



City of Philadelphia RFI Question Responses – 311 Mobile Application

#	RFI Section # (If applicable)	Question	Response
1.		Has the city or department identified any particular software or tool preferred for the solution?	No, the City does not have a preference at this time. We are interested in a modern, clean, and user-friendly mobile app and are open to learning what options are available.
2.		Is this RFI separate from the current 311 work being done in the city?	Yes.
3.		What is the current volume of calls and non-call cases for 311?	About 2,500 calls per day and 1,200–1,500 non-call cases (via mobile, web, and email).
4.		Are all services available on the website also available on the mobile app?	The mobile app and website include an 'Other' option, but the call center has more specific categories. However, everything available on the website will need to be represented in the new mobile app. (Both Google Play Store and Apple iTunes)
5.		Where are user-submitted images and content currently stored?	Images are stored in Salesforce and PublicStuff.
6.		How is the existing mobile application built? Is it a Salesforce or native app?	It is not a Salesforce app. The app was developed by another vendor and is solely managed by them.
7.		Will the city continue to use Salesforce as the backend?	Yes, the City intends to continue using Salesforce, and the middleware is MuleSoft.
8.		Will location accuracy use the city's location database?	Yes. The app should integrate with the City's location database (initials possibly 'ECESCR')
9.		Is it a city-maintained address registry that should be used for location validation?	Yes, it's used to validate addresses and possibly other assets like traffic lights and parks.
10.		Are there any specific data security concerns the city is focused on?	Vendors must follow best practices for secure coding. Most resident data should be stored in Salesforce, behind firewalls. A City security team will review and provide guidelines at an appropriate time.
11.		Is there a predefined taxonomy or routing logic in Salesforce to categorize and route service requests?	Issues are usually due to user error. The City is looking for solutions to help users select the correct service category. Some back-end Salesforce updates could be considered, but a full overhaul is unlikely.
12.		Is the city open to AI-based classification (e.g., auto-identifying categories from images)?	Yes, the City is open to this functionality.

#	RFI Section # (If applicable)	Question	Response
13.		How does the city currently detect and manage duplicate service requests?	This is handled manually and is a known bottleneck. The City is interested in systems that can group related cases and support parent-child ticketing.
14.		What is the timeline from RFI to MVP?	The City aims to have a Minimum Viable Product (MVP) live by May 2026.
15.		Where is aggregated 311 data published?	Data is published on https://opendataphilly.org/ . The City would prefer more localized stats for residents in the future.
16.	II	Is offshore work permitted for implementation, integration, and/or configuration services, or any other aspect of this project?	Yes.
17.	II	Are there specific vendor requirements for project location or team composition	No.
18.	II	What is the total anticipated number of users (external and internal)?	Internal: approx. 100 External: 100,000
19.	VI	How will vendor proposals or system options be evaluated during the selection process?	This City Request for Information does not have a selection process. The next step of the process is a Request for Proposal (or similar solicitation approach), which does have a selection process.
20.	VI	Does the City have a defined data retention timeline?	We need to ensure service data is made available to the public per City Executive Order 1-12, Open Data and Government Transparency. Internal retention will depend on the type of data. The current app logs are fully backed up.
21.	VI	Should resumes be included for prime: key personnel and consultants, with the RFI response?	Not at this point in the RFX process. This is not a contracting opportunity.
22.	VII	Do we need to submit three years of financial data with the RFI response?	Not at this point in the RFX process. This is not a contracting opportunity.
23.	VII	To qualify for this requirement, do prime / sub-contractors need to have a physical office in City of Philadelphia?	No, they do not need to have a physical office in the City of Philadelphia.
24.	VII	Can the City provide the details of the incumbent(s) for this requirement	The incumbent (s) details are not relevant to this RFI
25.	VII	To qualify for this requirement, do prime / sub-contractors have any goals to fulfill?	No. This is not a contracting opportunity.

#	RFI Section # (If applicable)	Question	Response
26.	VII	What is the estimated duration and please provide the timeline of implementation services?	MVP will be required by May 2026.
27.	VII	How are training services delivered (e.g., in-person, virtual)?	Virtual.
28.	VIII	Can the City provide the details of the budget for this requirement? Is there a defined budget or range for the project, including implementation, licensing, and support?	Not at this point in the RFX process.
29.	VII	Do you foresee expanding the system beyond the current scope to other administrative functions?	If the argument warrants scope expansion, it may be considered.
30.	VII	Should the system include offline capabilities for mobile devices?	Yes.
31.	VII	Are there any unique operational challenges the solution must address?	The system must be able to block bad actors and inappropriate photos, ensure address accuracy and validation, allow accurate submission of complaints, and integrate seamlessly with existing systems (MuleSoft, Esri, Salesforce, etc.). It should also manage duplicate complaints, align with operational workflows, and allow users to submit photos.
32.	VII	Are there key performance indicators (KPIs), success metrics, and eligibility criteria the City will use to evaluate the solution?	Yes, some from research discovery.
33.	VI	Will the City provide MuleSoft API endpoints and data mapping documentation, or is the vendor expected to lead API design?	City will provide endpoint API data.
34.	VI	Does the City have a preferred mobile app deployment model (e.g., native iOS/Android)	React Native is the preferred mobile app deployment model.
35.	VI	Will the City's internal IT team manage App Store / Google Play submissions and updates, or should the vendor manage this on behalf of the city?	The vendor should manage submissions and updates on behalf of the City.
36.	II	Can you clarify whether the City envisions a complete overhaul of the current 311 app UI/UX including	We envision a completely new app that supports existing functionality but connects to more City services and announcements.

#	RFI Section # (If applicable)	Question	Response
37.	VI	The addendum notes 'inconsistent location accuracy' as a major challenge. Could the City share sample scenarios or specific failure points (e.g., mismatched addresses, pin-drop discrepancies, etc.)?	The locations found via the app are not accurate and our addresses need to match City GIS data for certain requests.
38.	VI	On the City's current reporting site (https://iframe.publicstuff.com/#?client_id=242), for example, the Abandoned Vehicle request has a limited set of fields. Should vendors assume that these data points will remain static, or will the City want the flexibility to add more fields over time?	Flexibility is preferred.
39.	VI	What mapping solution is currently being used within the app/web platform? Would the City be open to migrating to alternatives like Mapbox, depending on licensing, visual customization, or feature capabilities?	We would like to connect to the City's GIS system.
40.	VI	The addendum mentions 'secure account creation and access' as a solution area. Can you elaborate on expected identity protocols or systems (e.g, Login.phila.gov, OAuth2, multi-factor)	login.phila.gov will need to be integrated into the solution.
41.	VI	In the RFI, there's interest in AI-assisted service identification via image input. Are you currently experimenting with any models or pilot tools, or would the City prefer vendors to propose new AI solutions from scratch?	We are open to learning about AI-assisted solutions on the market.
42.	VI	What level of SLA visibility and reporting exists today for residents? Are SLAs and case statuses tracked in Salesforce, and do you expect real-time integration into the front-end user dashboard?	Residents receive email notifications of the process and an expectation of service time. We expect users to be able to see the status of their case within the new mobile application.
43.	VI	Could the City share whether any service request flows (e.g., abandoned vehicle, illegal dumping) currently involve automated routing rules or escalations in Salesforce or Cityworks? Or is most of the routing manual today?	Routing is currently performed manually.

#	RFI Section # (If applicable)	Question	Response
44.	VI	Is the City expecting the vendor to deliver new MuleSoft APIs or simply integrate with the existing set? Will documentation and access to current API endpoints be made available during implementation?	The vendor will need to integrate into our MuleSoft setup managed by the City. Documentation and assistance will be available.
45.	VI	Beyond WCAG 2.1 AA compliance, are there additional accessibility goals (e.g., screen reader optimizations, multilingual content, low-bandwidth modes, offline mode) that the City wants to prioritize in the new experience?	We are interested in multilingual but prioritize ease of use for all.
46.	II	The City currently uses an iframe powered by PublicStuff (Accela) for service request intake. Could you clarify how PublicStuff (Accela) and Salesforce are expected to interact in the new solution? Specifically: • Will both platforms continue to play distinct roles (e.g., PublicStuff for intake and Salesforce for CRM)? • Is there scope or preference for consolidating platform? • Are there integrations in place today or planned via MuleSoft between PublicStuff and Salesforce that vendors should be aware of?	This new solution will replace the PublicStuff mobile and web application. Complaints submitted through the new platform will integrate directly into Salesforce as cases. Currently, PublicStuff and Salesforce are connected through Software AG; however, we are in the process of transitioning that integration to MuleSoft.
47.	II	Cityworks is mentioned alongside Salesforce and MuleSoft in the current architecture. Could you clarify the role Cityworks plays in the current 311 request lifecycle? For example: • Is Cityworks used primarily for field crew dispatch and work order management? • Are there existing integrations (via MuleSoft or otherwise) between Salesforce and Cityworks? • Would the City consider consolidating some of the functionality into Salesforce, or is Cityworks considered a long-term component of the architecture?	Cityworks will need to remain in place by the agencies using it and performing 311 services. Salesforce via MuleSoft communicates cases to Cityworks.
48.		Will the City's current 311 mobile app codebase, APIs, and documentation be made available to the selected vendor to support migration and feature parity?	This is something the City may consider.
49.		Is there an expected user concurrency or peak transaction load that the mobile app must be able to handle?	In 2025, the highest number of new mobile requests per hour was 58

#	RFI Section # (If applicable)	Question	Response
50.		Does the City have branding, style, or accessibility guidelines that must be followed in the UI/UX design of the app?	Yes, and this will be provided to the selected vendor at an appropriate time during a subsequent contracting process.
51.	VI	For Login.phila.gov, will the City provide full developer documentation and support for implementing SSO in a mobile app environment?	Yes, this element is internal, and support will be provided
52.	VI	How should the SLA display be calculated based on working days, calendar days, or other metrics?	The SLA should be working days unless the design dictates differently.
53.	VI	Can the City provide sample workflows or decision trees for the progressive forms to better understand conditional logic and emergency detection requirements?	Please review the Right of Way request as an example of requests that route to emergency response.
54.	VI	Does the City currently use Salesforce Platform Events or Change Data Capture (CDC) for real-time sync with external systems like Cityworks?	No.
55.	VII	Does the City have a preferred ticketing/help desk platform for support integration, or should the vendor propose one?	Salesforce is the backbone of the 311 team operation.
56.	VI	Will the City provide its own content moderation/bad actor detection API, or should the solution include AI moderation?	The solution should address bad actors. Any additional usage of AI will be considered.
57.		Will the City require end-to-end encryption at both transport and payload levels for API data?	Yes.
58.	VI	Will the City require the GIS integration to use its own Esri ArcGIS environment exclusively, or can other GIS data sources be used in combination?	We prefer to use our own Esri ArcGIS environment.
59.	VI	Is there a centralized logging and monitoring system for API transactions (e.g., Splunk, ELK, MuleSoft Anypoint Monitoring), or should vendors propose one?	Yes, we will use Mulesoft Anypoint Monitoring in addition to our own self-hosted setup using Grafana, Prometheus and Alloy.
60.	VI	Can the City confirm whether Cityworks is operated by the City or managed through a third-party government partner/vendor?	CityWorks is managed in-house by the respective City departments.

#	RFI Section # (If applicable)	Question	Response
61.	V	Can the City confirm which specific parts of the 311 solution will be subject to CJIS and HIPAA compliance, so vendors can plan infrastructure accordingly?	No part of the public facing app should be subject to CJIS or HIPAA data.
62.		Is the vendor expected to provide long-term maintenance and support using the specified technology stack?	The city is open to vendor-provided long-term maintenance and support or to alternative approaches recommended by the vendor.
63.		Are there specific minimum OS versions or device types that the mobile application must support? Does the technology stack selection relate to maximizing device compatibility?	We expect this application to be compatible with all modern mobile phones issued within the last 5 years.
64.	VI	Are there data governance or security restrictions when integrating with these systems, especially if they are managed outside the City's internal IT infrastructure?	Any solution will require adherence to the City's data governance and security procedures with guidance from the City.
65.	VI	For both Cityworks and PublicStuff, are there open API endpoints available, and do they have existing integration patterns with Salesforce?	Yes, there are open API endpoints via MuleSoft to connect Cityworks to Salesforce.
66.	VII	Does the City prefer references from U.S. municipalities only, or will international public sector projects be considered relevant?	All references are relevant.
67.	VI	For the 'legal addresses' requirement, will the City provide its own address validation service, or should the solution include address validation tools?	We would like the solution to utilize the City's GIS system for address validation.
68.	VI	What are the current maximum file size limits?	PublicStuff file size limit for videos and file attachment is 25 MB.
69.	VII	Will the City provide a list of standard KPIs and dashboards currently used in the 311 system for replication/improvement	This will be provided during a subsequent RFP or similar solicitation process.
70.		If we will create it from scratch, who will provide the UI/UX Design?	We have an in-house UX team that can work with the vendor.
71.	VI	Under System Functionality, can you provide more details on the "Ability to connect to Atlas.phila.gov"	The current mobile app links to atlas.phila.gov and the new mobile app must also.
72.	VI	Under Attachments, can you provide more details on the "Bad actor/blocking detection for attachments "	We need a solution that can detect bulk spam submissions as well as inappropriate images sent in lieu of issue images.

#	RFI Section # (If applicable)	Question	Response
73.	VI	Under Location, can you elaborate the “Require different types of location based on service (ie. Intersection or node)”	Departments such as Streets have services that would be best identified with an intersection rather than a street address. We would like the new solution to address different types of location submissions and validations.
74.	VI	Under Integrations, can you provide more details on the ff: -Utilize Login.phila.gov -City’s GIS platform -City’s trash/recycling schedule	Login.phila.gov is the City's accounts across all platforms. This will need to be the account linked to the 311 app. The City maintains a GIS database of legal street addresses and City assets that we would validate submitted addresses against. We are interested in associating account and location data to City services such as Trash collection. We would like the refuse service page to show the resident's trash schedule to prevent service requests when the pickup schedule is delayed.
75.	VI	Under Interested Functionality, can you elaborate the: AI supported identification of service via image taken a) Suggest service based on photo	We are interested in machine learning or AI suggesting services based on the image provided by the resident. We hope to reduce confusion over similar sounding services such as street light versus traffic light support.