charter
- identify risks to throughput or timeline early
- propose mitigation strategies when deviations occur

7.3 Illustrative Phase Timeline

Each phase will generally follow the methodology described in Section 2.1. Actual durations will vary based on:

- complexity
- dependencies
- data readiness
- stakeholder availability
- integration scope

Final timelines shall be defined in the applicable Project Charter.

7.4 Environments

OpenGov will utilize appropriate environments to support implementation, testing, and production operations, including:

- Sandbox (new)
- UAT (existing)
- Production (existing)

OpenGov shall:

- define promotion and deployment processes
- provide a documented protocol for environment refreshes and test data handling

Any environment-specific requirements for a phase shall be documented in the applicable Project Charter.

8. Phase Zero

Phase Zero establishes the foundation for all subsequent implementation work and must be completed prior to preparing Project Charters.

8.1 Purpose

The purpose of this phase is to:

- establish a shared understanding of the City's permitting and licensing landscape
- rationalize and standardize permit types across departments
- define required business and technical capabilities
- identify integrations, data dependencies, and readiness constraints
- assess implementation complexity
- develop a structured, phased implementation plan

Phase Zero is a diagnostic and sequencing engagement, not a full implementation phase. Phase Zero does not include:

- Detailed requirements gathering for individual permit types (deferred to Project Charter phase)
- System configuration, development, or go-live activities
- Extended stakeholder engagement beyond structured discovery interviews

The outputs of Phase Zero inform subsequent phases; detailed scoping and delivery occur in Project Charter-authorized phases.

To support City's permit rationalization activities, OpenGov will:

- designate a representative with PLC product knowledge including future roadmap capabilities, responsible for evaluating proposed permit models for product fitness with OpenGov
- assign a representative with PLC product knowledge to align with the City on prioritization for Project Charters
- provide feedback to rationalization proposals within ten (10) business days of request
- provide timely decisions on consolidation and standardization recommendations, in accordance with the governance structure defined in Section 3.

8.2 Phase Zero Timeline

Phase Zero is a fixed-timeline engagement designed to deliver structured discovery and sequencing recommendations. Phase Zero is no more than a 10-week engagement from kickoff to signed acceptance.

8.3 Scope of Activities

OpenGov shall perform the following activities in partnership with the City:

Permit Rationalization

- review the current inventory of permit types
- identify duplication, overlap, and fragmentation
- Make recommendations to consolidate permits into a right-sized, standardized permit model

Assess third-party system readiness Data Assessment

- evaluate data availability and structure
- identify gaps and inconsistencies
- align data assumptions with the Citywide Data Taxonomy

Complexity Assessment

- classify permits or permit groupings as Low, Medium, or High complexity using the framework defined in Section 6.3
- document the drivers of complexity

Sequencing & Phase Planning

- recommend sequencing based on readiness, dependencies, complexity, and business priority
- define the recommended scope for the initial implementation phase

8.4 Deliverables

At the conclusion of this phase, City will deliver to OpenGov:

- Rationalized Permit Model
- Permit Inventory and Dependency Matrix
- Capability Model
- Integration & Dependency Map
- Data Readiness Assessment
- Standardization Recommendations

OpenGov shall deliver the following at the conclusion of Phase Zero:

- Make recommendations to consolidate permits
- Data readiness evaluation
- Complexity assessment

- Phase Zero Acceptance Form

8.5 Ongoing Refinement – Phase Zero Finality and Change Governance

The parties acknowledge that implementation may surface additional detail or complexity not fully visible during Phase Zero.

Where new information emerges during implementation that materially impacts an approved Project Charter, the parties will address it through:

- the Change Control process defined in Section 3.5, where scope is impacted
- the Periodic Program Review defined in Section 3.6, where priorities or sequencing require adjustment
- the applicable Project Charter amendment process, where phase-level assumptions require revision

9. Project Charters

9.1 Purpose

Project Charters are the primary unit of scope definition and authorization under this engagement.

Each Project Charter serves as both:

- the binding authorization for a given phase
- the operational plan governing how that phase will be delivered

Each Project Charter defines a discrete phase of implementation and establishes:

- the specific permits included in scope, as rationalized through Initial Scoping
- the associated capabilities to be delivered
- the complexity mix
- assumptions, dependencies, and constraints
- the delivery timeline and milestones
- the success criteria and acceptance requirements

9.2 Phase Authorization

All professional services beyond the Initial Scoping & Capability Assessment shall be authorized exclusively through written Project Charters.

- No work shall commence without an approved Project Charter.
- Each Project Charter represents a discrete phase or defined scope of work.

9.3 Relationship to Initial Scoping

All Project Charters must be derived from the outputs of the Initial Scoping & Capability Assessment in Section 8.

In particular:

- permit types must reflect the rationalized permit model
- scope must align with defined capabilities and dependencies
- complexity classifications must be used to inform sizing and sequencing

Permits shall not be implemented in their current fragmented form without prior rationalization.

9.4 Required Contents of Each Project Charter

Each Project Charter shall include, at minimum:

1. Phase Overview

- objectives
- participating departments

2. Scope

- permits in scope, rationalized and grouped where appropriate
- description of each permit grouping

3. Complexity Mix

- number of Low, Medium, and High complexity permits or groupings
- key drivers of complexity

4. Capabilities

- workflows and routing
- inspections
- forms and documentation
- fees and payments
- reporting
- integrations, if applicable

5. Data Scope

- inventory of all ingested data feeds maintained in OpenGov for the applicable phase
- automated failure detection alerts OpenGov of data integration issues
- data included for MVP migration, if applicable
- validation approach

6. Assumptions & Dependencies

- City responsibilities
- City and third-party dependencies
- readiness requirements

7. Timeline & Milestones

- phase duration
- key checkpoints
- expected go-live window

8. Success Criteria & Acceptance

- completion criteria for permits and capabilities
- UAT expectations

9.5 Binding Nature

Once executed, a Project Charter:

- defines the full scope of work for that phase
- serves as the basis for delivery and acceptance
- supersedes prior informal discussions or assumptions related to that phase

9.6 Changes to Scope

Any change that materially impacts the approved Project Charter scope requires a Change Order, including:

- addition of new record types
- introduction of new integrations
- expansion of capabilities beyond those defined
- significant change in complexity
- changes to the agreed upon timeline and/or milestones

Clarifications or refinements that remain within the defined scope may be documented within the Project Charter without requiring a Change Order.

9.7 Phase Completion & Transition

Each Project Charter must define completion criteria.

A phase is considered complete when:

- all in-scope permits and capabilities are delivered
- acceptance criteria are met

Subsequent phases require:

- completion, or agreed closure, of the prior phase
- re-scoping and alignment
- execution of a new Project Charter

Exhibit 1: Desired Training Outcomes

The City has developed six training tracks and associated desired outcomes to optimize the adoption of the system. Outcomes for each track define the City's measurement of success and will be used by the City to determine readiness. OpenGov will support delivery of the trainings and staff readiness.

1. Administrator Competency

System administrators and designated civil service technical leads will gain the skills to configure, govern, and maintain the OpenGov Permitting & Licensing platform.

Desired outcomes:

- Manage system setup, record types, workflows, inspections, and document templates
- Build reports and dashboards to support operational decision-making
- Administer user roles, permissions, and access controls without vendor assistance
- Sustain long-term governance and scalability of the platform

Civil Service Transfer Requirement

OpenGov will provide training designed to enable designated technical staff to perform standard system administrator functions without vendor engagement. The City is responsible for ensuring designated staff attain independent system administrator competency by the end of Year 2 of platform use.

2. End User Proficiency

Operational staff, Plan Reviewers, Inspectors, Finance, Permit Technicians, and key public-facing representatives, will be trained to effectively perform daily tasks within the platform.

Desired outcomes:

- Navigate the system and complete role-specific functions
- Manage tasks, process permits, take payments, conduct inspections, and respond to notifications.
- Reduce friction and errors in daily workflows
- Resolve common workflow questions without escalation to Administrators or OpenGov

Civil Service Transfer Requirement

At least 85% of operational staff identified in the applicable Project Charter shall be given the opportunity to complete dedicated, role-based hands-on training prior to go-live. Training shall be delivered in-person or remotely as agreed in the Project Charter and shall not be satisfied by UAT participation alone.

Training sessions will be structured to include:

- A walkthrough of at least one complete end-to-end permit or inspection process relevant to each role within the configured OpenGov environment
- Guided instruction on locating, actioning, and closing assigned tasks
- Role-specific guidance on which workflow steps are automated, what triggers automation, and what actions remain staff-performed

3. Train the Trainer

Departmental leads and power users will serve as in-house experts and multipliers.

Desired outcomes:

- Ability to configure advanced forms and workflows without external support
- Provide troubleshooting and peer coaching
- Champion adoption, support onboarding of new hires, and handle change requests

Internally

- Facilitate department-level refresher and onboarding sessions without vendor involvement

Civil Service Transfer Requirement

OpenGov will provide training designed to support the City's goal of establishing an internal first line of support for routine application and workflow changes. The City is responsible for ensuring staff apply training content and fulfill internal support functions, including handling Tier 1 and Tier 2 support requests, by Year 2 of platform use.

4. Executive & Sponsor Alignment

Leadership and sponsors will understand the strategic and governance value of the system.

Desired outcomes:

- Clearly see how the platform aligns with City objectives and governance priorities
- Track success through reporting and program milestone reviews
- Support change management and stakeholder alignment at the executive level
- Hold both OpenGov and City implementation leads accountable to Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3 transition milestones.

5. Help Desk & Support Preparedness

Support staff will be trained to handle issue resolution and manage escalations, building internal first-response capacity.

Desired outcomes:

- Able to triage common issues and permissions requests without escalation to OpenGov
- Access documentation and FAQs for consistent independent support

- Escalate issues to OpenGov with clear handoff protocols when vendor engagement is required

Civil Service Transfer Requirements

OpenGov will provide training designed to support the City's goal of establishing independent administrative support capacity for routine platform issues. The City is responsible for ensuring designated support staff apply training content and perform standard administrative support functions independently by the end of Year 2 of platform use.

6. Technical & Integration Readiness

IT and development staff will acquire the skills to independently understand, monitor and maintain integrations and technical operations, where vendor engagement is not required.

Desired outcomes:

- Understand and monitor API usage, authentication, and webhook configurations
- Understand any restrictions or requirements around implemented integrations.
- Access and read the PLC activity log and data access solutions
- Understand the connectivity between connected systems; receive and maintain an integration relation diagram; Independently manage GIS layer authentication and access protocols
- Perform first-response troubleshooting on integrations before engaging OpenGov

Civil Service Transfer Requirement

By the second year of an integrations use, City staff will be able to independently monitor the integration without routine vendor engagement.

Measurable Completion & Readiness

With materials, sandbox access, and sign-off, the City will confirm readiness at each phase go-live. The following conditions must be met:

Desired outcomes:

- All six role-based tracks are delivered for the applicable phase
- Departments are trained to independently administer the system for all in scope permit types
- Champions and Help Desk staff provide first-line internal support before accessing OpenGov Support team
- Formal sign-off by the City Project Manager validates training as complete and effective
- At least one designated platform Administrator per department has confirmed independent readiness

Civil Service Capability Transfer – Three Year Framework

In recognition of the City's obligations under the San Francisco Civil Service Rules and commitments made to IFPTE Local 21 (RFI Response, June 2026), OpenGov will structure its training program and delivery approach to support the progressive development of administrative knowledge among City employees over the term of the contract. The City is responsible for the transfer of administrative ownership to City employees in accordance with applicable civil service rules and labor commitments.

Year / Phase	Vendor Activity	City / Civil Service Activity	Measurable Milestone
Year 1 Active Learning	Foundation & Setup OpenGov configures the system, connects integrations to core City systems, and delivers full documentation of all configuration decisions. OpenGov delivers Foundation & Setup training as defined in the applicable Project Charter.	Side-by-Side Mentorship City technical staff participate in side-by-side training sessions. Internal technical staff work directly with the OpenGov team to map business process logic, complete user setup, and enable system access.	End of Year 1: • Civil service Administrators have active credentials and system access • At least one Administrator per participating department has completed Track 1 • All configuration documentation delivered and accepted by City • Champions identified; Track 3 initiated Verified: Project Charter sign-off per department.
Year 2 Co-Delivery	Shared Ownership As new platform components are configured and finalized, OpenGov delivers training on updated functionality. OpenGov provides advisory support on request.	Collaborative Building City staff begin assuming responsibility for standard software administration tasks, including workflow updates, form and fee schedule changes, user and permission administration, report and dashboard maintenance, and routine integration monitoring. OpenGov provides advisory support on request.	End of Year 2: • Civil service Administrators have received training on all standard admin functions • Champions independently handle all Tier 1 and Tier 2 support • City technical staff independently monitor all integrations • OpenGov engagement limited to advisory and complex configuration only Verified: Written City attestation + Project Charter sign-off.
Year Full Autonomy	Support & Advisory Only Vendor engagement limited to: • Standard global SaaS cloud maintenance	Internal Mastery City civil service staff assume lead responsibility for all platform administration, including onboarding new departments,	End of Year 3 / Contract Completion: • City civil service staff administer the platform with no routine vendor engagement

Year / Phase	Vendor Activity	City / Civil Service Activity	Measurable Milestone
	• Platform-wide software updates and patches • Support upon written City request for issues beyond civil service capacity	configuring new or modified record types, training new City employees, integration monitoring and first-response troubleshooting, and standardizing administration patterns across departments.	• All administrative functions performed and documented by City staff • Transition Plan per Agreement Article 9.4 completed if contract does not renew Verified: Final program sign-off by City and PermitSF Program Director.

Exhibit 2 – Tax Collector Confidentiality Affidavit

Use of Confidential Taxpayer Information

The City and County of San Francisco Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector (“TTX”) will share with Contractor a list of all active registered businesses in San Francisco and designate which businesses are “on hold.” A business is “on hold” if that business has any outstanding delinquent obligations, or if it is any other way out of compliance with the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code.

Generally, taxpayer information, including the “on hold” information, is protected as confidential under Section 6.22-1 of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code. Under section 6.22-1(c), TTX is permitted to share otherwise confidential information “to the extent such disclosures are reasonably necessary to obtaining information bearing a direct relationship to the determination, assessment, collection, or enforcement of any civil or criminal liability arising under the Business and Tax Regulations Code.” The “on hold” information is only being shared because doing so will increase tax compliance and collections. To maintain compliance with local, state, and federal laws and regulations, and to ensure the integrity, security, and confidentiality of the “on hold” information, Contractor agrees that the only employees of Contractor that can have access to the “on hold” information are those that must have access to such information to fulfill Contractor’s obligations under this Agreement. Contractor further agrees that the use of the “on hold” information by its employees is strictly for purposes of fulfilling Contractor’s obligations under this Agreement and using such information for personal use, knowledge, or gain is strictly prohibited. Unless required by law, Contractor’s employees will not re-disclose the “on hold” information to any other requesting individuals, agencies, or organizations—including City departments other than TTX—without prior written authorization by TTX. Contractor agrees that if a law or court requires Contractor to disclose this “on hold” information, Contractor shall immediately notify TTX in writing. And if any party seeks to obtain the “on hold” information from Contractor, Contractor agrees to notify TTX of such request via email to TTX-TPASupervisors@sfgov.org and agrees to work with TTX to appropriately respond to such request. Before access is granted to Contractor employees, Contractor shall require its employees who will have access to the TTX “on hold” information to sign an Acknowledgment of Confidentiality (attached as Appendix A). Contractor agrees to include information about the confidential nature of the “on hold” information in its policies, and to train staff at least annually with the assistance of TTX.

Appendix A

Acknowledgement of Confidentiality

Information contained in the City and County of San Francisco Office of the Treasurer & Tax Collector (“TTX”) data provided through OpenGov contains confidential information about businesses in San Francisco. Whether a business is “on hold” is confidential and may not be shared with any person other than the business itself.

As an employee of Contractor with access to this information, you are bound by the confidentiality provisions of the San Francisco Business and Tax Regulations Code. Section 6.22-1 of that code holds that “[t]he information in a taxpayer’s return is confidential, as is any information the Tax Collector learns about a taxpayer’s business from the taxpayer. Except as permitted by this Section 6.22-1 or as otherwise required by law, neither the Tax Collector nor the Tax Collector’s staff, nor any other of the City’s current or former employees or agents may disclose taxpayer confidential information to any person.” This information is permitted to be shared with Contractor pursuant to an exception in Section 6.22-1(c) of the Business and Tax Regulations Code because sharing the data will help TTX increase tax compliance. Confidential information may not be shared with anyone, even other Contractor employees or employees of City departments other than TTX. Examples of inappropriate access or misuse of confidential information include, but are not limited to:

- Making personal inquiries regarding an employee’s own records or those of friends or relatives;
- Accessing information about another person for any reason that is not related to a job responsibility;
- Passing information to someone who has no legitimate right to it;
- Removing confidential records in writing, in print or on electronic media from the office, without prior authorization.

I acknowledge that I have read and understand the confidentiality provisions, and will abide by them.

[NAME]

[DATE]

Exhibit 3: Project Charter Template

PermitSF

Project Charter

[Department Name]

Prepared by: OpenGov Professional Services

Prepared for: [Executive Sponsor Name, Title, Department]

SOW Reference: PS-11559 | Version: v1 DRAFT | [Month YYYY]

Document Version	v1 — DRAFT FOR REVIEW	Charter Date	[Month YYYY]
Department	[Department Name]	Status	Pending Co-Signature
Prepared by	OpenGov Professional Services	SOW Reference	PS-11559

ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

How to Use This Charter

This Project Charter is a working governance document. It is co-developed by OpenGov and [Department Name] through the Discovery Sprint kickoff process and co-signed before implementation work begins. Once signed, it becomes the binding accountability instrument for [Department Name]’s engagement within PermitSF.

Project Charters replace line items as the unit of accountability. They define what was agreed, by whom, and what success looks like — and establish a clear boundary that determines when a Change Order is required.

This version is a seeded draft based on: (1) [source document / SOW reference], (2) the discovery call held [date], and (3) [any other source]. Fields marked [TBC] are to be confirmed with [Department Name] stakeholders during the charter kickoff session.

EXSECTION 1

1. Objectives

What [Department Name] is trying to achieve within PermitSF.

[Describe the key drivers and mandate for this department's participation. Include the program context, any governing directive or business need, and a brief overview of the objectives below.]

#	Objective	What It Means for [Department Name]
1	[Objective Title]	[Describe what this objective means in practice for this department — what changes, what gets automated, who benefits, and how success looks different from the current state.]
2	[Objective Title]	[Describe what this objective means in practice for this department.]
3	[Objective Title]	[Describe what this objective means in practice for this department.]
4	[Objective Title]	[Describe what this objective means in practice for this department.]

SECTION 2

2. Scope — Record Type Inventory

[Describe the total number of record types in scope, how they are organized (e.g., by cluster, priority, or delivery phase), and the delivery methodology that applies to all of them.]

[Add a callout note here if there is important context about scope — e.g., clustering approach, prioritization rationale, dependency notes, or Discovery Sprint sequencing guidance.]

Cluster / Group	Category	Record Types	Priority / Notes
[A]	[Category Name]	[RT 1, RT 2, RT 3, ...]	[Priority level and rationale — e.g., High: operational urgency, high volume, dependency on legacy system]
[B]	[Category Name]	[RT 1, RT 2, RT 3, ...]	[Priority level and rationale]
[C]	[Category Name]	[RT 1, RT 2, RT 3, ...]	[Priority level and rationale]
[D]	[Category Name]	[RT 1, RT 2, RT 3, ...]	[Priority level and rationale]

Complexity Classification Reference

Each record type is assigned a complexity classification that informs scoping, sequencing, and effort estimates.

Classification	Description
Low	Each low classification record type includes configuration of the following: • up to 10 workflow steps • fixed or table-based fee structures with no custom logic and up to 14 fees • up to 5 inspection types with no logic • up to 2 department review(s) • up to 20 generated documents • up to 50 form fields • autofill or data lookup from existing sources or related records • re-using an existing custom script Low classification record types do not include: • branching workflows using conditional logic • integration dependencies. Note: Classifications are determined by the most complex element. If any limit is exceeded the next classification applies.
Medium	Each medium classification record type includes configuration of the following: • up to 20 workflow steps • up to 4 branching workflows using conditional logic • fixed or table-based fee structures with no custom logic and up to 15 fees • up to 5 inspection types with logic • up to 3 department reviews • up to 1 integration dependency with a system of record (e.g., Oracle PTS, Clariti) • up to 20 generated documents • up to 50 form fields • autofill or data lookup from existing sources or related records • re-using an existing custom script Note: Classifications are determined by the most complex element. If any limit is exceeded the next classification applies.
High	Each high classification record type includes configuration of the following: • more than 20 workflow steps • more than 4 branching workflows using conditional logic • complex, branching fee calculations or more than 15 fees • more than 5 inspection types with logic • more than 3 department reviews • more than 1 integration dependency with systems of record (e.g., Oracle PTS, Clariti) • more than 20 generated documents • more than 50 form fields

SECTION 3

3. Deliverables

Specific outcomes and configurations that OpenGov commits to deliver for [Department Name] under this charter. All deliverables are contingent on [Department Name] completing its corresponding responsibilities.

Deliverable	Description	Completion Criteria
[Deliverable Name]	[Describe what OpenGov will configure, build, or deliver. Be specific about scope boundaries within this deliverable.]	[Define the measurable sign-off criterion — e.g., '[Department] PM DocuSign sign-off upon completion of UAT.']
[Deliverable Name]	[Description of deliverable.]	[Completion criterion.]
[Deliverable Name]	[Description of deliverable.]	[Completion criterion.]
[Deliverable Name]	[Description of deliverable.]	[Completion criterion.]
[Deliverable Name]	[Description of deliverable.]	[Completion criterion.]
[Deliverable Name]	[Description of deliverable.]	[Completion criterion.]
[Change Management]	[Describe change management scope: readiness materials, communication templates, leadership engagement guidance.]	[Department] PM confirms readiness prior to go-live.
[Training Program]	[Describe training tracks, delivery method (onsite/remote), and approximate hours per track.]	All tracks completed; staff demonstrate readiness; DocuSign sign-off.
[HyperAdopt Post-Launch Support]	[Describe post-go-live enablement scope: reinforcement sessions, just-in-time adjustments, adoption monitoring.]	[Department] confirms readiness for long-term platform ownership; final project sign-off.

SECTION 4

4. Decision Owners

Who on the [Department Name] side has authority to make binding decisions across key topic areas. These individuals are the authoritative voices OpenGov works with for approvals, sign-offs, and escalations. Fields marked [TBC] are to be confirmed at the charter kickoff session.

Decision Area	[Department] Owner	Authority / Scope
Executive Sponsorship	[TBC — Name, Title]	Final authority on scope, priorities, go-live decisions, and escalations. Engaged at program level; not required for day-to-day operational decisions.

Project Management	[TBC — Name, Title]	Day-to-day coordination, scheduling, SME availability, and DocuSign sign-offs. Primary OpenGov point of contact throughout implementation.
[Operations / Workflow]	[TBC — Name, Title]	Authority to approve workflow configurations, process decisions, and operational SOPs. Leads SME team engagement during discovery and configure phases.
[Technical / Integration]	[TBC — Name, Title]	Authority for integration decisions, data architecture, and system access. Responsible for confirming integration specifications and field mapping.
[Fee Schedule / Finance]	[TBC — Name, Title]	Authority to confirm and approve fee calculation logic, rate schedules, and financial output specifications. Fee structure is a priority discovery item.
[Program Oversight]	[TBC — Name] [Title, Organization]	Cross-departmental alignment, program-level governance, and coordination with the broader program initiative.

SECTION 5

5. Success Criteria

How both parties confirm the work is complete and meets the agreed standard. Success is confirmed at the cluster or go-live level to enable continuous validation throughout delivery.

Success Criterion	How It Is Measured	Who Confirms
[All record types configured and validated]	[UAT completed per cluster/group; pass/fail logged; misconfigurations resolved prior to sign-off.]	[Department] Project Manager (DocuSign)
[Integration(s) operational]	[Integration validated end-to-end during UAT against sample data.]	[Department] Technical Lead + PM (DocuSign)
[Fee calculations accurate]	[Automated fee output matches fee schedules for all standard scenarios.]	[Department] Finance Lead + PM
[Data migrated]	[Historical records accessible in OpenGov; department validates sample set prior to final load.]	[Department] PM + Data SME (DocuSign)
[Staff trained and ready]	[Training tracks completed; staff demonstrate proficiency across all roles.]	[Department] PM + Department Leads (DocuSign)
[Applicant experience meets [Department] standards]	[Public portal tested for representative applicant scenarios; ADA compliance verified.]	[Department] Executive Sponsor / PM sign-off

SECTION 6

6. Scope Boundaries

What is explicitly out of scope for this charter. These are the Change Order triggers — if either party determines that something listed here needs to be added, a formal Change Order is required before work begins.

Out of Scope — OpenGov	Out of Scope — [Department] Responsibility
• [Record types not listed in SOW Exhibit / this charter] • [Integration(s) not listed in this charter — e.g., specific GIS, MAT, payment, or document management integrations] • [Data migration beyond agreed parameters — e.g., more than agreed load cycles, document storage beyond agreed limit] • [Configuration beyond agreed autofills, custom exports, or custom scripts] • [Post-HyperAdopt ongoing configuration — transitions to Customer Success Manager] • [Any other items explicitly agreed as out of scope during scoping]	• [Timely provision of data, SME availability, and sign-offs per the SOW] • [Legacy system data in required format and within agreed timelines] • [Integration specifications, field mapping, and system access on [Department] side] • [Procurement and administration of third-party licenses (e.g., payment processor, document management)] • [Internal org change management beyond OpenGov-delivered materials] • [SOP updates and process documentation outside OpenGov change management deliverables] • [Internet access, conference facilities, and workstations for onsite OpenGov team per SOW] • [Timeline delays caused by [Department] stakeholder unavailability or decision-making delays]

SECTION 7

7. Timeline & Milestones

Agreed milestones and readiness checkpoints. Dates are placeholders pending confirmation during the charter kickoff session.

Delays caused by either party — including stakeholder unavailability, delayed sign-offs, or failure to provide data within agreed windows — are that Party's responsibility and will result in milestone dates being adjusted on a day-for-day basis. These delays do not constitute an OpenGov delivery failure.

Milestone	Target Timing	Completion Criteria	Owner
Contract Signature & Project Kickoff	[Month YYYY]	Project kickoff complete; Project Plan and Charter signed via DocuSign.	Both parties

[Validate — Discovery & Requirements]	[Month – Month YYYY]	[Requirements matrix complete; validation workshops complete; workflow design and integration specifications confirmed with SMEs.]	OpenGov (lead) / [Department] SMEs
[Configure — Record Types & Integrations]	[Month – Month YYYY]	[All record types configured; integrations developed; UAT initiated.]	OpenGov (lead) / [Department]
[User Acceptance Testing (UAT)]	[Month YYYY]	[UAT completed for all record types and integrations; issues resolved; [Department] PM DocuSign sign-off.]	[Department] (lead) / OpenGov
[Train — Administrator & End User]	[Month YYYY]	[Training tracks complete; staff demonstrate readiness; DocuSign sign-off.]	OpenGov (lead) / [Department]
[Go-Live — Cluster / Phase Name]	[Month YYYY]	[Record types in production; integrations operational; [Department] staff processing through OpenGov PLC.]	Both parties
[HyperAdopt & Project Closure]	[Month – Month YYYY]	[Post-go-live enablement complete; final sign-off; handoff to OpenGov Customer Success Manager.]	Both parties

SECTION 8

8. Known Risks & Open Items

Items identified prior to charter kickoff that require explicit resolution during the Discovery Sprint. These are not blocking issues but are flagged for prioritized discussion.

#	Risk / Open Item	Description	Owner	Target Resolution
1	[Risk / Open Item Title]	[Describe the risk or open item, why it matters, and what needs to be resolved. Include any known dependencies or blockers.]	[Owner]	[Discovery Sprint Week X / Prior to charter sign-off]
2	[Risk / Open Item Title]	[Description.]	[Owner]	[Target Resolution]
3	[Risk / Open Item Title]	[Description.]	[Owner]	[Target Resolution]
4	[Risk / Open Item Title]	[Description.]	[Owner]	[Target Resolution]
5	[Risk / Open Item Title]	[Description.]	[Owner]	[Target Resolution]

6	<i>[Risk / Open Item Title]</i>	<i>[Description.]</i>	<i>[Owner]</i>	<i>[Target Resolution]</i>
---	---------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------	----------------------------

SECTION 9

9. [Department Name] Responsibilities

The following must be met by [Department Name] for OpenGov to deliver against this charter. Failure to meet these responsibilities will trigger the Customer Delay provisions in SOW Section 7 — milestones will be extended day-for-day and OpenGov may place services on hold following 5 business days' written notice.

- *Designate a [Department] Project Manager with authority to make binding decisions before project kickoff*
- *Identify and confirm SMEs for all record type clusters and integration workstreams; ensure their availability for discovery, validation, configuration, and UAT sessions*
- *[Provide specific data or documentation required — e.g., legacy system data files, fee schedules, workflow documentation, application forms, output document templates] within 2 weeks of project kickoff*
- *[Provide integration specifications — e.g., field mapping, API credentials, system access, flat file format] within agreed timelines*
- *Validate all OpenGov-delivered configurations and integration outputs within 2 weeks of each request; provide sign-off prior to go-live*
- *[Other department-specific responsibility — e.g., populate and validate GIS flag file; confirm finance export specifications including GL codes]*
- *Provide conference rooms, stable Wi-Fi, and AV equipment for all onsite OpenGov sessions per SOW*
- *Participate in all readiness surveys and complete Department Readiness Checklists prior to each go-live*
- *Identify champion/power users for Train-the-Trainer track in advance of the Train phase; ensure staff availability for all training sessions*
- *Deliver internal leadership communications to [Department] staff using OpenGov-provided messaging materials*
- *[Any additional department-specific responsibilities identified during scoping]*

10. Co-Signature

This charter is co-signed by both parties before implementation work begins. By signing, both parties confirm that the objectives, deliverables, decision owners, success criteria, scope boundaries, and timeline reflect their shared understanding. Any modifications require mutual written agreement.

OpenGov, Inc.	<i>[Department Name]</i>
Signature	<i>Signature</i>
-----	-----
[Name]	<i>[Name]</i>
[Title]	<i>[Title]</i>
Date: -----	Date: -----

This document is prepared by OpenGov for internal review and stakeholder discussion. It is based on available information as of [Month YYYY].

Exhibit 4: Implementation Commitment

October 1, 2026-March 31, 2027

The following deliverables will make up the body of work for the first six months of the professional services engagement.

Milestone 1

Deliverables completed and signed off by December 31, 2026:

- Consultative Services for Phase Zero – City Rationalization
 - Review the current inventory of permit types
 - Identify duplication, overlap, and fragmentation
 - Make recommendations to consolidate permits
 - Data readiness evaluation
 - Complexity assessment
- PeopleSoft AR Interface Charter Development
- Public Works (PW) – Sidewalk Permit Charter Development
- Public Utilities Commission (PUC) Water Service Charter Development

Milestone 2

Deliverables completed and signed off by March 31, 2027:

- Public Utilities Commission (PUC) Water Service Launch
- Vertical Construction Permits Charter Development
 - Department of Building Inspection (DBI)
 - San Francisco Planning Department
 - San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD)
 - Public Works (DPW)
 - Department of Public Health (DPH)
 - Public Utilities Commission (PUC)
- Entitlement & Zoning Charter Development
 - San Francisco Planning Department
 - Special Events Charter Development
 - Office of Small Business
 - Port of San Francisco
 - Recreation and Park Department
 - Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
- 1st Ongoing Program Review (Section 3.6)

Exhibit 5: Expert Services

Introduction

This Statement of Work (SOW) outlines the terms and scope of OpenGov Expert Services to be provided by OpenGov to the City and County of San Francisco, CA (the "Customer") pursuant to the applicable Order Form. The objective of this SOW is to define the engagement framework and responsibilities of both parties to ensure the successful execution of the expert services. This engagement is not limited to reactive support; rather, it is a structured Managed Services relationship where OpenGov functions as an extension of the City's team—continuously monitoring, optimizing, and evolving the Permitting & Licensing platform to drive efficiency, compliance, and citizen satisfaction.

1. Service Overview:

- 1.1. This Expert Services Package provides comprehensive support for the operation, monitoring, and optimization of the OpenGov Permitting and Licensing solution. It is designed to align with and enhance the City and County of San Francisco's implementation project.
- 1.2. Access to OpenGov Professional Services resources for post-implementation activities (e.g. training, consulting, configuration, or staff augmentation).
- 1.3. Optimize is the premium expert services level offering a more comprehensive volume of service packages.
- 1.4. OpenGov will perform the work under this SOW remotely unless on-site activities are explicitly selected in the annual plan.
- 1.5. If on-site activities are selected, the Customer is responsible for paying travel expenses as incurred on a quarterly basis. If applicable, the not to exceed amount for the quoted expenses will be included on the Project Charter.
- 1.6. OpenGov will use personnel and resources located across the United States, and may also include OpenGov-trained implementation partners to support the delivery of services.
- 1.7. Why OpenGov Expert Services:
 - 1.7.1. Predictable outcomes through proactive system governance.
 - 1.7.2. Reduced administrative burden and risk for the City.
 - 1.7.3. Continuous alignment with new features, compliance requirements, and community needs.
 - 1.7.4. Faster realization of ROI from the platform.
- 1.8. To ensure long-term success and accountability in the use of OpenGov's Permitting & Licensing Suite, this engagement includes a formal governance structure and clearly defined success measurement practices. Governance and Success Measurement:
 - 1.8.1. Quarterly health checks to evaluate platform performance, usage, and optimization opportunities.

- 1.8.2. OpenGov and the City will collaboratively define and agree upon shared success criteria annually. These goals will be informed by strategic objectives, historical system usage, and department-specific needs, with updates made as necessary to reflect evolving priorities.
 - 1.8.3. Progress toward goals will be shared regularly through quarterly summary reports and/or live status reviews. These tools will promote transparency across departments, facilitate executive alignment, and help identify areas where additional support or configuration may be required.
- 2. Key Activities:**
 - 2.1. Annual planning session within the first 30 days of the contract year to define the activities to be completed that year and resources allocated to those activities.
 - 2.2. The Project Charter is defined as the annual plan of activities, tasks, assignments, timeline, and milestones to be performed by OpenGov and Customer within the contract year.
 - 2.3. Creation of a Project Charter between OpenGov and Customer outlining the agreed upon expert services for that year. Once the Project Charter timeline is mutually agreed upon, any changes will require a Change Order per Section 6.
- 3. Timeline**
 - 3.1. Expert Services are delivered annually per the Order Form, with a contract year potentially shorter than twelve months if specified on the Order Form.
- 4. OpenGov Responsibilities**
 - 4.1. Assign qualified personnel to perform the agreed upon activities.
 - 4.2. Ensure timely and professional execution of deliverables as outlined in the Project Charter.
 - 4.3. Maintain clear and regular communication with the Customer as needed for planning and execution of agreed upon activities.
 - 4.4. In the event of requested changes to the Project Charter, a change order will be drafted and sent to Customer for signature.
- 5. Customer Responsibilities**
 - 5.1. Assist OpenGov in coordinating and attend the annual planning session within the first 30 days of a new subscription term.
 - 5.2. Provide access to the relevant personnel, systems, and data per activities defined in the Project Charter.
 - 5.3. Review and approve deliverables within a timely manner as outlined in the Project Charter.
 - 5.4. Designate a point of contact for ongoing communication and decision-making.
 - 5.5. Submit a change order request if changes to the Project Charter are needed.
- 6. Change Order Process**
 - 6.1. Any change to the scope as outlined in the Project Charter must be agreed to in writing by both Customer and OpenGov, and documented via a Change Order.
 - 6.2. Verbal agreement is not binding on OpenGov or Customer.
 - 6.3. A Change Order is defined as work that is added to or deleted from the original scope of this SOW.

Expert Services Offerings

Expert Services from OpenGov for Permitting & Licensing, helps our customers gain access to guidance and advanced configuration support provided directly by OpenGov's implementation and support teams. While the exact scope may vary, Expert Services typically includes the following offerings:

Advanced Configuration Support

- Assistance with complex setup needs such as:
 - Conditional workflows and fees
 - Multi-entry form section logic
 - Auto-calculations (e.g., ICC Building Valuation Table)
 - Escrow/deposit handling workarounds
- Support for nuanced use cases across building, planning, code enforcement, etc.

Tailored Implementation Guidance

- Collaboration with OpenGov experts to align software configuration with the community's internal processes.
- Best-practice-based support for record type design, inspection workflows, payment setups, and document management.

Training and Coaching

- Targeted admin and user training sessions focused on system optimization.
- Guidance on how to use features like:
 - Explore reporting
 - Renewal campaign setup
 - Department form fields
 - Public portal customization
 - Task and group management

Specialized Hands-On Support

- OpenGov staff may directly assist with:
 - Building record types
 - Creating and linking project templates
 - Designing department form fields for cross-record reporting
 - Setting up conditional attachments, inspection types, or ad hoc steps

Appendix C-1 Calculation of Charges

OpenGov Pricing Sheet

Annual license and services fee is due annually in advance. License period is October 1 through September 30.

Description of License Component	10/1/25-9/30/26	10/1/26-9/30/27	10/1/27-9/30/28	10/1/28-9/30/29	10/1/29-9/30/30	10/1/30-9/30/31
Permit & License Service Areas (12)	\$2,567,815.35	\$ 2,731,483.31	\$ 2,868,057.48	\$ 3,011,460.35	\$3,162,033.37	\$3,320,135.04
Additional SA – Port Authority	\$204,515.93	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Additional Instance	\$ 134,802.68	\$ 132,690.69	\$ 139,325.22	\$ 146,291.49	\$ 153,606.06	\$ 161,286.36
Additional Instance	\$ -	\$ 132,690.69	\$ 139,325.22	\$ 146,291.49	\$ 153,606.06	\$ 161,286.36
Advanced Reporting Integration (prod)	\$ 238,602.14	\$ 219,211.12	\$ 230,171.68	\$ 241,680.26	\$ 253,764.27	\$ 266,452.49
Advanced Reporting Integration (test)	\$ -	\$ 219,211.12	\$ 230,171.68	\$ 241,680.26	\$ 253,764.27	\$ 266,452.49
Autofill Interface (Qty 100)	\$ 235,460.93	\$ 216,325.20	\$ 227,141.46	\$ 238,498.53	\$ 250,423.46	\$ 262,944.63
Mobile App	\$ 113,620.25	\$ 104,386.42	\$ 109,605.74	\$ 115,086.03	\$ 120,840.33	\$ 126,882.35
Bluebeam Integration	\$4,707.92	\$ 4,325.32	\$ 4,541.59	\$ 4,768.67	\$ 5,007.10	\$ 5,257.45
Contractor License Verification	\$37,356.78	\$ 34,320.83	\$ 36,036.87	\$ 37,838.72	\$ 39,730.65	\$ 41,717.18
Accounting & Finance Export (Qty 2)	\$ 9,415.85	\$ 8,650.63	\$ 9,083.16	\$ 9,537.32	\$ 10,014.19	\$ 10,514.89
Document Management Interface	\$ 5,604.49	\$ 5,149.02	\$ 5,406.47	\$ 5,676.79	\$ 5,960.63	\$ 6,258.67
Master Address Table / Assessor Integration	\$ 4,707.92	\$ 4,325.32	\$ 4,541.59	\$ 4,768.67	\$ 5,007.10	\$ 5,257.45
Record Data Export	\$ 4,707.92	\$ 4,325.32	\$ 4,541.59	\$ 4,768.67	\$ 5,007.10	\$ 5,257.45
Esri ArcGIS Integration	\$ 2,354.61	\$ 2,163.25	\$ 2,271.41	\$ 2,384.98	\$ 2,504.23	\$ 2,629.44
Flag Integration	\$ 2,354.61	\$ 2,163.25	\$ 2,271.41	\$ 2,384.98	\$ 2,504.23	\$ 2,629.44
Expert Services (Custom)	\$ 398,073.88	\$ 417,977.58	\$ 600,000.00	\$ 600,000.00	\$ 600,000.00	\$ 600,000.00
Premium Support	\$ 35,898.74	\$ 32,981.27	\$ 34,630.33	\$ 36,361.85	\$ 38,179.94	\$ 40,088.94
Total due by 10/1 annually	\$4,000,000.00	\$ 4,272,380.34	\$ 4,647,122.90	\$ 4,849,479.04	\$ 5,061,953.00	\$ 5,285,050.64

Additional Cost Provisions:

1. **Optional Product Subscription: San Francisco Public Works has the option to purchase OpenGov Enterprise Asset Management for \$1.85 million in software licenses** covering from the date the option is exercised and continuing for one year, provided the option is exercised via an amendment and/or a new Order Form on or before June 30, 2027. Professional Services fees for implementation must also be added to the contract and are contingent on additional scope. This option covers the following domains: Transportation & Traffic, Walkability, Signals. The stated subscription fees are contingent upon a direct purchase from OpenGov. If purchased through any reseller or other third-party channel, this option shall not be available.
2. **Professional services are not to exceed \$6,500,000** for the parameters in the Statement of Work. The professional services amount of \$6,500,000 is committed over the eleven payments reflected below.

Professional Services Payment Schedule. Compensation shall be paid within 30 days from receipt of invoice, and not dependent on milestones or acceptance, as set forth in the following table:

Invoice Date	Amount
December 31, 2026	\$975,000
March 31, 2027	\$975,000
October 1, 2027	\$500,000
January 1, 2028	\$500,000
April 1, 2028	\$500,000
July 1, 2028	\$500,000
October 1, 2028	\$500,000
January 1, 2029	\$500,000
April 1, 2029	\$500,000
July 1, 2029	\$500,000
September 30, 2029	\$550,000

Deliverables and services under this Agreement are described throughout the Statement of Work and may include, as jointly agreed by the City and OpenGov and codified in the applicable Project Charter(s):

- Discovery & Design
- Configuration by Complexity Tier(s)
- Data Migration
- Integration Development
- Training
- Post-Launch Support

The specific combination, sequencing, and scope of the foregoing services for any given Project Charter shall be determined by the Parties following completion of Phase Zero and shall not expand the Implementation NTE set forth in Section 3.3.1.(a).

Record Type Complexity Pricing. Record Type Complexity shall be scoped in accordance with Section 6 of the Statement of Work. Phase Zero work may impact record type complexity distribution; however, the \$6,500,000 NTE is based on the complexity distribution below:

Record Type Config/Documentation	Complexity Distribution	Amount per Record Type	Total
Low	25%	\$12,062	\$446,281
Medium	50%	\$13,312	\$998,375
High	25%	\$19,312	\$733,843

3. **A contingency amount of \$600,000 will be added to the value of the contract** which will be applied towards additional subscription services, not professional services. Use of the contingency will require a written amendment.