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**I. General Items**

A. Invitation to Submit Proposals in Response. The New York City Department of Design and Construction (“DDC”) invites you, as a Consultant under the Town+Gown Master Academic Consortium Contract (the “Consortium Contract”), to submit a Proposal in Response for **SERVICE DESIGN TO IMPLEMENT PUBLIC POLICIES.**  All defined terms used in this Request for Proposals in Response and not defined here in shall have the meanings given to them in the Consortium Contract.

B. Due Date for Receipt of Proposals in Response. Consultants shall submit their Proposals in Response ONLY via email, no later than 12 A.M., July 31, 2015, to John Magisano, Assistant Director of Town+Gown at [MagisanoJ@ddc.nyc.gov](mailto:MagisanoJ@ddc.nyc.gov). Please note that there is a 3.5MB file size limit.

If a Consultant chooses not to submit a Proposal in Response, such Consultant shall submit a No Bid Response (which form is available from Walter Matystik, President of the Gown Advisory Council, [walter.matystik@manhattan.edu](mailto:walter.matystik@manhattan.edu)), no later than 12 A.M., July 31, 2015, to John Magisano, Assistant Director of Town+Gown at [MagisanoJ@ddc.nyc.gov](mailto:MagisanoJ@ddc.nyc.gov).

C. Inquiries and Requests from Consultants for Clarification or Explanation. If a Consultant wishes to make an inquiry or request a clarification or explanation with respect to this Mini RFP, such Consultant must make such inquiry or request in writing sent via email ONLY to John Magisano, Assistant Director of Town+Gown at [MagisanoJ@ddc.nyc.gov](mailto:MagisanoJ@ddc.nyc.gov), no later than 12 A.M., July 24, 2015. In the event DDC determines that it is necessary to respond to such inquiry or request in writing, such response will be furnished as an addendum to this MIni RFP sent to all Consultants as described below.

D. Addenda to this Mini RFP. If DDC determines that it is necessary to respond to an inquiry or request for clarification or explanation from a single or several Consultants in writing, such writing will be in the form of an addendum to this Mini RFP, which will become part of the requirements for such Mini RFP, and sent to all Consultants. In addition, it will be necessary for such Consultants to acknowledge receipt of an addendum to this Mini RFP by attaching an original signed copy of the addendum to its Proposal in Response.

E. The Name and Contact Information of the City Agency Procurement Process Contact. All Proposals in Response, Inquiries or Requests for Clarification or Explanation, and receipts of any Addenda, shall be sent ONLY to via email:

John Magisano

Assistant Director, Town+Gown

[MagisanoJ@ddc.nyc.gov](mailto:MagisanoJ@ddc.nyc.gov)

**II. Scope of Work**

A. General Research Project Description and Background

*Service Design.*  Service Design is the subset of any design project especially focused on the user-centered experience of program delivery. This can take the form of strategy, program development, environmental design, digital communication systems, product design, and many other forms of design; all coordinated to implement a holistic, integrative user-centered system in which programs, spaces, communication methods, and service delivery systems achieve the optimum user experience and so deliver government programs best.

Government services in particular touch the public, and service design is the specialty involved in the final moment of engagement with the person. This specialty is important to achieving Mayor de Blasio’s goals for One City, which includes implementing policies that support all parts of our population, increasing equity and access for everyone; the successful delivery of public services makes for successful public policy.

A particular focus for Service Design is incorporating processes for community engagement in the scoping and program analysis, to allow solutions to come *from* the community, and not only *to.* Simultaneously, this area of work should be taking advantage of the latest understanding in behavioral economics, anthropology, and other methods for best-serving and understanding each target population. This area of study is especially tasked with awareness of cultural differences and clarifying the impact of cultural heritage in providing of city services.

*Government and DDC Role.* DDC manages design and construction for other City agencies expert in the operation and delivery of their programs. The analytical process undertaken when a new capital project begins design is the ideal opportunity to evaluate service design aspects of a project’s program delivery. This will result in architectural designs that support service delivery innovations and best practices for their programs. This service design component will help ensure that our diverse and disparate communities are reached, and successfully served, to support the goals of One City.

*DDC’s Service Design Guidelines.* The deliverables to this Mini RFP will inform DDC’s upcoming publication on Service Design Guidelines, which are being developed for projects in the City’s capital project portfolio and scheduled for release on March 1, 2016.

B. Research Project Objectives. DDC seeks data and analysis on the efficacy of and best practices in service design in the implementation of public policy as described in greater detail below.

Provide a proposal for a research project on the efficacy and strategies for service design in government. The proposal should include proposed research questions and methodologies for gathering primary research. Research should include identifying elements of service design and the development of indicators to evaluate their efficacy. DDC can work with the proposer to help identify locations and programs that can be used for study among City agencies.

The suggested deliverables and schedule for this research project include:

Deliverables, to be completed by October 1, 2015:

* Presentation on interim report on:
* Survey of existing literature;
* Best practices from Behavioral Economics, Anthropology, Psychology and related relevant fields;
* Identified indicators from which to obtain data;
* Key research questions;
* Strategies for data collection tools and data flow;
* Study Design

Deliverables, to be completed by December 15, 2015:

* Presentation of interim Report on findings and recommendations aimed at supporting DDC’s drafting of its Service Design Guidelines to be released on March 1, 2016, including:
* Service design strategies for different populations and programs
* Cultural cues that can affect service design outcomes
* Strategies for community engagement

Best practices for service design to support successful public policy programs

In addition, DDC is interested in outlining an evaluation framework to measure the impact of service design features in DDC’s capital projects on the behavior of building occupants and their surrounding communities.

Deliverables, to be completed by February 1, 2016:

* Presentation of final interim report to support release of Guidelines.

Deliverables, to be completed by May 1, 2016:

* Presentation of interim report on work aimed at supporting future Guidelines.

Deliverables, to be completed by June 30th, 2016:

* Presentation of a final report reviewing all findings including those related to May 1, 2016 interim report, to include research, and final report presenting Inputs, Activities, Outputs and Outcomes (short, intermediate, and long term)

C. Anticipated Term. The term of the related Task Order for this Research Project can commence within one (1) calendar day from the date of written notice from DDC, on behalf of the Practitioner Project Manager, to proceed until June 30, 2016. Within that term, however, some or all of the deliverables will be due before June 30, 2016, as indicated above.

**III. Format and Contents of the Proposal in Response**

The Proposal in Response will be in the form of Appendix C to the Town+Gown Academic Consortium Contract, which is attached to this Mini RFP for the purpose of convenience. The Consultants should revise the form of Appendix C, as indicated in notes therein, to transform it into the Consultant’s Proposal in Response. The Proposal in Response of the Consultant to which the Task Order will be awarded will be transformed as indicated in Appendix C to become the Task Order.

**IV. Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Procedures**

A. Criteria. The Proposals in Response will be evaluated on the basis of criteria set forth below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criteria | Weight |
| **Experience.** The Academic Team’s background and experience with respect to the disciplines and issues covered in the Research Project | 40% |
| **Organizational Capacity.** The Academic Team’s organizational capability and, in particular, the clear definition of key roles and duties among the Principal Investigator/Project Director and other members of the Academic Team, as well as clear lines of communication among them, particularly with regard to interdisciplinary input | 20% |
| **Approach and Methodology.** The Academic Team’s approach to the Research Project and methodologies proposed | 30% |
| **Cost.** DDC has allocated $50,000 of its Research and Development budget to this Research Project. | 10% |

B. Other Considerations. DDC would like the Consultants to consider, in preparing its Proposal in Response, using an overhead rate of 10 percent for this Research Project. In addition, DDC would like the Consultants to consider staffing its proposed Academic Team with a graduate student dedicated to the Research Project full time, taking into consideration the student’s class load (approximately 20 to 25 hours a week) for a period of 9 months, with the remaining costs allocated to full-time faculty and other expenses.

C. Basis of Award. DDC will award the project to the responsive and responsible Consultant whose Proposal in Response DDC determines to be in the most advantageous to and in the best interest of the City, taking into consideration all the criteria and considerations which are set forth above in this Mini RFP. Award of the resulting Task Order is subject to successful negotiation of terms of the Task Order as provided in the Consortium Contract.

**Appendix C**

Template for Proposal in Response/Task Order \* \* \*

*\* \* \* Note: Each of the Consultants and the Practitioner Partners will need to modify elements of this Appendix C template to reflect the nature of the document it is drafting—in the case of the Consultant, its Response to a Mini RFP from a Requestor, and in the case of the Practitioner Partner (which is the Requestor in the Mini RFP), its resulting Task Order with the Academic Partner (which is the Consultant winning the award). This Appendix C template will contain additional notes focusing on the nature of expected changes which are provided for illustrative or clarification purposes.*

Prepared by [Consultant Name] (on Consultant’s Letterhead)

[Date]

### Article 1. *Agreement.* This [Proposal in Response/Task Order, [dated as of . . ., [by and between . . ./by and among . . .] ] is [prepared/executed] pursuant to the Consortium Contract, made and entered into as of the thirtieth (30th) day of November 2012, by and between the City (the “Consortium Contract”; all capitalized terms used, but not defined, herein shall have the meanings ascribed to them in Article 1 of the Consortium Contract), acting by and through the Commissioner of DDC, on behalf of the City, and each academic institution participating in Town+Gown.

*\* \* \* Note: When a Practitioner Partner modifies this Appendix C template in drafting the Task Order, the Practitioner Partner should indicate names of the City Agency or Agencies and/or Public Entity or Entities that constitute the Practitioner Partner and are each a party to the Task Order, indicating the status of each party as a City Agency, Certain Corporation or Public Entity. As provided in Section 2.8 of the Consortium Contract in the event of a Project jointly funded by any combination of City Agency and Public Entity, with an inter-agency transfer of funds from a Public Entity to a City Agency, the Public Entity shall comply with the procurement and budget requirements, to the extent permitted by applicable Law, to which the City Agency is, by Law, subject. In the event of a Project solely funded by a Public Entity, the Public Entity shall not be subject, by operation of this Consortium Contract, to any of the procurement and budget requirements that apply by Law to City Agencies. The resulting Task Orders shall reflect the operation of Section 2.8 of the Consortium Contract, so that all parties in the Task Order understand the procurement- and budget-related procedures on Research Projects applicable to Public Entities.*

### [Each/This] Research Project [will be/is] governed by a Task Order, negotiated and executed, pursuant to Section 3.4 of the Consortium Contract, by the Practitioner Partner and the Academic Partner, which Task Order [will define/defines] the contractual relationship between such Partners for the duration of that Research Project. The provision of services under this Task Order, which [will be/is] governed by the terms and conditions of the Consortium Contract, including but not limited to those in the Mini RFP complying with the provisions of Section 3.2 of the Consortium Contract and those in the Consortium Contract as required and provided therein.\*\*\*\*

*\* \* \* Note: When drafting the Mini RFP and resulting Task Order from elements of this Appendix C template, it will be necessary to choose between the terms within brackets to reflect the related step in the process.*

The Academic Partner shall accomplish the Project for which a Task Order has been executed and registered, on time and within budget. The nature of academic research requires some flexibility in the timing of performance, with unforeseeable obstacles and delays. Section 4.03(a) of the PPB Rules is analogous to the National Science Foundation’s practice with respect to delays in academic research and is available as a method of providing extensions of time on Task Orders for performance due to the typical delays in academic research. The Academic Partner shall not perform services under the Consortium Contract until a Task Order has been executed and registered with the Comptroller.

# *Article 2. Proposal in Response to Mini RFP.* Subject to the requirements of the Consortium Contract and the Mini RFP issued by the Requestor, the Consultant’s Proposal in Response shall be organized in a manner so as to provide the types of information as described below. Due to the standard of evaluation set forth in Section 4.3 of the Consortium Contract with respect to payment and the certification in Section 4.2 of this Proposal in Response/Task Order, it is especially important that the Consultant be as detailed, as specific and as clear as possible with respect to the elements set forth below.

*\* \* \* Note: After the award is made based on a particular Mini RFP, these Article 2 elements of the Mini RFP become the Academic Practitioner’s obligations under the resulting Task Order.*

## 2.1 *Research Project Objectives*

Describe the overall objectives and goals.

Describe the scope, listing and describing the research approaches, work to be performed and the phases of the work.

Describe the nature of the collaboration between staffs of the Requestor, as practitioner, and the Consultant, identifying the elements of practitioner experience that would be useful for the research, as well as any other research needs with which the Requestor could provide assistance.

## 2.2. *Work Products and Deliverables*

Describe the anticipated work products and deliverables for the project, including interim reports if appropriate, with a sufficient level of detail, including the form and the nature of the content.

## 2.3*. Project Plan and Estimated Duration of Project, including Schedule*

Describe the plan for the Research Project, assigning time values for elements of the scope as a schedule for the Project. City Agencies must use expense funds in the City fiscal year they are appropriated; they are not permitted to roll unexpended expense funds into the following City fiscal year, but must appropriate expense funds anew in each succeeding City fiscal year. Thus, for Research Project funded with City tax levy funds, it is important to demonstrate an alignment between the proposed schedule in the Project Plan and the City Agency’s expressed expectation for the project duration in the Mini RFP. Payment requisitions pursuant to Article 4 of the Consortium Contract require, among other things, a status report to indicate the relation of the payment requisition to the Project Plan.

## 2.4*. Project Staffing and Organization.*

List the members of the Academic Team, the costs of whose work will be estimated in the chart in Section 2.5 below, and provide an organizational chart showing the Academic Team’s organization for the Project.

One of the elements of Town+Gown’s Organizational Character is supporting academic-practitioner collaborations by highlighting the importance of practice as a source of knowledge, with Academics and Practitioners as equal partners in knowledge creation. Thus, it is important to describe how the Academic Team members will interact with the Requestor’s staff and other entities, including a narrative describing the organization and interactions as they support the nature of the academic-practitioner collaboration in Section 2.1 above which will become part of the Project Plan. In such Project Plan, it will be important to anticipate how the Academic Partner will work with the Practitioner Partner on a Research Project as the equivalent of a peer reviewer on any Task Order-generated work product as contemplated by Section 6.01 of Appendix A.

The Consultant will estimate costs associated with the Academic Team pursuant to the provisions of Section 3.3 (d) and (e) of the Consortium Contract and show them on the chart in Section 2.5 below. The Consultant shall include a curriculum vitae or resume of no more than three (3) pages for each Senior Personnel member of the Academic Team, including any Subcontractors.

As provided in Section 3.3 (e) (8) of the Consortium Contract, the Consultant may include, in the Academic Team, entities providing services as Subcontractors. To the extent a Task Order includes the services of Subcontractors, the Consultant shall be responsible for the performance of services thereby. For the convenience of reference only, the Consultant should know that subcontracts shall comply with the requirements of Section 2.07, 3.02, 4.07, 7.03, 7.08, 7.09 and 13.06 of Appendix A.Further, expenses incurred by the Consultant in connection with furnishing Subcontractors for the performance of required services under a Task Order are deemed included in the payments to the Consultant as set forth in Article 4 of this Consortium Contract. While the Consultant may pay its Subcontractors first and then seek reimbursement pursuant to the applicable provisions of this Consortium Contract, in the event the Consultant does not pay its Subcontractors prior to seeking reimbursement, the Consultant shall pay its Subcontractors the full amount due them from their proportionate share of the requisition, as paid by the City. The Consultant shall make such payment not later than five Days after receipt of payment by the City.

2.5*. [Proposed] Project Budget [and Not to Exceed Amount].*

Using this chart as a template, provide a proposed Project budget, estimating the costs of each component of the Project as provided in Section 3.3(e) of this Consortium Contract, and providing any require additional justification. Please provide a copy of an effective negotiated indirect cost rate with federal agency bound by the provisions of OMB Circular A-21 or a proposed indirect cost calculation methodology pursuant to Section 3.3(e)(xi) of the Consortium Contract.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Principal Investigator/Project Director: | | | | |
| Headings under Section 3.3 (e) | [columns for calculations] | | | Costs |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ***Not to Exceed Amount*** |  |  |  | ***$ .*** |

## *Article 3. Consultant’s Billing and Invoicing.*

The general requirements of the Consortium Contract, including Article 4, and any specific requirements of the Mini RFP will govern the billing and invoicing process from the Requestor’s perspective.

The Consultant should list the personnel responsible for billing and invoicing functions at the Consultant organization and related contact information.

*Article 4. Representations and Warranties.*

4.1. *Accuracy and Completeness of Statements.* The Consultant/Academic Partner certifies that statements, representations and warranties contained in the Proposal in Response, the Task Order, and the Consortium Contract, including Appendix A thereto, were true and complete as of the date they were made and are true and complete as of the date it executes this Task Order.

*\* \* \* Note: For convenience of reference only, the Academic Partner should know that Sections 2.01 (procurement of contract/task orders), 2.03 (fair practices), 2.04 (VENDEX), 2.07 (unlawful discriminatory practices), 3.02 (e) (subcontractor performance); 4.01 (independent contractor status), 4.02 (employees), 4.07 (E.O. 50), 6.01 (copyrights) and 7.08 (insurance certificate) contain specific representations and warranties.*

4.2. *The Project.* The Consultant/Academic Practitioner certifies that all elements of the work and costs necessary to perform the Project in a professional and competent manner according to the standards of the relevant field(s) and/or discipline(s), and to meet the requirements set forth in the Mini RFP have been included in this Proposal in Response/Task Order.

4.3. *Academic Team Members.* The Consultant/Academic Practitioner represents and warrants that the members of the Academic Team possess the experience, knowledge and character necessary to qualify them individually for the particular services they will perform on the Project in a professional and competent manner.

The submission of curriculum vitae and resumes for the Senior Personnel members of the Academic Team, whether they are the Consultant’s direct employees or Subcontractors, with the Proposal in Response, implies that such individuals will be available to perform the services on the Project. For the Consultant who is awarded the Task Order, it is expected that such members of the Academic Team will perform the services under the Task Order; provided, however, that such Consultant may replace members of the Academic Team on the Project during the term of the Task Order with personnel who possess qualifications substantially similar to those being replaced, with prior notice to the Practitioner Partner.

To the extent a Requestor/Practitioner Partner believes a member of the Academic Team is unable to perform services in a professional and competent manner according to the standards of the relevant field(s) and/or discipline(s), it shall have the right to raise such concerns with the Consultant/Academic Partner so that both parties have the opportunity to resolve such concerns in good faith, subject to the provisions of Section 10.02 of Appendix A.

4.4. *Agreement to Comply with Terms of Task Order.* The Consultant/Academic Partner agrees to comply with the terms and conditions of the Task Order and the Consortium Contract under which it was issued.

4.5. *Conflicts of Interest—Gown.* The Consultant/Academic Partner certifies that it has implemented and is enforcing a written policy on conflicts of interest, consistent with the provisions of the National Science Foundation’s AAG Chapter IV.A.; further, that, to the best of the undersigned Authorized Party’s knowledge, all financial disclosures required by the conflict of interest policy were made; and that conflicts of interest, if any, were, or prior to the institution's expenditure of any funds under the award, will be, satisfactorily managed, reduced or eliminated in accordance with the Consultant’s conflict of interest policy.

4.6. *Training and Oversight.* To the extent the Academic Team includes any postdoctoral researchers, graduate students or undergraduate students, the Consultant/Academic Partner certifies that it has a plan to provide appropriate training and oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research to undergraduates, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers.

4.7. *Affirmation.* The Consultant affirms and declares that it is [describe status under State corporations law and federal income tax law], and, further, that it is not in arrears to the City upon debt, contract or taxes, it is not a defaulter, as surety or otherwise, upon obligation to the City, it has not been declared “not responsible” or disqualified, by any agency of the City, and that, to its knowledge, there is no proceeding pending relating to its responsibility or qualification to receive public contract except as indicated in the space below:

*Article 5. Task Order Execution.* Execution of a Task Order by the Practitioner Partner shall be evidence of such Practitioner Partner’s approval of the following items:

(1) subcontractors pursuant to Sections 3.3 (b) and (e)(8) of the Consortium Contract, subject to final compliance with PPB Rule requirements and Sections 2.07, 3.02 and 4.07 of Appendix A,

(2) compensation beyond three months and/or utilizing a percentage equivalent of academic contract effort pursuant to Section 3.3(e)(1) of the Consortium Contract,

(3) treating components of an Academic Partner’s facilities and administration as a direct cost pursuant to Section 3.3 (e)(2) of the Consortium Contract,

(4) the purchase of equipment and post-Project ownership of such equipment pursuant to Section 3.3 (e)(6) of the Consortium Contract,

(5) the incurrence of expenses related to long-distance travel pursuant to Section 3.3 (e)(7) of the Consortium Contract, to be reimbursed, in the case of City Agency Requestors, pursuant to the provisions of Article 4 of the Consortium Contract,

(6) the incurrence of expenses related to computer services pursuant to Section 3.3 (e)(9) of the Consortium Contract, and

(7) the application of the formula to determine indirect costs pursuant to Section 3.3(e)(10) of the Consortium Contract.

*Article 6. Relation of Task Order to Consortium Contract.*

6.1 *Task Order Incorporates Terms of Consortium Contract.* This Task Order shall be deemed to incorporate all the terms and conditions of the Consortium Contract, including Appendix A thereto, even if such terms and conditions are not expressly reiterated in this Task Order.

*\* \* \* Drafters of the resulting Task Order should also reflect the following aspects resulting from various provisions of the Consortium Contract and decide how to reflect them in the remainder of this Appendix C template:*

*Mini RFPs issued by any Requesting City Agency, alone or with other Requestors, shall comply with the requirements of PPB Rules as discussed in greater detail in Section 3.2 of the Consortium Contract, and the resulting Task Order will also be subject to the PPB Rules.*

*Pursuant to Section 2.8 of the Consortium Contract, Mini RFPs issued solely by a Public Entity or Public Entities shall comply with applicable Laws, and the Public Entity or Entities shall include references to such applicable Laws in its Task Order to the extent necessary or helpful for the Academic Practitioner. Further, as discussed in Section 3.2(g) of the Consortium Contract, the Public Entity or Entities shall also indicate, in the Task Order, provisions in the Consortium Contract that do not apply to the Public Entities, including but not limited to Sections 8.09, 9.01, 11.01, 11.02, 12.02, 12.03, 12.04 and 13.06 of Appendix A, and indicate such analogous provisions, if any, that do apply.*

*To the extent a Practitioner Partner elected, pursuant to Section 3.2(f), certain optional provisions in Appendix A, including but not limited to Sections 5.05, 5.08, 6.01 and 6.02 of Appendix A, the Practitioner Partner shall indicate in the Task Order such elected provisions.*

6.2 *Task Order Not an Amendment of Consortium Contract.* Neither a Proposal in Response nor a Task Order may alter the terms and conditions of the Consortium Contract. The terms and conditions of the Consortium Contract Agreement can only be modified by the parties in an amendment pursuant to Section 6.4 of the Consortium Contract, and any provision of a Task Order that would have the effect of amending a term or condition of the Consortium Contract shall be null and void.

Any amendments, changes or modifications of this Task Order must comply with the provisions of Section 9.01 of Appendix A.

6.3 *Conflict between Task Order and Consortium Contract.* In the event of any conflict between any provision in this Task Order and any provision of the Consortium Contract, including Appendix A thereto, the provision in the Consortium Contract shall control.

*Article 7.* *Notices*

***.*** Any notices or other instruments required to be given or delivered pursuant this Task Order and the Consortium Contract under which it was issued shall be in writing and shall be delivered by hand against the written receipt therefor or sent by registered or certified mail as set forth below:

* To DDC, as manager of this Consortium Contract, addressed to the attention of Commissioner, New York City Department of Design and Construction, 30-30 Thomson Avenue, Long Island City, New York 11101;
* To the Practitioner Partner,[to come]; and
* To Academic Partners, [to come].

The parties hereto have executed original copies of this Consortium Contract, as of the last date below or such other date as applicable, in quantities required by Section 3.4 (f) of the Consortium Contract.

**[Academic Partner] [Practitioner Partner]**

**AGREED TO AND ACCEPTED BY: AGREED TO AND ACCEPTED BY:**

By: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**DDC, as Administrator of Consortium Contract and Director of Town+Gown,**

**(for City Agencies: ACCEPTED BY)**

**(for Public Entities: ACKNOWLEDGED BY)**

By: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_