

January 27, 2026

ADDENDUM NUMBER 2

Battery Park City Authority

RFI for Systems to Automate BPCA's Financial Processes

Please be advised that this Addendum Number 2 to the above-referenced Request for Information is issued for the purpose of providing responses to the substantive questions received by the initial January 20th 5pm deadline, this deadline has since been changed to January 30th by 5pm Est in Addendum Number 1. This Addendum Number 2 is hereby made a part of the RFI to the same extent as if it were originally included therein. Vendors should acknowledge receipt of this addendum as part of their submission.

RESPONDERS PLEASE TAKE NOTE OF THE FOLLOWING CHANGE TO THE RFI:

A) RFI REVISIONS:

The following revisions are hereby made to the Request for Information (“RFI”) document for the RFI for Systems to Automate BPCA's Financial Processes:

- 1) Addendum No.1 – Issued on January 26, 2026
- 2) Addendum No.2 – **THIS ADDENDUM:**

The following is a list of responses to questions submitted by prospective respondents to the RFI for Systems to Automate BPCA's Financial Processes. A copy of the RFI is available at:

<https://media.bpca.ny.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/12165203/RFI-for-Systems-to-Automate-BPCAs-Financial-Processes-RFI.pdf>

All other provisions contained in the RFI and previous Addendum, including the revised deadline for RFI responses, remains unchanged.

1. Please confirm whether MFR Consultants, including any affiliates, subcontractors or partners, are permitted to submit proposals or otherwise participate as a bidder or implementation partner in any subsequent solicitation arising from this RFI. ***MFR Consultants, Inc. is precluded from submitting proposals or otherwise participating as a bidder or implementation partner in any subsequent solicitation arising from this RFI. BPCA anticipates that MFR will continue in an overall project management and coordination role.***
2. Will these be considered BPCA records under BPCA's control? Will personnel at MFR have access only with a need to know? ***Vendor submissions are considered BPCA records, and access is limited to those MFR personnel working directly on this project.***
3. Please confirm whether information provided by vendors will be used for BPCA's planning and market research purposes only, or may be reused, summarized or incorporated into future requirements, deliverables or advisory work in a manner that could advantage or disadvantage vendors. ***Vendor information will be used only to inform BPCA's understanding of available market solutions, capabilities, and best practices, and may be synthesized to help develop future procurement requirements and specifications.***
4. Is MFR Consultants subject to contractual confidentiality and non-use obligations covering vendor submissions, including protections beyond FOIL-related disclosure requirements? ***Yes. MFR Consultants, Inc. is subject to contractual confidentiality and non-use obligations under their professional services agreement with BPCA. These obligations prohibit unauthorized use or disclosure of vendor information except as necessary to fulfill their advisory role to BPCA.***
5. The RFI references (Ref: Requirements 1.4.2 & 2.4.3) bidirectional data exchange with Microsoft Dynamics GP. For planning purposes:
 - a. Is the current Dynamics GP environment hosted on-premises or in a third-party/cloud environment? ***The current Dynamics GP environment is hosted in a cloud environment.***
 - b. Should vendors assume integration via existing interfaces (e.g., APIs or file-based exchange), rather than direct database-level integration? ***BPCA is seeking information on all available integration approaches. Please describe your solution's native integration capabilities and your recommended integration approach.***
6. Requirement 1.4.6 references the potential availability of useful data in Procore (Ref Requirement 1.4.6).
 - a. Can BPCA confirm whether Procore is currently used as the primary system of

record for construction management data relevant to capital project tracking?
Procore is not currently the system of record for construction management data relevant to capital project tracking.

- b. If not, is Procore considered an optional or secondary data source for informational purposes only? ***For the purposes of this solution, Procore will initially be an optional data source. However, the proposed solution should support potential future integration.***
7. Requirement 2.1.5 indicates support for payment receipt following billing. Should vendors interpret this requirement as recording and reconciling payments received through existing external channels (e.g., checks, wires, ACH processed elsewhere), rather than directly processing payments within the solution? ***Vendors should interpret this requirement as recording and reconciling payments received through existing external channels. However, BPCA would be open to considering direct payment options if available.***
8. To ensure consistent assumptions across vendor responses, should vendors assume responsibility for hosting and licensing of proposed cloud solutions in a future pricing model, or alignment with an existing BPCA enterprise cloud tenant, if applicable? ***BPCA is seeking information on all available deployment and hosting models.***
Vendors should describe their preferred or available approaches, including:
 - o ***Vendor-hosted SaaS solutions with pricing that includes hosting and licensing***
 - o ***Solutions deployable in BPCA's cloud environment (if applicable to your offering)***
 - o ***Hybrid or other arrangements***
- Please include details on who would be responsible for cloud infrastructure costs, licensing fees, and ongoing hosting. If your solution can be deployed in multiple ways, describe the options and any associated cost or operational differences.***
9. The RFI references (Ref: Requirements 1.1.18 & 2.2.3) approval workflows and potential external access (e.g., auditors) Should vendors assume all approval workflows are performed by internal BPCA staff, or do any workflows require participation from external parties (e.g., bond trustees, city agencies, or external auditors)? ***Vendors should assume that all approval workflows are performed by internal BPCA staff.***
10. Appendix 4 references FedRAMP considerations for cloud services. For planning purposes, should vendors assume that a commercially hosted cloud solution that is SOC 2 Type II compliant (and aligned with ISO 27001 or equivalent standards) is acceptable, or is FedRAMP authorization required? ***BPCA generally seeks cloud solutions that meet or***

exceed FedRAMP security standards. However, for purposes of this RFI, vendors are encouraged to respond regardless of current FedRAMP authorization status. Please describe your current security certifications and frameworks. Responses to this RFI will help inform final requirements for any subsequent solicitation.

11. For Case #3 (Ref: Requirement 3.4.1), does BPCA currently receive consolidated investment data through a third-party aggregator or advisor, or should vendors assume ingestion of data from individual custodial sources? *Assume ingestion of data from individual sources. Note that BPCA currently has one custodian and two investment advisors.*
12. For fair-value reporting and analysis (Ref: Requirements 3.3.12 & 3.4.6), Should vendors assume market pricing data would be supplied indirectly (e.g., via custodian or advisor files), or does BPCA anticipate requiring direct integration with third-party pricing data providers? *BPCA does not anticipate requiring direct integration with third-party pricing data providers, but would be open to considering it if available.*
13. To support high-level feasibility and migration planning for Use Case #2:
 - a. Approximately how many active PILOT or abatement agreements are currently managed (e.g., fewer than 100, 100–1,000, or more than 1,000)?
PILOT is required to be paid to BPCA based on assessments and tax rates set by the New York City Department of Finance. There are approximately 3,800 PILOT records currently tracked via spreadsheet.
 - b. Are historical records maintained primarily in spreadsheets, or are there other legacy systems that store this information? *Spreadsheets primarily support transaction calculation, processing and reconciliation. Transactions are recorded in Dynamics GP.*
14. Regarding migration of legacy spreadsheet data (Ref: Requirement 1.5.2), approximately how many years of historical financial data should be assumed to remain accessible and reportable in the proposed solution? *Ideally, all historical data currently tracked by spreadsheet would be incorporated into the new solution to provide a complete history of each bond issuance. Transactions date back to 2013 (the year the earliest outstanding bonds were issued). However, BPCA is open to vendor recommendations on the most practical approach to historical data migration based on vendor platform capabilities.*
15. To better understand the current state, are these financial tracking and reporting processes currently supported by any third-party software vendors, or are they managed primarily through internal BPCA processes and tools? *The three in-scope Use Cases are primarily managed by internal processes and tools (Excel).*
16. How does BPCA prioritize Use Cases #1,2,3 in their go-forward approach? Is one Use Case more burdensome than the others, either now or in the anticipated future? *BPCA has identified all three use cases as equal priorities for near-term implementation.*

17. Can you share the BPCA's budgetary expectations for fulfilling these Use Cases?

Budgetary expectations will be defined following this RFI process. Respondents should provide cost estimates and pricing structures to help inform BPCA's budget development.

By signing the line below, I am acknowledging that all pages of this Addendum #2 have been received, reviewed and understood, and will be incorporated into the RFI response submitted. This document must be attached to the RFI response for consideration.

Print Name

Signature

Date

Number of pages received: _____ <fill in>

Distributed to: All prospective Responders.